


## AUTHORITARIAN IDEAS IN BRAZILIAN MILITARY THOUGHT: THE PRESENCE OF OLIVEIRA VIANNA AND ALBERTO TÔRRES' CONCEPTIONS IN JUAREZ TÁVORA

 [https://doi.org/ 10.56238/arev6n1-007](https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n1-007)

Submitted on: 26/08/2024

Publication date: 26/09/2024

Felipe Fontana<sup>1</sup> and Carla Cristina Wrbieta Ferezin<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

This article seeks to measure the impact of certain political-authoritarian ideas on Brazilian military thought. In view of the scope of this object, we will limit our analyses to the presence of the ideas of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna in the midst of the thought of Juarez Távora, a unique figure in the political-military scenario between the 1920s and 1960s. Such an activity will allow the understanding of how certain conceptions of Tôrres and Vianna were read and reproduced by Távora, that is, if they were literally used, if they suffered inflections, or even, if changes are identified, what are the reasons for such changes. Because of this, we will investigate how Vianna and Tôrres' perceptions of Brazil may have inspired the construction of a diagnosis and a prognosis for the Brazilian nation in Távora's intellectual trajectory. In addition, we will attribute great relevance to the conjuncture, both for the historical context in which the ideas of Tôrres and Vianna were constituted, as well as for the social and political moment in Brazil in which Távora produced his positions and, mainly, articulated them given theorizations and readings of the two aforementioned authors.

**Keywords:** Authoritarianism in Brazil. Viannian Thought. Appropriation and Circulation of Ideas. Brazilian Authoritarian Thought. Authoritarian Thought of Alberto Tôrres.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doctor in Political Science from PPG-Pol/UFSCar (2017) and Post-Doctorate in Teaching for Science and Mathematics from PCM-UEM (2020)

Professor and researcher at the Department of Social Work at the State University of the Midwest of Paraná (DESES-UNICENTRO) and at the Graduate Program in the National Network for the Teaching of Environmental Sciences at the State University of Maringá (PROFCIAMB-UEM)

E-mail: [buthjaum@gmail.com](mailto:buthjaum@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9582-2178>

LATTES: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6129448426028004>

<sup>2</sup> Doctor in Political Science from PPG-Pol/UFSCar (2017)

E-mail: [carlaferezin@gmail.com](mailto:carlaferezin@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6527-9327>

LATTES: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/0439807619383825>

## INTRODUCTION

Juarez Távora's ideas aimed at guiding political actions for Brazil, especially his perception of the need for a strong State that would carry out modernization from above and that would limit political participation when it threatened the current social order, were in line with some ideological propositions perpetrated by the military who longed for a military intervention in Brazil, a fact that allowed him to conquer high-ranking positions in the Castelo Branco government after the 1964 coup. However, according to our perception, Juarez Távora did not align his perceptions, or even sought influences only in the set of ideologies internal to the knowledge produced by intellectuals circumscribed to our military thought. Seeking to further problematize the conceptual and theoretical sources that helped Távora to build his intellectual fortune, we can also observe certain connections between some of his positions and given aspects of the authoritarian thought of Oliveira Vianna and Alberto Tôrres.

Against the backdrop of this finding, we emphasize that this article will seek to detail the presence and relevance of the aforementioned authors in the intellectual and political trajectory of the Brazilian general. While we investigate the links between certain conceptualizations and interpretations of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna in relation to the positions and theorizations of Juarez Távora, we end up taking a significant step towards achieving a greater understanding of the way in which such conceptions were read and reproduced by Távora. That is, to understand if they were literally used, if they underwent inflections, or even, if changes are identified, what are the reasons for such changes. Because of this, we will investigate how Vianna and Tôrres' perceptions of Brazil may have inspired the construction of a diagnosis and a prognosis for the Brazilian nation in Távora's intellectual trajectory.

In addition, we must make it clear that the analyses developed by us in this article considered both the historical context in which the positions of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna were constituted, as well as the social and political moment of Brazilian history in which Juarez Távora produced his ideas and, mainly, articulated them with the theoretical elaborations of these authors from Rio de Janeiro. In addition, we believe that, in general, the relationship and appropriation of authoritarian ideas in the midst of Brazilian military thought is not an object of study that is much investigated in the Social Sciences of our country, especially in Brazilian Political Science. In this sense, a good part of the justification for carrying out this work is linked to the need to help fill this gap, after all, as

much as our work deals with a particular relationship between the thought of two precursors of statesmanship in Brazil and the ideas of a military theorist, we will have with our investigations the possibility of dimensioning, even if germinally, what was the weight of specific authoritarian perspectives in the midst of military thinking in Brazil.

This article will undertake its activities through, but not only, the bibliographic analysis, which, in turn, will be based on the following works: 1) by Alberto Tôrres, *The National Organization* (1914) and *The Brazilian National Problem* (1910); 2) by Oliveira Vianna, *Southern Populations of Brazil* (1922), *The Idealism of the Constitution* (1927) *Brazilian Political Institutions* (1949); and, finally, Juarez Távora, *Petróleo para o Brasil* (1955), *Organização para o Brasil* (1959) and *Uma vida e muito lutas. Memories, From the plain to the edge of the altiplano* (1974).

## **IDEAS & CONTEXTS: THE FIRST GOVERNMENT OF GETÚLIO VARGAS (1930-1945) AND THE BRAZILIAN POPULIST REPUBLIC (1945-1964)**

The context referring to the First Republic and the End of the Estado Novo is extremely highlighted by Bolivar Lamounier, Evaldo Vieira, Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos and Boris Fausto in their reflections on the construction of an authoritarian thought in Brazil. In this way, revisiting this moment of our past helps both in understanding the definition of Authoritarian Thought given by these authors, and in understanding the social and political conditions that fueled the emergence and structuring of a given intellectual current composed of significant and influential forms<sup>3</sup> of knowledge that, among other things, had the purpose of modifying the Brazilian social and political reality of that period<sup>4</sup>.

Marshal Deodoro da Fonseca, in November 1889, through a military coup, put an end to the Brazilian Empire. A provisional government called the Republic of the Sword began in our nation, which, in turn, ended in 1894 and began a second period, better known as the Oligarchic Republic (1984-1930). At this moment in our trajectory, the role of the oligarchies or regional elites of the South and Southeast of Brazil was highlighted,

---

<sup>3</sup> Significant because they managed to condense the main perceptions and desires of certain social and political groupings in our country. In Karl Mannheim's terms, scholars capable of promoting *synthesis*. Influential because they were not limited to capturing and theorizing a specific moment in Brazil. Intellectuals seen as belonging to Brazilian Authoritarian Thought are defined as producers of practical ideas, with purposes oriented towards social change. Appropriating a term widely used by Ângela de Castro Gomes (1993) to define Oliveira Vianna's work in the Brazilian State between 1932 and 1940, we can consider *them statemakers*.

<sup>4</sup> The lessons of Karl Mannheim present in the work *Ideology and Utopia* (1976) help to a large extent in the understanding of these two movements exposed in this paragraph, which are: 1) the deep link between the material conditions of life and the emergence of a given knowledge; 2) the way in which a given knowledge returns to the reality that inspired it, thus giving rise, in most cases, to its social and political change.

especially in the states of São Paulo and Minas Gerais, which, in the midst of the Coffee with Milk Policy, constantly took turns in the presidency of the country. In addition, the so-called Governors' Policy was developed concomitantly with the Coffee with Milk Policy. This policy, strengthened mainly in the government of Campos Salles (1898-1902), was an important tactic to enable local interests to be guaranteed. Among the various expressions and consequences of the oligarchic organizations existing in Brazil during the First Republic, the coronelismo stands out<sup>5</sup>, which, in turn, represented, for Maria Campello de Souza in *The Political-Party Process in the First Republic*: "The strength of the state oligarchy arising from the control exercised over the great municipal colonels, conductors of the electoral mass incapable and impotent to participate in the political process that had been theirs opened with the representative regime imposed by the Constitution of 1891" (SOUZA, 1968, p. 185).

In 1891, the first Republican Constitution of Brazil, or the second Brazilian Constitution, was promulgated. Years later, it was harshly criticized by some exponents of Brazilian Authoritarian Thought precisely for safeguarding a great idealism and an enormous dissonance between what Brazil really was and the interpretation of Brazil that was expressed there. Linked to this, the Constitution was also accused of being strongly influenced by the Constitution of the United States of America and the Federal Constitution of Switzerland. Such influence was seen as dangerous precisely because such Constitutions, according to these thinkers, adapt to the social, cultural and political peculiarities of specific peoples who, necessarily, are very different from the Brazilian one<sup>6</sup>.

In the midst of the First Republic, there were important popular revolts, we can name: The Revolt of the Armada (1893-1894), the Federalist Revolution (1893-1895), the War of Canudos (1893-1897), the Vaccine Revolt (1904), the Revolt of the Whip (1910), the War of the Contestado (1912-1916), the Workers' Strikes (1917-1919) and the Revolt of the

<sup>5</sup> See, to deeply understand the concept of coronelismo (LEAL, 1997).

<sup>6</sup> Oliveira Vianna is one of these authors who makes profound criticisms of the 1891 Constitution. In *The Idealism of the Constitution*, the author, while informing the way in which our future Constitutions should be drafted, makes harsh criticisms of our First Republican Constitution. According to him: "For this very reason, Brazil's political problem must be solved with a mentality different from the 'dreamer' mentality of the 'historicals', or those who continue their tradition. We must therefore react at once against these two precepts of the old republican idealism: the precept of the power of written formulas and the precept of political reorganizations only possible by political means. We can no longer be inspired by these abstract principles, nor constrain ourselves within the guidelines of this doctrinaire unilateralism. Our future constituent legislator must have a broader and more enlightened mentality, a more realistic and objective intelligence, a more human awareness of the relativity of political systems. And, above all, a more perfect and complete knowledge of our national reality, of our idiosyncrasies, of our failures, of our insufficiencies, of our condition as a people in formation" (VIANNA, 1981, p. 118).

Eighteen of the Fort of Copacabana (1922), highlighting from then on, the Tenentista Movement. Tenentism questioned, among other things, the state of disintegration and social and political disintegration of Brazil as a nation and the permissive and problematic power exercised by the oligarchies and local elites<sup>7</sup>.

In 1930, with the deposition of President Washington Luís, the well-known coup d'état that began the First Government of Getúlio Vargas (1930-1945) took place. From 1930 to 1934, Getúlio Vargas ruled by decree as Head of the Provisional Government. During this period, even under the exercise of the almost unlimited power of the President and the little autonomy of the Brazilian states, new Ministries were created in Brazil, such as, for example, the Ministry of Labor, Industry and Commerce and the Ministry of Education and Health. In addition, at this moment in our history, the Unionization Law and important Labor Laws were built (seen as advances, but also as germinal mechanisms of fundamental importance for the construction of Populism in Brazil). In 1932, we had the Constitutionalist Revolution led by the State of São Paulo, which, in turn, was defeated. In 1933, Getúlio Vargas convened a Constituent Assembly that promulgated, in July 1934, a new Constitution for Brazil. The 1934 Constitution brings the secret ballot, as a tactic that makes the coronelista practice unfeasible, the compulsory nature of primary education, the possibility for women to vote and the inclusion of several labor laws.

At this moment in Brazilian history, the Brazilian Integralist Action (AIB) and the National Liberation Alliance (ANL) emerged. Such parties, unlike those existing in the First Republic, did not have as their purpose the exclusive political representation of a Brazilian State, their political ambitions were national and linked to Brazil as a whole. The main exponent of the AIB was Plínio Salgado (1895-1975). From the ANL, we can mention Luiz Carlos Prestes (1898-1990) and Olga Prestes (1908-1942). In 1935, the ANL unsuccessfully carried out a coup d'état against the Getúlio Vargas Government (known as the Communist Attempt). Because of this action, the members of the AIB created the "Cohen Plan" which, in turn, provided for the containment of a communist action greater than that of 1935. In this sense, in 1937, Getúlio Vargas and the Brazilian Armed Forces,

---

<sup>7</sup> Several studies have been dedicated to understanding the tenentista phenomenon, with divergent lines of interpretation: associated with the corporate interests of the Armed Forces (CARVALHO, 1985); correlated with the interests of the urban middle class (PINHEIRO, 1985; FORJAZ, 1977); related to the petty bourgeoisie (SANTA ROSA, 1976; SODRÉ, 1968; CARONE, 1975; 1976; VIANNA, 1992; CUNHA, 2002); linked to the Prestes Column (MEIRELLES, 1995); linked to the participation of the lieutenants in the overthrow of the First Republic and its use as a private army" of the Provisional Government of Getúlio Vargas, especially in the city of São Paulo (PRESTES, 1999; BORGES, 1992) and concatenated with the fragmentation of the group at the end of the 1920s (CARONE, 1975).

seeking to stop communism in Brazil, staged a coup d'état and began in our country, under the aegis of a new Constitution, the Estado Novo (1937-1945). The 1937 Constitution eliminated party freedom, suppressed independence between the three branches, closed the National Congress and created the National Security Court. The Constitution made it possible for the president to appoint governors and governors to appoint mayors. It also instituted the DIP (Department of Press and Propaganda).

During World War II (1939-1945), Brazil, led by Getúlio Vargas, sought to establish as much as possible a situation of neutrality in the face of the Allied versus Axis bipolarization. However, in August 1942, Brazil joined the Allies. In 1943, politicians, intellectuals and businessmen from the State of Minas Gerais signed the Manifesto of the Miners, which, among other things, criticized the Vargas State and demanded the redemocratization of Brazil as soon as possible. In October 1945, Getúlio Vargas, through a military coup, was deposed. Also in 1945, free elections were held for parliament and for the presidency in the country.

Even in the face of the exacerbated centralization of power exercised by Getúlio Vargas and the use of measures considered dictatorial, violent, and anti-democratic, this moment in our history bequeathed important advances, especially when we think about the construction of a contemporary and modern Brazil. It is undeniable that, while dismantling state powers and strengthening the central government, Getúlio Vargas' staff weakened the local elites and oligarchies in Brazil too much. To the extent that it placed the State as the main driver of economic and industrial development, the First Government of Getúlio Vargas promoted in our country an important economic growth never before experienced by the Brazilian nation.

Important scholars who have dedicated themselves to the examination of what Authoritarian Thought represents in Brazil report that it emerges, to a large extent, as a response to the context of the First Republic and the Constitution of 1891. It is not by chance that this finding can be verified. After all, the celebrated and necessary authority of the State, for example, found in the writings of Alberto Tôrres (1865-1917), Oliveira Vianna (1893-1951), Azevedo Amaral (1881-1942), Francisco Campos (1881-1968) and Virgínio Santa Rosa (1905-2001) seeks, among other things, to effectively break with the State of social and political disintegration present in the First Republic, with the remnants of our Colonial Formation, with our predisposition to the exclusive exercise of agro-export activity, with the pernicious power exercised by local elites and regional oligarchies, with our non-



industrial development and consequent non-economic growth and, finally, with the impossibility of Brazil experiencing full modernization and development.

Many authors of Brazilian Authoritarian Thought also express, to a large extent, the need to break with the past through the action and interference of the State. In this sense, we found that they often theorize and produce knowledge aimed at action and changing the reality in which they are immersed. Thus, two issues can be verified during the First Vargas Government (a moment in Brazilian history in which, it should be noted, many state interventions were carried out guided and planned by intellectuals who did not necessarily consider procedures or orientations of democratic inspiration). The first is the massive presence of these intellectuals in the midst of the government of this period (apart from Alberto Tôrres and Azevedo Amaral, the other thinkers listed above worked in the Brazilian State during the government of Getúlio Vargas). The second is linked to the fact that, in certain cases, the ideas and knowledge produced by these scholars took the form of laws and public policies. The First Vargas Government is important, above all, for understanding the social and political context in which the ideas of Alberto Tôrres, Oliveira Vianna and Juarez Távara resonated with greater effectiveness. However, specifically in the case of the Brazilian general, the years between 1945 and 1964 are also important for understanding Juarez Távara's positions and theorizing. A significant portion of his intellectual production, including part of which we will later analyze, is temporally located in this period of our history.

After the deposition of Getúlio Vargas, in October 1945, the phase better known as the Populist Republic began in Brazil, one of the denominations given to the moment in Brazilian History circumscribed between the years 1945 and 1964. Following a current and a form of political action very much in vogue in Latin America during this period, populist governments were thus classified as being firmly based on the charismatic image, or even on a positive representation fixed in the popular imagination, of specific politicians and/or rulers, thus enabling greater control of the population and, consequently, better governance.

The Populist Republic began in 1946 after the elections of December 2, 1945, which, in turn, ended with the choice of General Eurico Gaspar Dutra for the position of President of the Republic. During his government, the collision of interests between the various urban industrial sectors intensified. From 1951 to 1954, Brazil was governed, again, by Getúlio Vargas under the aegis of a nationalist and highly statist political ideology that displeased

representatives of foreign capital, the national bourgeoisie and even the Brazilian middle class. Vargas spared no effort to circumvent this situation (he made, for example, ministerial changes and made new alliances with the workers' movement). However, after some failures and certain events (such as, for example, the concession of a 100% increase in the minimum wage and the Toneleros Street Attack), Getúlio Vargas, in 1954, committed suicide inside the Catete Palace and his vice-president, João Fernandes Campos Café Filho, began to lead the country.

In 1956, Juscelino Kubitschek inaugurated the historical-Brazilian phase called developmentalist. With a government highly marked by technical-industrial advances, effective progress of the national economy and a specific industrialization policy, Juscelino Kubitschek propagated the motto *"fifty years in five"*. One of the most emblematic gains of this moment in our history was the foundation and inauguration of Brasília, the new capital of Brazil, in 1960. In addition to the national/state indebtedness caused by this government, it also bequeathed: the expansion of the infrastructure of highways, railways, ports and electricity, the creation of the Superintendence of the Development of the Northeast (SUDENE), the promotion of interiorization, the implementation of the industries of durable consumer goods and production goods, the installation of automobile industries, household appliances, shipbuilding, heavy mechanics, cement, pulp and paper.

In 1961, Jânio Quadros assumed the position of President of the Republic and, in August of that same year, he resigned, after numerous pressures, from the post "for representing the communist possibility/imminence in Brazil". After the departure of Quadros, Vice President João Goulart, even under coercion from the military who still considered him a strong element for the establishment of communism in Brazil, becomes President of the Republic. However, he was in China at the time. The way out of this dilemma was the establishment of parliamentarism in Brazil. In just over a year, three prime ministers succeeded: Tancredo Neves (1961-1962), Brochado da Rocha (1962) and Hermes Lima (1962-1963). In January 1963, a popular consultation was held and Brazil began to adopt, again, a presidential political system with João Goulart as President of the Republic.

With great difficulty in promoting political coalitions and obtaining support from popular and union bases, Goulart launched the three-year plan for economic and social development, which, in turn, proposed basic agrarian and urban reforms, anti-inflationary measures, and also foreign investments. The plan was controversial and rejected by both the left and conservatives. In the midst of an acute political-economic crisis and broad US



influence/interference, the government of João Goulart was deposed by the Military Coup on March 31, 1964. Some politicians and leaders of the left were arrested and João Goulart went into exile in Uruguay.

In general, we can understand the Brazilian Populist Republic considering the following characteristics: 1) it was a representative liberal democracy; 2) it promoted a greater economic integration of the country in relation to Western capitalism (massive inflow of capital/foreign investments), thus helping to boost Brazilian industry; 3) while the process of modernization and development has not reached everyone, we see the expansion of the contradictions of Brazilian society and classes; 4) and, consequently, we note the formation of social movements in the countryside (Peasant Leagues), the strengthening of urban workers' unions and the increase in the influence of political parties linked to workers – such as, for example, the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB) and the Brazilian Labor Party (PTB). The Brazilian ruling classes of this period, markedly conservative (linked to landowning sectors, dependent on foreign capital and even the military) did not see positively the process of Brazilian modernization which, among other things, gave rise to the strengthening of popular organizations/movements and parties linked to the workers. For the elites of this period, such issues and events represented attempts to the detriment of the current social order and in favor of the construction of communism in Brazil. In the context of the Cold War, where we found the polarization between the USA *and* the USSR, we found significant attempts/intentions to coup the Populist Republic, one of which was successful, that of March 31, 1964: a Bureaucratic-authoritarian Military Regime lasting twenty-one years (BOTELHO, p. 15-25, 2008).

## **BRAZILIAN AUTHORITARIAN THOUGHT: TÔRRES AND VIANNA – VISIONS OF BRAZIL**

Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna (intellectuals, *statemakers*, or even men of *the national intelligentsia* ) have some contiguous perspectives and positions. Among them, the recognition of the authority and centrality of the State to transform, modernize and develop the social, political and economic reality of Brazil without compromising the social order stands out. In addition, the particularities of the diagnosis of Brazilian society, that is, its visions of the formation of Brazil and the Brazilian people, safeguard some alignments that, among them, deserve greater emphasis on the following interpretation: the condition of a former agro-export colony and, consequently, the prominence of culture and rural economy

to the detriment of urban life and industrial production are issues directly linked to the obstacles that hinder the process of modernization of Brazil. These interpretations – also shared by other intellectuals – were widely debated and complexified in our political thought and brought together in the same conceptual key called Authoritarian Thought. According to Bolivar Lamounier, Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos and Boris Fausto, the concept of Authoritarian Thought is capable of bringing together in the same register the ideas and positions of some thinkers, such as: Alberto Tôrres, Oliveira Vianna, Francisco Campos, Azevedo Amaral, Virgílio Santa Rosa and Gilberto Amado. In view of these possibilities, the choice of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna is justified precisely because both scholars, in addition to being considered the main exponents of this intellectual current, are cited more frequently by Brazilian military personnel, especially those who participated in the tenentista uprisings in the 1920s and 1930s.

In the text, "FORMATION OF AN AUTHORITARIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE FIRST REPUBLIC: AN INTERPRETATION", published for the first time in 1978 in the work *História Geral da Civilização Brasileira* (Volume III, Volume 2), Bolivar Lamounier states that Brazilian Authoritarian Thought emerged at the beginning of the First Republic and had as its main representatives Oliveira Vianna, Alberto Tôrres, Francisco Campos and Azevedo Amaral. According to the researcher, Authoritarian Thought is linked to an ideological current highly concerned with political action (transformation of the Brazilian reality) averse to the constitutional model established in Brazil in 1891. To think about this action, these intellectuals considered the specificity of the formation of Brazil, followed by a diagnosis of the present and the proposition of an alternative model of political organization. For the author, we can highlight the following contributions of this "ideological complex" and its exponent members: 1) they were important to disseminate in our country a significant range of anti-liberal ideas; 2) they corroborated the propagation and institutionalization of the Social Sciences in Brazil; 3) in political practice, they were the idealizers/ideologues behind the 1930 Revolution, and can thus be characterized as men of *the intelligentsia* during this moment in Brazilian history.

During our First Republic, Bolivar Lamounier identifies three models of thought. The first can be called the scientific institutional model. The second would be the historical model. And the third was named by the researcher as an authoritarian model. The first would give the new methodological techniques a deserved prominence that, according to their exponents, would lead to a clear, objective and profound understanding of the

Brazilian reality (the method would be the focus of this form of thinking). The second sought to understand national interests, or the issue of nationalism and nationality, having as a reference the history or historical development of Brazil (the various processes and arrangements that transformed Brazil into what it is), however, this way of thinking also engendered the methods seen as more advanced in the Social Sciences. The third model would be composed of organicist intellectuals linked to the State, concerned, at first, with the development of a national bourgeoisie and, later, with privatism. Because of this, the solution given by them did not in any way refuse the prerogative of a strong State capable of solving these problems (obstacles that limited the modernization of Brazil).

In general terms, we can summarize Bolivar Lamounier's reading of the exponents of Brazilian Authoritarian Thought with the following words: altruistic, enlightened, nationalistic, equipped with sophisticated tools of the Social Sciences capable of promoting a deep understanding of society, averse to the free market or the rules of the market, anxious for the strengthening of central power, that is, intellectuals, sometimes technicians and agents of the State, surrounded by a determined ideological complex, whose objective was to theorize, conceptualize and, consequently, legitimize in their works the "authority of the State as a tutelary principle of orientation and organization of Brazilian society" (LAMOUNIER, 1985, p. 356). This ideological complex was condensed by Lamounier in the model called State Ideology, which, in turn, is composed of the following components: 1) predominance of the state principle over the market principle; 2) organic-corporate view of society; 3) technocratic objectivism; 4) paternalistic and authoritarian view of social conflict; 5) non-organization of civil society; 6) importance of non-political mobilization; 7) elitism and voluntarism as a vision of the processes of political change and 8) the Benevolent Leviathan. Finally, Lamounier points out that many of the ideas of these intellectuals were abandoned, or ceased to be studied, due to the occurrence of factors external and internal to Brazil. For external reasons, the researcher credits the decline of fascism with a part of the blame for the disuse of some authoritarian perspectives. For internal reasons, the Brazilian scholar states that the process of redemocratization in 1945 was very important for the rejection of ideas and positions of an authoritarian nature in the country.

Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos was also an intellectual of our Political Thought who focused on the task of understanding Authoritarianism in Brazil. In the texts, "A Praxis Liberal no Brasil" (1974) and "Paradigma e História" (1975), both made in previous years, but published in 1978 in the work *Ordem Burguesa e Liberalismo Político*, the author makes

expensive observations on this theme. In these works, Guilherme dos Santos does not focus exclusively on the theme of Authoritarian Thought in Brazil. However, while investigating the *liberal praxis* in our country, as well as the Brazilian bourgeois ideology, the researcher reflects on the social and political conditions that enabled the constitution of an ideological current of an authoritarian nature in Brazil. In general, we were able to apprehend a reading and definition of the notion of Authoritarian Thought, not by chance, at the moment when he seeks to analyze its main objects in the context of the First Republic and at the end of the First Vargas Government (1889-1945).

Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos detects, as well as other scholars who have already analyzed us, some characteristics of Brazilian Authoritarian Thought, they are: the aversion to liberal ideals or ideals; the perception that the foundations capable of supporting a liberal and/or democratic type of government have not been built in Brazil, thanks to the specificity of its formation and constitution as a nation; the reading that the social, political and economic transformations in Brazil (modernization and development of the country) should be conducted by a strong, centralized and intervening State (preponderance of state authority), after all, the effective reality of Brazil and its people required this form of action and political-governmental intervention. Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos, as well as Bolivar Lamounier, also notes that a significant portion of the intellectuals linked to Authoritarian Thought in Brazil saw the possibility of the masses mobilizing and participating in the political process as problematic. Such concern is linked to the perception that social conflicts necessarily delay and hinder the process of development and modernization of a country. Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos, in relation to the other intellectuals visited here, goes on to define the category called instrumental authoritarianism. For him, this concept defines a strand of Brazilian Authoritarian Thought that saw the construction of an Authoritarian State in Brazil as a necessary and transitory/transitory condition for its modernization, thus breaking with our historical ties and deficiencies. In this sense, the authoritarian State would be a transitional instrument capable of promoting a transformative advance in Brazil: the necessary bridge for the construction of a modern, developed and liberal society in an environment adverse to this.

So far we have evidenced the definition of the concept of Authoritarian Thought in Brazil; in this sense, we identified the similarities between the interpretations of Bolivar Lamounier and Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos. Aside from some differences, there are common elements shared between them in the approach to this topic. Now, we will verify

the relevance of these definitions through the analysis of certain reflections by Oliveira Vianna and Alberto Tôrres.

Alberto de Seixas Martins Tôrres was born in 1865 in the State of Rio de Janeiro and died in 1917. In São Paulo, in 1882, he attended law school and began important journalistic activities. In 1889, he was appointed public prosecutor, but did not accept the position. That same year he founded the newspaper *O Povo*. After the Proclamation of the Republic, he became a deputy of the Fluminense Constituent Assembly installed on March 1, 1892, serving as a state deputy until 1893. In 1894, he began his work as a federal deputy. For three years (1897-1900) he served as President of the State of Rio de Janeiro. Later, he was appointed minister of the Federal Supreme Court, a position from which he stepped down in 1907. After abandoning public and political life, Tôrres dedicated his time to the study of Brazil's political and social problems. Between November 1910 and February 1911, he published a series of articles in the *Gazeta de Notícias*, which later composed the work: *The National Organization*, published in 1914. Another relevant work by the Rio de Janeiro native was *The Brazilian National Problem*, released in 1911.

In general, in these studies, we can find some reflections, criticisms and positions of Alberto Tôrres on important issues related to Brazil. In relation to the Constitution of 1881, the thinker believed that it was incongruous when contrasted with the actual reality of Brazil. Among his reform proposals, the creation of a legislature that would represent the professional and working classes also stands out. In addition, he showed concern about the difficulty of building a strong nationality in countries that had gone through the colonial experience, thus seeking to firmly understand our problems of national identity and nationalism. Because of this perception, Tôrres believed that the Brazilian social reality should be aimed at as a national unity, having, obviously, a strong State at its head that would lead this process.

Alberto Tôrres' vision of the formation of Brazil and its people is marked by an intrinsic amorphousness, insolidarity, and disintegration (social, political, economic, cultural, and geographical). Tôrres, in his intellectual production, refuted liberalism and socialism precisely because they were incompatible with the Brazilian reality. He believed that the colonial experience that Brazil went through was highly permissive for its economic formation, in many moments, Tôrres characterizes this process as the assault and looting of our wealth. He often reaffirmed the need to establish deep links between specific realities and institutional, legal and governmental forms; postulated that it was of fundamental

importance that scholars in Brazil embrace the techniques and methodological conceptions seen as the most advanced in the Human Sciences, in order to objectively understand Brazilian society and propose pragmatic changes for it (a deep link between the production of knowledge and the intention that it produces a social change/transformation); and, in a pioneering way and very different from some of his peers, he made important criticisms of the predominant eugenicist racial theories of his time.

However, the most well-known and controversial conceptualization or proposal of Alberto Tôrres is the tool of political intervention called Coordinating Power. The Coordinating Branch would be composed of representatives appointed by a National Council. Such representatives would have lifetime investitures and they would exercise, among other things, (i) the function of verifying the mandates of those who were elected by the people's vote at the most diverse levels (federal, state and municipal) and (ii) the function of analyzing and interfering in the actions of the Union that were aimed at the Brazilian States and Municipalities. In this way, this instrument would be relevant to ensure the proper functioning of the nation, after all, it would help in the control of local and national interests while promoting greater supervision of electoral elections. In other words, it would be an autonomous body endowed with extensive political and intervention powers. For Tôrres, the creation of the Coordinating Power would crown:

[...] finally, these provisions – all of which tend to strengthen government action, to bind the country's institutions in solidarity and to establish continuity in the pursuit of national ideals, to 'realize', in short, the sovereignty of the law, democracy, the republic, autonomy and federation – with an organ whose function will be to concatenate all the apparatuses of the political system, as the representative of the whole nation – of the nation of today, as well as of the nation of tomorrow – before his delegates. It is not an arbitrary creation: it is the complement of the democratic and federative regime, suggested by the observation of our life and the experience of our institutions (TÔRRES, 1914, p. 275-276).

In this sense, we cannot fail to notice how the definition of the Coordinating Power ratifies the importance of the centralization of the State, its interventionist prerogative and the "conductive" function that it would exercise over Brazilian society. In our opinion, these assumptions that animated the construction of this tool of action and political interference guided, even if to a lesser degree of radicalization, certain writings of some intellectuals of



Brazilian Authoritarian Thought during the First Government of Getúlio Vargas, as well as of our Military Thought.

Oliveira Vianna was born in the town of Rio Seco de Saquarema-RJ in 1883 and died in Niterói-RJ in 1951. Among the various positions, activities and functions developed by him, we can highlight the following attributions: Brazilian professor, thinker and writer, jurist and legal consultant and, finally, immortal of the Brazilian Academy of Letters. Considering his trajectory, we see that he graduated in Law in 1906. After his training, the intellectual joined the Faculty of Law of the Fluminense Federal University as a professor. As a jurist, he specialized in Labor Law and contributed as a consultant to the Ministry of Labor, Industry and Commerce during the First Vargas Government (1932-1940) to the creation and consolidation of our first labor laws (FONTANA, 2022). In 1940, he became a minister of the Federal Court of Accounts. In his works, the following works stand out: *Southern Populations of Brazil* (1920), *Small Studies of Social Psychology* (1921), *Idealism in the Political Evolution of the Empire and the Republic* (1922), *Evolution of the Brazilian People* (1923), *The Sunset of the Empire* (1925), *The Idealism of the Constitution* (1927), *Problems of Objective Policy* (1930), *Race and Assimilation* (1932), *Problems of Corporate Law* (1938) and *Brazilian Political Institutions* (1949) (FONTANA, 2014, p. 116-119).

An important issue present in Viannian thought is linked to the criticism that the intellectual establishes in relation to the negative legacies of our colonial past and the means by which it would be possible to transform Brazil. Linked to this internal debate in the author's thought, some relevant themes and issues are articulated and theorized by him, such as: (i) the specificity of the monarchical period in Brazil; (ii) the peculiarity and relevance of Corporatism in the Brazilian Nation, the distinctive attributes of a Labor Law, a Labor Legislation and a Corporate Law for Brazil; (iii) the inconsistencies of the Brazilian Constitution of 1891; (iv) the constitutive characteristics of our political institutions; (v) and the specificity and typology of the central power necessary for Brazilian modernization. The maximum expression of Oliveira Vianna's reading of the transposition of laws and institutional forms averse to the peculiarities linked to the Brazilian reality that, according to him, proved to be extremely counterproductive in relation to the task of modernizing Brazil was presented by the intellectual from Rio de Janeiro in the work *The Idealism of the Constitution* (1927) which, in turn, brings an acid criticism of the Constitutional Charter of 1891. In this study, the author exposes one of the most developed explanatory keys in his work that justifies the proposition that Brazil needs specific forms of government, particular

institutions and, mainly, laws concerned with the peculiarities inherent to the Brazilian people.

In general, the author argues that the Constitution of 1891 was incompatible with the social, political, cultural and economic reality of Brazilian society. Among other things, it excessively guarded liberal principles that could only be alien to the Brazilian mentality (VIANNA, 1927, p. 85). It was, unfortunately, inspired by the English and American Constitutions (VIANNA, 1927, p. 37-41). It was made by an elite unaware of the specificities of Brazil and its people (VIANNA, 1927, p. 21-24). And it safeguarded permissive oligarchic interests. Finally, she was extremely innocent about the effectiveness of the written law (for Vianna, our jurists and legislators believed that the law alone would produce an effect on society). Thus, the Constitution of 1891 was in complete disagreement with the Brazilian reality (VIANNA, 1927, p. 36).

Faced with this interpretative framework about the problems arising from the colonial legacy that hindered, if not prevented, the process of modernization of Brazil and about the obstacles to producing effective and consistent laws and institutions in our country that would overcome the colonial legacy, Oliveira Vianna proposes some ways to develop the Brazilian nation. Among the possible solutions, none excludes the recognition, by the author, of the necessary authority of the State to transform Brazil. In other words, the Brazilian nation would only develop through the action of a strong, centralized, and intervening type of State capable of building, through public policies and adequate laws, the constitutive stages of a modernizing project of the nation. In the midst of the functions that the State should perform, the regulation of labor in Brazil, as well as of the working class, assumes an important role in the work and political trajectory/life of Oliveira Vianna.

Oliveira Vianna's authoritarianism – or his authoritarian perspective of the State – is linked to the author's diagnosis of Brazil; however, this perspective/position materializes in the context of 1930, especially between the years 1934 and 1937. In 1934, the proposition of an Authoritarian State was linked to a rejection of the Brazilian Magna Carta, because, for the author, it was excessively liberal and, as in our First Republic, safeguarded the interests of political clans and oligarchic groups (dressed in the figure of political parties) to the detriment of the actual national needs/interests. In 1937, the Estado Novo seemed to be an alternative in line with Viannian thought, so the intellectual supported the movement of that year and the Constitution subsequent to it. About the Magna Carta of 1937, he stated that it "results from a long and direct observation of our political environment and its

peculiarities, the failures of our civic culture and its reflections on the mechanism of public powers" (VIANNA, 1939, p. 173). In general terms, this is Vianna's view of the need for an authoritarian state in Brazil. It is not by chance that this interpretation is close to the reading of other authors, including those linked to the military life of Brazil. So, let's examine one of them, Juarez Távora.

## **JUAREZ TELEMETERS**

The general context in which Juarez Távora's ideas were immersed has already been commented by us. However, an important historical element must be analyzed in order to fully understand the insertion and relevance of the Brazilian general's positions: the lieutenant movement. When talking about tenentism, it is worth mentioning that we cannot fail to mention Juarez Távora, one of the most relevant characters of this group that marked the Brazilian historical-political scenario previously analyzed.

## **TENENTISM**

The first demonstrations of the lieutenants took place in 1922 and are marked by the episode of the "False Letters", offensive letters that would have been written by the situationist candidate for the presidency Artur Bernardes to Marshal Hermes da Fonseca, to the opposition candidate Nilo Peçanha and to the military. This fact seems to have hurt the pride of certain groups of military personnel to the point of making them raise arms against the federal government in 1922, an event that became popularly known as the Revolt of the Copacabana Fort. In this vein, two elements are essential to characterize the lieutenant phenomenon: defense of military honor and the breakdown of hierarchy.

However, in 1924, the tenentista movement, through the publication of its *Manifestos*, demonstrated that it was no longer a corporatist movement, of a military nature, that fought against Artur Bernardes. From this moment on, the dissatisfaction of the lieutenants would be against the policy that Bernardes represented at the head of the State, that of favoring agro-export groups. However, in 1930, the lieutenant movement split into two currents: (i) lieutenants linked to the Brazilian Communist Party, led by Luís Carlos Prestes; (ii) and lieutenants linked to the State with the Liberal Alliance, led by Juarez Távora. Távora's centrist tenentism – opposed to Prestes' revolutionary left-wing tenentism – indicated fundamental actions for the political field of the post-1930s, among them, we mention: a) the imperative of nationalizing politics, with a clear rejection of the federalism

practiced in the First Republic; b) the suppression of liberalism in favor of a strong presence of the national state; c) the definitive extinction of the democratic-representative system, inadequate for the Brazilian reality, in which the "masses" had no capacity to react to the arbitrariness of power, the need for political, social and economic reforms, which would lead to the modernization of the country.

## TRAJECTORY

Juarez do Nascimento Fernandes Távora was born in Jaguaribe, State of Ceará, in 1898 and died in 1975, in the State of Rio de Janeiro. In his youth, he attended the Military School of Realengo and, after participating in the armed uprising that attempted against the Federal Government in 1922, he was sentenced to three years in prison and lost his rank in the Army. In disagreement with his conviction, Távora defected and joined the revolutionaries of the Tenentista Movement. In the July 1924 uprising in São Paulo, Juarez Távora lost his brother, Joaquim Távora, in a combat between the revolutionary lieutenants and the forces of the São Paulo and Federal Governments. Defeated in São Paulo, Távora and his companions went to Rio Grande do Sul. From this state, under the command of Luís Carlos Prestes, the Brazilian general began a walk through the interior of Brazil campaigning against the government of President Artur Bernardes: the so-called Prestes Column. Távora had a prominent role in the command of the Coluna Prestes until he was arrested in 1926, in Teresina-PI (CPDOC, 2014).

After escaping from prison and living in hiding, Távora went into exile in Argentina. However, in February 1930, he returned to Brazil, settling in the Northeast and starting to support, along with a wing of the lieutenants, the presidential candidacy of Getúlio Vargas. During the 1930 Revolution, the general assumed the post of military commander of the revolutionary movement in the Northeast. After Vargas took office, in January 1931, "he was appointed military delegate to the leaders of the states of the North and Northeast, and was therefore called 'viceroy of the North' by the press" (CPDOC, 2014). Still in 1931, he participated in the foundation of the Clube 3 de Outubro. In 1932, he was appointed Minister of Agriculture, a position in which he remained until 1934. In 1936, he entered the Army General Staff School, completing his course at the end of 1938. In 1945, he joined the National Democratic Union (UDN), thus marking his return to politics and his disagreement with elements and positions taken by the Estado Novo. In 1946, he reached the rank of general. The following year, he developed discussions on Brazilian oil. In this debate, he

positioned himself defending the participation of investments and foreign capital in the exploration of national oil, even contradicting important portions of the Armed Forces (CPDOC, 2014).

In September 1952, he became director of the War College (ESG). In 1954, he became vice-president of the Military Club and supported the movement that fought for the resignation of Getúlio Vargas. In 1955, he launched himself as a candidate for President of the Republic for the UDN: "the elections held in October gave the victory, however, to Juscelino Kubitschek, launched by the Social Democratic Party (PSD) and the Brazilian Labor Party (PTB)" (CPDOC, 2014). In 1962, he was elected Federal Deputy for the Christian Democratic Party (PDC). He was an opponent of the government of João Goulart and supported the Military Coup of March 1964. During the beginning of the Military Regime, he was Minister of Transportation and Public Works. In addition to the professional, public and political events that marked his life, Juarez Távora had an intense and complex intellectual activity. From this other facet of the Brazilian general, he bequeathed us a valuable production, with emphasis on the following works: *À guisa de Depoimento sobre a Revolução Brasileira de 1924 (1927 e 1928)*, *Petróleo para o Brasil (1955)*, *Produção para o Brasil (1957)*, *Organização para o Brasil (1959)* and *Uma vida e muito lutas. Memoirs – Volumes I, II and III (1974)*. In fact, it is considering part of these works that, in the next topic, we will expound some of Juarez Távora's ideas, which, in turn, are concatenated with certain positions of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna.

## **CONCEPTIONS OF OLIVEIRA VIANNA AND ALBERTO TÔRRES IN JUAREZ TÁVORA**

The figure of Juarez Távora is constantly related to the Prestes Column, to the uprisings of 1920 that led to the Revolution of 1930 and to Tenentismo. However, we must observe that Távora's ideas cannot be solely linked to military ideas. A careful reading of his works makes us understand that his conceptions went beyond the organizational cause of the Army and the other Armed Forces. Távora's political proposition goes beyond the motivations of professionalization and restructuring of the Army: in it we note a project of reorganization of the Brazilian State. With a diagnosis of state-national disorganization, Távora seeks to achieve the organization of Brazil in a "revolutionary" way<sup>8</sup>. We will see how this conception was present in his works.

<sup>8</sup> In a letter sent to Luiz Carlos Prestes, Távora gives his position on how a Revolution would materialize in Brazil: [...] The strengthening of civil liberty by a judicious reform of the judiciary; the establishment of the

After the July 1922 Uprising, Juarez Távora was arrested for the first time. At that moment, according to the general, in the work *A life and many struggles: Memories – From the Plain to the Edge of the Altiplano*, he began his studies on the work of Alberto Tôrres: "To 'shorten' time, I began, at that time, the attentive reading of the works of Alberto Tôrres. I then read *O Problema Nacional Brasileiro e A Organização Nacional*" (TÁVORA, 1974a, p. 122). Juarez Távora, as well as other important intellectuals and *statemakers* of his time, was also a member of the *Society of Friends of Alberto Tôrres*<sup>9</sup>. The work *Petroleum for Brazil* begins with a quote from Alberto Tôrres that, in general, endorses Juarez Távora's diagnosis/vision about the economic formation of Brazil:

Alberto Tôrres – the most objective of our political thinkers, at least with regard to the economic aspects of Brazilian life – stated that 'the colonial exploitation of the South American peoples was an assault on their wealth, and their entire economic history has been an extension of this assault' (TÁVORA, 1955, p. 11).

In addition to this, the Brazilian general adds, at a later point in his text, other quotations from Tôrres in order to problematize a discussion about oil exploration in Brazil. In this sense, Tôrres' words are exposed to question the use of foreign investments in this newly discovered niche of exploration in Brazil:

In closing these considerations, I quote again two concepts of Alberto Tôrres about our economic disorganization: 'A nation can be free, even if barbaric, without legal guarantees; it cannot be free, however, without the mastery of its sources of wealth, its means of nourishment, the living works of its history and its commerce'. [...] "All our apparent vitality consists of the extraction of products and the limited effort of extensive exploitation, with which we plunder the land, while trade, foreign labor, and usury credit drain, in capital, abroad, almost everything that is ascertained from this

---

economic independence of the masses by the spread of small property; the effective and practical restraint of the arbitrariness of power by the creation of a new body of political control; social equilibrium, established by proportional class representation; and, finally, the continuity indispensable to the work of solving the great national problems; by the persistent influence of technical councils, which permanently superimpose themselves on the temporariness of governments - these are the basic points for which Brazilian revolutionaries must fight, defeated or victorious, [...] I think that revolution is not the privilege of a class or of a few predestined individuals: it is the common, universal patrimony of all the disillusioned and desperate for legal protection against the arbitrariness of tyranny (TÁVORA, 1974a, p. 351-352).

<sup>9</sup> A group formed by intellectuals or men of *the Brazilian intelligentsia* founded on November 10, 1932 with the purpose of honoring Alberto Tôrres and, mainly, discussing national problems from the thought of the former Minister of the Federal Supreme Court. Among them, we can highlight the following members: Oliveira Vianna, Alcides Gentil, Sabóia Lima, Cândido Mota Filho, Roquete Pinto, Juarez Távora and Plínio Salgado.



brutal destruction. These concepts, which I read in my youth, and on which I have not ceased to meditate through the many vicissitudes of my life (and this has been going on for a quarter of a century), should also constitute a reason for meditation for every Brazilian aware of his responsibilities in this almost crucial hour of our history (TÁVORA, 1955, p. 45-46).

If Alberto Tôrres' position is markedly against this type of investment, Juarez Távora makes some concessions and seeks an intermediate position on the subject. For him, the inflow of foreign capital would not be a problem if the laws that regulated it and regulated it safeguarded, above all, Brazilian sovereignty and national economic development (TÁVORA, 1955, p. 47-48). In the study *Organization for Brazil*, a work in which there is the largest number of citations and mentions of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna in the works of Juarez Távora, we find that the Brazilian general begins the first session of the work with the following quotation from Alberto Tôrres:

Extent of the causes of our disorganization: 'We are a country without political direction and without social and economic orientation. Patriotism without a compass, science without synthesis, letters without ideals, economics without solidarity, finance without continuity, education without a system, work and production without harmony and without support—act as contrary and disconnected elements, destroy each other, and the selfishness of illegitimate interests flourishes over the ruin of common life.' This discouraging picture of the disorganization of our life as a national community, drawn almost half a century ago by Alberto Tôrres, still presents many aspects of the present day. Brazil has practically to equate and solve almost all its basic problems, including, in the foreground, the preliminary problem of the rationalization of its political-administrative structure. And it seems to us that, without the prior solution of this basic problem of organization, it will not be feasible to satisfactorily solve its political, economic and social problems, and even less so to carry out the respective solutions methodically and efficiently (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 5).

Here, clearly, we note the use that Juarez Távora makes of Alberto Tôrres' diagnosis of the formation of Brazil (a transposition of almost fifty years, by the way), thus highlighting elements already commented by us, of which, in turn, the inorganic and unsolidary character that marked the construction of Brazilian society and that still comes, according to the general, stands out: indelibly marking both the Brazilian people and its political institutions. Thinking about the obstacles that hinder the construction of a modern Brazil,

Juarez Távora goes back to one of Oliveira Vianna's most important arguments: the inability of our elites to conduct the development of the country through laws and institutions appropriate to the national reality, thus distancing themselves from other political and legal forms (the already explained dilemmas circumscribed to the polarizations between "the real country and the legal country", "the form and the content", or even "the ideas and the place"). In the words of the general:

This continued inability to organize ourselves, as a nation, to objectively solve the fundamental problems of our people, does not result, in our view, from a lack of culture, nor from the absence of patriotic sensitivity of the majority of the men who have governed us: it results, rather, from two factors inherent to our cultural formation, inspired by European or North American standards: lack of knowledge, in which it insists on maintaining our elite, of a few basic national realities; and the mental indiscipline of this elite that, distanced from the down-to-earth of such realities, is commonly trapped in fanciful reveries that range, without transition, from boastfulness to defeatism, but almost always attacks the elementary sense of proportion and opportunity. This is what Oliveira Vianna confirms in these concepts: 'This disregard for the surrounding reality – revealed by observation – and the experimental reality – revealed by history – derives from the marginalism already pointed out, of our political elites and of our publicists and legislators. They are, as it were, still in this phase of political philosophy, in which the state is conceived as a structure alien to society, adjusted to it, coming from above, as if by divine right – and not emanating from it, sharing its material and spiritual conditions, living the life of its culture and suffering the influence of its transformations. Evidently they have not yet come to conceive the State as it should be conceived: – as a social reality, the reality of the State, of which Mac Iver speaks' (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 6-7).

At the end of the first session of *Organization for Brazil*, Távora admits his positions favorable to the theories and ideas of Oliveira Vianna and Alberto Tôrres by making the following statement:

Long-time appreciators of the political thought of Alberto Tôrres, whose main works we have read and reread several times in the last thirty-five years, we open this Introduction with one of his concepts, permeating it with some others. And so we will do so, perhaps abusively, throughout the text of this book. Although with greater parsimony, we will also resort, several times, to the authority of one of his most fruitful disciples – J. F. de Oliveira Vianna – whose voluminous work, along with that

of Tôrres (apart from some debatable therapeutic indications), constitutes a valuable repository of observations worthy of meditation by those who are interested in the documented knowledge of our political and social realities (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 22).

In this quote, it should be noted that Juarez Távara indicates, without going too deep, that he has differences with Oliveira Vianna. However, we are unable to measure exactly which, after all, would be "debatable therapeutic indications"? Everything indicates that they deal, according to our view, with some of the political proposals for reforms – legal and institutional – suggested by Vianna with a view to transforming, modernizing and developing Brazil with which the Brazilian general did not agree. At the beginning of "Chapter II" of *Organization for Brazil*, Juarez Távara states:

[...] Alberto Tôrres is right: "The Constitution, as a practical law, cannot be a formal law: it is a true political roadmap; a synthesis not only of methods, processes and instruments necessary for national progress, but also of its great ends and objectives, dictated by the nature of its land and its people". This Torrian concept is mirrored not only in the spirit in which the Constitution should be interpreted and executed, but, above all, in the concern that should inspire and guide the elaboration or amendment of its fundamental provisions (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 19).

It is not by chance that Juarez Távara proposes a minimum Constitution and makes use of the theorizations of Alberto Tôrres, after all, the malleability and flexibility of the law (greater openness to legal interpretation) are fundamental for the construction of a type of power such as the Coordinator, proposed by Tôrres, or even, such as the Ordenador, which we will see even more clearly, required by the Brazilian general. Perhaps it is this perspective so close to Távara and Tôrres that is capable of helping to understand the differentiation that the general sought to demarcate in relation to Oliveira Vianna. After all, Vianna never theorized about such an extensive form of power. What we verify, in fact, is the constant affirmation by Oliveira Vianna, of the importance of constituting laws and institutions in Brazil appropriate to the national reality without, however, limiting, inspecting and controlling in an imperative and "tyrannical" way the different powers at their different levels. In this sense, it is worth asking: would Távara's Authoritarianism be more radical than Oliveira Vianna's? The Ordering Power, a tool for political intervention designed by Juarez Távara, has deep and clear similarities with the concept of Coordinating Power,

fixed in the thought of Aberto Tôrres. Let us note that the Ordering Power must have between:

[...] other functions assigned to it by Alberto Tôrres, the following: a) to periodically establish, and supervise the application of political directives interested in national security; b) to plan, coordinate and control the execution of the duties of common competence of the Union, the States and the Municipalities, ensuring their coherence and continuity through these three administrative orbits; c) to correct or annul the acts of any of the Circumscription powers, in the Union, in the States or in the Municipalities, which it deems to be in disagreement with the Constitution, or harmful to the common good of the Brazilian people; d) to establish the various functional categories of public servants of the Union, of the States or in the Municipalities [...]; e) to appoint, upon approval of the Senate (or parliament), the Ministers of the Federal Court of Auditors, the Federal Prosecutors in the States, the Commanders-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and the Commanders-in-Chief of the Army, Navy and Air Force [...] (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 56).

The definition of Ordering Power, given by Juarez Távora, is significantly aligned with the conceptualization offered by Alberto Tôrres of Coordinating Power. The impression we have is that the Brazilian general only changes the nomenclatures without making and/or adding other contributions to Tôrres' theorizing. After making a systematic characterization of the political structure that, according to his view, would engender the Ordering Power in order to promote in Brazil the construction of the most appropriate political-institutional engineering for the nation, Távora is faced with the issue of individual freedom. After all, how to justify the extensive powers and possibilities of intervention of the Ordering Power? It is precisely at this moment that he quotes Vianna who, in profaning this diathesis, stated:

[...] that 'The problem of individual and civil liberty in Brazil – a problem that should be preliminary to any and all problems of political freedom – is precisely to eliminate this 'long habit of impunity'. This certainty of impunity, which our customs assure to arbitration, corrupts everything; it kills, in its cradle, the citizen and prevents the formation of true public spirit. Once this certainty of impunity is eliminated from our customs, civil liberties will be assured (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 60-61).<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Or even, see (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 246-247).

After this quote, we raise a question: what institution or body would ensure, then, civil liberties and put an end to the certainty of impunity that exists in Brazil? In line with the perception of Oliveira Vianna and Alberto Tôrres, Távora believes that only a Strong and Centralized State would be able to guarantee individuals their civil liberties in territories that are averse and adverse to the realization of the law (punishment), thus contradicting the perception that a state with broad recognized authority would necessarily be an attack and a violation of individual rights and freedoms. On the contrary, it would guarantee the construction of a nation capable of marching "quickly and surely towards the realization of its destiny, which is, as Alberto Tôrres said, 'That of creating a new plexus of civilization – a valid, prosperous and happy country, where its children and those who come to cooperate with it, enjoy the fruits of work and intelligence, in health, peace and culture'" (TÁVORA, 1959, p. 121).

## **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

So far, we have analyzed the presence of the authoritarian ideas of Alberto Tôrres and Oliveira Vianna in the thought of Juarez Távora, thus revealing the crucial role of these influences in the construction of his vision of the State and in the definition of his political strategies for the modernization of Brazil. Távora, by resuming and adapting the propositions of Tôrres and Vianna, developed a project of national modernization centered on a strong and intervening State, which sought to overcome the historical ills of Brazil, such as social insolidarism and the lack of an efficient state structure. Távora, despite being largely influenced by Tôrres, diverged from Vianna on some important points, especially regarding the radicality necessary to implement political and economic reforms. While Vianna proposed a strong state intervention, Távora saw the need for a more incisive apparatus, which is reflected in his proposal for an "Ordering Power", similar to the "Coordinating Power" of Tôrres. Brazilian Authoritarian Thought, as articulated by Tôrres and Vianna, found in Távora a particular synthesis that contributed significantly to the complexification and expansion of the theoretical-analytical robustness of Brazilian Military Thought. This appropriation and adaptation of ideas helped shape military action at crucial moments in the country's political history, such as the 1964 coup in which Juarez Távora placed himself as one of the most relevant protagonists.

It is evident that there was a greater proximity on the part of Távora to the ideas of Alberto Tôrres, especially if compared to Viannian perspectives. It does not seem to us that

this is verifiable only by the greater number of quotations that the Brazilian general makes of Tôrres. Tôrres' thought and the concepts that are immersed in it allow, according to our perception, a greater alignment with the positions and theorizations raised by Juarez Távora (his perceptions about Brazil and the changes necessary for its development and/or modernization).

In relation to the thought of Alberto Tôrres, we verify the following uses made by the Brazilian general: 1) diagnosis of Brazil – as a result of our colonial past, there is an amorphism (social, economic, political and cultural) intrinsic to our constitution as a country; 2) Tôrres' prognosis for the nation (requisition and need for a strong, centralized and intervening State engendered by an incisive tool of intervention and political action, the Ordering or Coordinating Power); 3) the characterization of our economic formation and the current state of our economy; 4) the need to establish an intimate connection between the legal and institutional forms built in Brazil (concatenation between the national reality and its laws/institutions).

No divergences with Alberto Tôrres were found, on the contrary, Távora makes extensive use of his ideas, in order to support his analyses and perceptions about Brazil and the problem of our national organization. What seemed strange to us, only, was that he named the concept of the Coordinating Power of Towers with another name, without, however, making clear modifications or certain advances in its definition. However, in relation to Oliveira Vianna, we find that the Brazilian general diverges on the following point: the political project of transformation and modernization for Brazil. Our analysis leads to the understanding that, among other things, Oliveira Vianna's positions on this subject are, for Juarez Távora, not very radical and/or incisive to combat the ills that insist on persisting in the political life of our country. Despite this divergence, it can be seen that on many other points the authors converge, they are: 1) the Viannian position that ratifies the perception that there is in Brazil an indelible insolidarism resulting from our colonial past that permeates the various instances and sectors of the nation; 2) the conception that the modernization and development of Brazil could only be achieved through a strong State; 3) reading about the concept of individual freedom and the tutelary function that the State should exercise; 4) the need to establish an intimate connection between the legal and institutional forms built in Brazil and our national reality.

Juarez Távora does not express an intellectual predisposition to the creation of new theories, interpretations, concepts and readings, as do the other two intellectuals listed



here. In fact, he values the applicability of the concepts and theories of Tôrres and Vianna without, however, making modifications and, what is more complicated, temporal mediations. Perhaps this characteristic of the author and his thought is better understood when we keep in mind how technical-bureaucratic most of the functions were, especially his training as a military officer of the Brazilian Armed Forces. Finally, while we study the presence of Tôrres and Vianna's thought in the midst of Juarez Távorá's theorizing, we walk, even if in a germinal way, to understand the uses that were made of perspectives seen as authoritarian by some exponents of Brazilian military thought. Specifically related to the object with which we are dealing, it is worth noting that a more in-depth analysis of other works would help to a great extent, among them: *À guisa de Depoimento sobre a Revolução Brasileira de 1924 – Volumes I e III – (1927 and 1928)*, *Produção para o Brasil (1956)* and *Uma Política de Desenvolvimento para o Brasil (1962)*. However, so far, we have observed how a certain set of Torrian and Viannian positions are linked to contexts different from those that made their emergence possible. This transit of ideals and perspectives enriched the thinking of some military personnel and endorsed some of their readings for Brazil and, mainly, for overcoming our social, economic, political, and even social backwardness.

## REFERENCES

1. Borges, V. P. (1992). \*Tenentismo e a revolução brasileira\*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
2. Botelho, A. (2008). Uma sociedade em movimento e sua intelligentsia: apresentação. In E. R. Bastos, A. Botelho, & G. V. Bôas (Orgs.), \*O moderno em questão: a década de 1950 no Brasil\* (1ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: TOPBOOKS.
3. Carone, E. (1975). \*O tenentismo: acontecimentos – personagens – programas\*. São Paulo: Difel.
4. Carone, E. (1976). \*A primeira república (1889-1930): texto e contexto\*. São Paulo: Difel.
5. Carvalho, J. M. de. (1985). Forças armadas na primeira república: o poder desestabilizador. In B. Fausto (Org.), \*História geral da civilização brasileira: o Brasil republicano\* (pp. 343-374). São Paulo: Difel.
6. CPDOC-FGV. (2013). \*Accessus – Documentos de Arquivos Pessoais – Azevedo Amaral\*. Disponível em: <<http://cpdoc.fgv.br/acervo/arquivospessoais/consulta>>.
7. CPDOC-FGV. (2014). \*Accessus – Documentos de Arquivos Pessoais – Juarez Távora\*. Disponível em: <<http://cpdoc.fgv.br/acervo/arquivospessoais/consulta>>.
8. Cunha, P. R. R. (2002). \*Um olhar à esquerda: a utopia tenentista na construção do pensamento marxista de Néelson Werneck Sodré\*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan; São Paulo: FAPESP.
9. Fausto, B. (1968). A revolução de 30. In C. G. Mota (Org.), \*Brasil em perspectiva\* (4ª ed.). São Paulo: Difusão Européia.
10. Fontana, F. (2014). O diagnóstico sobre o Brasil: Oliveira Vianna e sua primeira grande contribuição à ciência política brasileira. \*Revista Florestan\*, 1(1), 116-125.
11. Fontana, F. (2022). \*Teoria e práxis: Oliveira Vianna como consultor jurídico do Ministério do Trabalho, Indústria e Comércio (1932-1940)\* (1ª ed.). Curitiba: Appris.
12. Forjaz, M. C. S. (1977). \*Tenentismo e política: tenentismo e camadas médias urbanas na crise da Primeira República\*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
13. Lamounier, B. (1985). Formação de um pensamento político autoritário na primeira república. In B. Fausto (Org.), \*História geral da civilização brasileira\* (Tomo III, Vol. 2, pp. 343-374). São Paulo: Difel.
14. Leal, V. N. (1997). \*Coronelismo, enxada e voto\*. Rio de Janeiro: Fronteira.
15. Mannheim, K. (1976). \*Ideologia e utopia\* (3ª ed., Trad. Sérgio Magalhães Santeiro). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

16. Meirelles, D. (1995). *\*As noites das grandes fogueiras – uma história da Coluna\** (2ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Record.
17. Menezes, G. B. de. (1997). *\*Intérpretes do Brasil\** (1ª ed., pp. 155-191). Niterói: Clube de Literatura Cromos.
18. Mundim, L. F. C. (2020). *\*Juarez Távora e Golbery do Couto e Silva: Escola Superior de Guerra e a organização do Estado Brasileiro (1930-1960)\** [Dissertação de mestrado]. Universidade Federal de Goiás.
19. Pinheiro, P. S. (1985). Classes médias urbanas: formação, natureza, intervenção na vida política. In B. Fausto (Org.), *\*História geral da civilização brasileira\** (pp. 7-37). São Paulo: Difel.
20. Prestes, A. L. (1999). *\*Tenentismo pós-30: ruptura ou continuidade?\** São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
21. Santos, W. G. (1978a). A práxis liberal no Brasil. In *\*Ordem burguesa e liberalismo político\** (pp. 65-118). São Paulo: Duas Cidades.
22. Santos, W. G. (1978b). Paradigma e história: a ordem burguesa na imaginação social brasileira. In *\*Ordem burguesa e liberalismo político\** (pp. 15-64). São Paulo: Duas Cidades.
23. Sola, L. (1968). O golpe de 37 e o Estado Novo. In C. G. Mota (Org.), *\*Brasil em perspectiva\** (4ª ed., pp. 256-282). São Paulo: Difusão Européia.
24. Sodré, N. W. (1968). *\*História militar do Brasil\**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
25. Souza, M. C. C. (1968a). O processo político-partidário na primeira república. In C. G. Mota (Org.), *\*Brasil em perspectiva\** (4ª ed., pp. 162-226). São Paulo: Difusão Européia.
26. Souza, M. C. C. (1955). *\*Petróleo para o Brasil\**. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.
27. Souza, M. C. C. (1959). *\*Organização para o Brasil\**. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.
28. Souza, M. C. C. (1974a). *\*Uma vida e muitas lutas: memórias – da planície à borda do altiplano\**. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca do Exército – Editora e Livraria José Olympio.
29. Souza, M. C. C. (1974b). *\*Uma vida e muitas lutas: memórias – a caminhada no altiplano\**. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca do Exército – Editora e Livraria José Olympio.
30. Tôrres, A. (1914a). *\*A organização nacional\**. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional.
31. Tôrres, A. (1914b). *\*O problema nacional brasileiro\**. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional.
32. Vianna, L. W. (1978). *\*Liberalismo e sindicalismo no Brasil\** (2ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

33. Vianna, M. (1992). \*Revolucionários de 35\*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
34. Vianna, O. (1981). O idealismo da constituição. In V. L. Cardoso (Org.), \*À margem da história da república\* (1ª ed.). Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília.