

## Guerreiro Ramos' forbidden book

*O livro proibido de Guerreiro Ramos*

*El libro prohibido de Guerreiro Ramos*

RICARDO RAMOS SHIOTA <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DO NORTE FLUMINENSE DARCY RIBEIRO (UENF) / GRADUATE PROGRAM IN POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY, CAMPOS DOS GOYTACAZES – RJ, BRAZIL



RAMOS, G. **Mito e verdade da revolução brasileira**. 2. ed. Florianópolis: Insular, 2016. 294 p. (Coleção Pátria Grande. Biblioteca do Pensamento Crítico Latino-Americano, 6). ISBN 9788574748481.

**Keywords:** Guerreiro Ramos. Social Thinking. Theory of Socialism. Organizational Theory.

**Palavras-chave:** Guerreiro Ramos. Pensamento social. Teoria do socialismo. Teoria das organizações.

**Palabras clave:** Guerreiro Ramos. Pensamiento social. Teoría del socialismo. Teoría de las organizaciones.

*Mito e verdade da revolução brasileira* (*The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution*) was published originally in 1963. Included in the dictatorship's index, it has become a little-known work, but it appeared in a new edition published by Editora Insular in 2016. It is a book that is part of the vast literature about the Brazilian Revolution. In it, Guerreiro Ramos expounds his thesis about the need for a Brazilian path to socialism, in opposition to the importing of revolutionary models from abroad. In conceptualizing the social phenomenon, he distinguishes revolution from analogous social phenomena such as coups, civil wars, and military rebellions. Through a dialogue between Brazilian social thought and the revolution category, linked to socialism and communism, Guerreiro Ramos makes a 'sociological reduction' of the category and offers the reader a book in which he criticizes the roots of Stalinism, pointing out the challenges of transforming contemporary Brazil.

Alberto Guerreiro Ramos (1915-1982), a Brazilian intellectual and politician who was ousted and lived in exile in the United States after the coup of 1964, where he was a professor at the University of Southern California<sup>1</sup>, has had his books reedited<sup>2</sup> and even made available on the internet through the Federal Board of Administration<sup>3</sup>. Recently in 2016, Editora Insular published a new edition of *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition as the sixth volume of the Pátria Grande Collection, which is part of the Library of Critical Latin American Thought in the Latin American Studies Institute (IELA/UFSC). The publisher promises to launch a collection of a total of 80 classic books of the Latin American intelligentsia, works by intellectuals who broke with the Eurocentric canon and made fundamental contributions to orient politics designed to overcome underdevelopment and dependence.

<sup>1</sup> And not a professor at South Carolina University as is written on the book flap.

<sup>2</sup> See: Azevedo (2016, p. 24).

<sup>3</sup> Available at: <[http://www.cra-rj.adm.br/publicacoes/acervo\\_digital/guerreiro-ramos/](http://www.cra-rj.adm.br/publicacoes/acervo_digital/guerreiro-ramos/)>. Accessed on: July 15, 2019.

Book review submitted on January 15, 2019 and accepted for publication on October 13, 2019.

The author thanks the Capes/PNPD funding agency- Postdoctoral Fellowship for this work.

[Translated version] Note: All quotes in English translated by this article's translator.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1679-395120190004x>

In light of these criteria, a book written in a dated historical and intellectual context goes against the tide of the ongoing process of neocolonial reversion, in which “[...] Brazil tends to be relegated to a position of an outsourced supplier of primary and semi-manufactured products, of low technological content, with high energy consumption and an elevated negative impact on the environment” (SAMPAIO JUNIOR, 2017, p. 133). From this point of view, this work published for the first time in 1963, conserves its exemplary nature, and is also an important contribution by a Brazilian intellectual to the theory and history of the ideas of socialism, preoccupied with national sovereignty from a leftist perspective at a time when the USA and the USSR disputed international geopolitical hegemony. In those years, the PTB (Brazilian Labor Party) was in the government, but the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), even though it was operating clandestinely, was hegemonic within the Brazilian left (BRANDÃO, 1999). Before Guerreiro Ramos, Celso Furtado (1962) had already positioned himself against Marxism-Leninism, which was capturing the sympathies of university students and the student movement, to present his interpretation of the historic process underway. However, he did this without making a broad and systematic critique of Stalinism as the Bahian sociologist did.

The new edition of *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution* features, on the flap, a text by Nildo Ouriques and a written presentation by Ariston Azevedo, and otherwise conserves the other parts of the original edition. They are: the Preface from 1963; Chapter I, “A Short Discussion of the Brazilian Revolution”; Chapter II, “Direct Revolution and Socialism”; Chapter III, “A Corruption of Philosophy: Marxism-Leninism”; Chapter IV, “The Death and the Life of the International Proletariat”; Chapter V, “Defense of Revisionism”; Chapter VI, “Organization-Man and Parenthetical-Man”; Chapter VII, “Brazilian Revolution or Journey of Fools?”; Appendix I, “The Philosophy of Guerreiro without a Sense of Humor”; and Appendix II, “The Worker Movement and Marxism-Leninism”.

Initially the book was to be called *Os Rinocerontes e a Revolução Brasileira (The Rhinoceroses and the Brazilian Revolution)*, however, Guerreiro Ramos followed his editor's advice, against his own preference, and entitled it *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution* as it appears in the preface. He uses the play *Rhinoceros* by Ionesco, which is against conformity and criticizes the rise of fascism in Romania, to question the PCB and the left which is guided by Marxism-Leninism. This expression is used by the author to refer to Stalinism, the ideology which appeared in the Soviet Union after the death of Lenin, imported in an uncritical manner by some sectors of the Brazilian left. Quotes from Ionesco's play, used as epigraphs in the Preface, the Chapters and Appendix I of the book, elucidate the verve with which the author sparred with his opponents and there were many of them.

He clashed with none less than Gilberto Freyre, Florestan Fernandes, and Costa Pinto – from the point of view of sociology, the greatest Brazilian interpreters of their generation. Given the stature of his opponents, one may perceive the daring of the thought of Guerreiro Ramos, a capacity mobilized to question Stalinism and the importation of this ideology in Brazil. His criticism came with a sense of humor and reality; the rhinoceroses were comic, but indicated the possibility of an imminent absurd tragedy. But, despite his questioning of the revolutionary model of PCB and the adepts of Stalinism, he was not anti-communist, given that his writing defended the legalization of the Communist party which was banned in 1947.

The content of the book was considered subversive after the coup of 1964, and like so many others it was prohibited from being commercialized and was confiscated by the police according to an accusation by the author himself made during a speech to Congress as a Representative of Guanabara for PTB on April 8, 1964<sup>4</sup>. The policy of repression and censorship affected the book market in the social sciences.

Thousands of books were summarily confiscated from book shops and publishers for a variety of reasons: because they spoke of communism (even if they were against it), because the author was a *persona non grata* in the eyes of the regime, for being translations from Russian, or simply because they had red covers (HALLEWELL, 1985, p. 483).

Progressive publishers suffered a boycott under the dictatorship, which pressured banks to not grant loans to them and newsstands and book shops to not sell books by these publishers. To give an idea, “[...] by the end of 1978 there were close to five hundred books prohibited in Brazil” (HALLEWELL, 1985, p. 501).

An integral analysis from beginning to end still remains to be performed for *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution*, because researchers have discussed its thematic singularities rather than the collection of issues raised by the book. Among these analyses, we may highlight the article by Luiz Eduardo Motta (2010), who, even though he did not address all of the book's

<sup>4</sup>The author that best called attention to this denouncement was Pizza Junior (1997). Accessed on November 1, 2018, the document that contains Guerreiro Ramos's words is archived at: <<http://imagem.camara.gov.br/Imagem/d/pdf/DCD09ABR1964.pdf#page=19>>. Accessed on: Nov. 01, 2018.

issues, was pioneering in elucidating them from the prism of issues involving nationalism, third worldism and Guerreiro Ramos's rejection of the revolutionary model of the PCB. Motta reveals that in this critique of the PCB, Guerreiro Ramos adheres to revolutionary nationalism, which is anti-imperialistic, and pro-third world and as a result breaks with the developmental credo.

Motta (2010) disagrees with Caio Navarro Toledo (2007, p. 311), to whom "[...] the nationalism of Guerreiro Ramos sought to conciliate 'ideologically' leftist sociology with a typically liberal-bourgeois developmental policy". In fact, this author failed to notice that Ramos, after leaving the Superior Institute of Brazilian Studies (ISEB) in 1958, broke with developmentalism and the view of the national bourgeois leadership in the process of the Brazilian revolution. In addition, Toledo is mistaken in saying that in the vision of ISEB sociology, "[...] the Brazilian proletariat would be opposing itself to the collective interests of the nation, if it came to fight for the destruction of the country's bourgeois order or fought directly to implement socialism" (TOLEDO, 2007, p. 311). However, in the words of the Bahian sociologist himself,

[...] the nation is an essentially bourgeois concept, an essential value of the bourgeois revolution [...]. The working class today, in underdeveloped countries, knowing the history of bourgeois revolutions in the Old World, adheres with irony to nationalism and nationalists, but it is not nationalist. In essence, it is internationalist. Its vocation is not the nation. It's the universal human community. To the working class, nationalism is a circumstantial ideology (RAMOS, 2016, p. 282-283).

A reading of *A crise do poder no Brasil (The Power Crisis in Brazil)* by Guerreiro Ramos (1961), is revealing and contradicts the affirmation that he was still in favor developmentalism. Instead, according to Motta (2010), the positioning of the author in defense of anti-imperialistic nationalism and socialism as they existed before the coup of 1964, present in *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution*, is the result of an analysis of socialist revolutions in the Third World and is based on the continuity of the Marxist theory of dependence, expounded by authors such as Ruy Mauro Marini and Theotonio dos Santos.

The preface of *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution*, exposes the criteria, motives and original plans that supported the writing and publication of the book. The author expounds two criteria to make a critique of Stalinism: one is of a cultural nature, the uncritical use of foreign theories; the other is organizational and regards the reproduction of the organization model and the leadership characteristic of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union (CPSU) by the PCB. Both criteria, which are at the heart of the previous works of Guerreiro Ramos, result from an appropriation of the critiques of Alberto Torres of "all of the *a priori* ideas of politics" (TORRES, 1978, p. 61) and forms that are foreign to the Brazilian reality, and those of Oliveira Vianna (1955, 1987) in terms of utopian idealism. The intention to erect a national sociology based on the overcoming of underdevelopment and the colonial condition illuminates the author's intransigent critiques of Brazilian sociology (RAMOS, 1995) and acquires a theoretical groundwork in the book *A redução sociológica (Sociological Reduction)*<sup>5</sup>.

In 1966, Caio Prado Júnior published *A revolução brasileira (The Brazilian Revolution)*, in which the same criteria are used, but from another perspective (Marxist) and with another objective: that the political program of the PCB, which based on a mistaken interpretation of the Brazilian reality, partly led to the fall of the government of João Goulart. It questions "[...] concepts formulated *a priori* without an adequate consideration of the facts: and only later was an effort made – which is more serious – to fit these concepts in concrete reality" (PRADO JÚNIOR, 1978, p. 29). The national-democratic program, which was completely alien to Brazilian history, compromised the entire organization and party actions; the PCB's theoretical conceptions and schemes of action are the object of criticism of Caio Prado Júnior, a party member. These books by Caio Prado Júnior and Guerreiro Ramos complement each other. A comparative study still hasn't been made of them, extending from the 1940s to the 1960s, even though they have elective affinities, such as radical nationalism and the aspiration to formulate a theory rooted in Brazilian history, offering a global interpretation of Brazil, even though from distinct theoretical perspectives. In addition, Caio Prado Júnior was cited and praised by Ramos (RAMOS, 1995).

In the first chapter, "A Short Discussion of the Brazilian Revolution", the author makes a theoretical and conceptual review and proposes models for thinking about this phenomenon of social transformation. There's a contribution to differentiate revolution from a coup of the State, and analogous but distinct social phenomena such as insurrection, civil war, armed movements and military rebellions (SHIOTA, 2018). To the Bahian sociologist, these social phenomena were revolutionary only during the periods in which the working class did not exist, when the transformations occurred through the action of a minority of the dominant sectors. Today,

<sup>5</sup> A contextual analysis followed by an overview of the importance of this book may be found in Bariani Junior (2015).

[...] revolution is the moment, subjective and objective, in which a class or coalition of classes, in the name of general interests, according to the concrete possibilities of each moment, modifies or suppresses the current situation, determining changes in the attitude of the exercise of power by current leaders and/or imposing the advent of new mandates (RAMOS, 2016, p. 62).

The definition, based on a review of revolutionary writing (Blanqui, Marx, Lenin and Lukács), highlights the exercise of power and the individual nature of each political form, which is in accordance with the thesis argued in the book that a Brazilian path towards socialism needs to be found. "Revolution is a conscious movement that seeks to make an objective possibility effective, and this can only be known concretely and objectively when it is situated within a totality. This is why there are no uniform models of revolution. Each one is specific" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 72).

To Guerreiro Ramos, the change of content criterion in the power of a society serves to systematize a typology of four possibilities of political change, according to the way in which they are employed: 1) the circulation of elites or modification of their composition without the loss of power; 2) collapse, when there is an assault on power backed by arms, used by Marxism-Leninism; 3) assumed revolution – when a dominant circle addresses the complaints of radicalized social layers, but conforms to the interest in the development of the possibilities contained within the reigning economic and social system; 4) direct revolution, a purely theoretical construct which occurs when the majority assumes the functions of social reconstruction and does not delegate them to a restricted group which represents them. This model desired by the author assumes what is called a parenthetical attitude.

Guerreiro Ramos uses the concept of revolution in a procedural manner, rejecting epic conceptions of insurrection and argues in favor of democratic improvement, that is, the need to transform the rules of the political game to broaden representative democracy. To him, Brazilian parties did not express ideological differences. They had already lost control of the political situation in the country. There was a potential revolution contained within the crisis of political and organizational institutions, which were out of step with the new social reality created by the Revolution of 1930 and the emergence of the people in political life in 1946, when a large, free layer of the Brazilian population became capable of opposing the designs of government and local leaders to impose their will through voting, contrary to what occurred in the First Republic. But there was a lack of virtuous leaders to make the Brazilian revolution a reality. It was not a historical reality similar to the Soviet Union, China or Cuba in which the revolution occurred through civil war or the taking of power by force, which gave birth to political regimes whose concept of organization was capitalist rather than socialist.

The defense of the primacy of political decisions in the face of economic determinism in revolutionary situations and the defense of the theory of revolution extracted from historical particularities is addressed by the last writings of Karl Marx, revealed in the correspondence that he exchanged with Russian activists between 1877-1894, known through the documents of Maximilien Rubel, cited by Guerreiro Ramos and published a few years ago in *Marx and Engels* (2013).

In these last writings of Marx, between the lines there is a "[...] dialectic, polycentric perspective which admits a multiplicity of forms of historical transformation and, above all, the possibility that modern social revolutions may begin on the periphery of the capitalist system and not, as he had written before, in the center" (LOWY, 2013, p. 9). This is a perspective which breaks from a unilinear, Eurocentric and gradual interpretation of historical materialism, which was popular within the intellectual context of the 1950s and 1960s. Marx (2013) distances himself from the economic approach by postulating the possibility of a socialist transition based in rural Russian communes, without previous capitalist development. He rejects the use of his theory by those who formalize or generalize his "[...] historical scheme of the genesis of capitalism in Western Europe in a historical-philosophical theory of the general course of history imposed by fate on all peoples, independent of the historical circumstances in which they are found [...]" (MARX, 2013, p. 68). "Those who believe in a final theory of revolution do not make revolutions" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 82), summarizes Guerreiro Ramos.

In the second chapter, "Direct Revolution and Socialism", he develops his concept of direct revolution, based on intellectuals such as Max Adler, Kautsky, Ernest Mendel, Maximilien Rubel, Daniel Guérin and Rosa Luxemburgo, to criticize the USSR and argue that there was no socialism there, but rather State capitalism. The model of direct revolution is based on the active role of the people participating in social reconstruction. "Up until now, a revolution of this type has not taken place" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 102), he notes. From this point of view, as justified as the critiques may be, he concludes by contradicting a principle adopted in his concept of revolution, appropriated from Marx: "[...] revolution is not a state that should be created, that is ideal for guiding reality; it is an effective movement that, following the concrete possibilities of each moment, dismantles the present situation" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 58).

Guerreiro Ramos also retreats from his affirmations of the previous chapter by basing his critique of the USSR on the low economic level present at the time of revolution, subordinating the construction of socialism in peripheral countries to the development of productive forces. From this angle, he defines socialism as a political and economic method for the development of productive forces in which “[...] the State assumes the role of the only empresario [which] organizes production according to the criterion of the public interest” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 115); in order to promote accelerated capitalistic development in peripheral nations. This can only “[...] take hold in Brazil, to the extent that it has been generated by the particular conditions of the history of our people” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 294). The socialism proposed by the author would be a transformation in defense of national sovereignty, achieved in a pacific manner through the democratic institutional political process with a humanist horizon. It should be remembered that the book was written in 1963, ten years before the fall of the Salvador Allende government in Chile, which was also democratic socialist and multi-party in nature.

The third chapter, “A Corruption of Philosophy: Marxism-Leninism”, Guerreiro Ramos deconstructs the idea of Stalin’s psychological deviation. He criticizes Stalinism, demonstrates the social and cultural roots of the political phenomenon of Stalinism, its origins in the Russian intelligentsia and how it received the writings of Marx and Engels, mediated by the “messianism, dogmatism and volunteerism” of local tradition. He returns to Marx, Engels and Lenin to distance them from the doctrine, and the interpretation of vulgar followers in Communist political parties which followed the rules of the CPSU. In the history of “liberation movements” he identifies the “Law of Bronze”, “[...] according to which, from a certain point on, authentic representatives tend to be substituted and even denounced by activist and false representatives” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 130). Thus, Marxism-Leninism appears, which, in this book refers to Stalinism, the CPSU, and the Soviet regime after the death of Lenin and Stalin’s assumption of control. Stalinism was created as an official ideology to impede criticism and promote expansion of the regime. Various intellectuals were affected and Guerreiro Ramos uses the ideas and life stories of Lukács, Brecht and various other Marxist intellectuals cited to sustain his arguments against Stalinism.

In the fourth chapter, “The Death and Life of the International Proletariat”, he performs an analysis of the differences, positive and negative aspects of organized worker internationalism, from the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century – highlighting the First International, the Second International, and the Third International – seeking to rectify obsolete theoretical conceptions and practices that were detrimental to the effort to emancipate workers. In terms of recognizing the importance of Soviet internationalism (the Comintern and Cominform) in consolidating the Revolution of 1917, the author argues that history will make these powerful organizations obsolete and counterrevolutionary to the extent that they convert the rationale of the State into “[...] the ideology of domesticating the proletariat” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 176). He sustains the impossibility of identifying socialism with the political regime of a country termed socialist. The internationalism of the proletariat serves to institutionalize the active solidarity of the masses in defense of socialism. The international nature of the workers’ cause, however, is mediated by various national paths of transition, to the extent that “[...] fighting for their own national causes, each worker’s movement fights for the advent of world socialism” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 181). These ideas are in line with various intellectuals in defense of third-world socialism (MOTTA, 2010).

The fifth chapter, “Defense of Revisionism”, delineates a story of the reception of Karl Marx’s thinking in political-party organizations and spells out the reasons why, between 1924 and 1953, revisionism became taboo and a motive for coercion and even the physical elimination of its protagonists. To him, revisionism is conceived of “[...] as the exercise of independent criticism, independent of all criteria of convenience, which do not have the objectivity of truth” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 202). The monopoly of the Marxist interpretation of the CPSU, under the domination of Stalin, represented a fight for the consolidation and expansion of power and Soviet ideological hegemony, which was the reason for the disappearance of tolerance for revisionists. Above all during the Stalinist interregnum, the CPUS exercised the “[...] role of Holy Office in the interpretation of Marxism” (RAMOS, 2016, p. 190). In elaborating the state of the art of revisionism at that time, the author distinguishes five currents, pointing to the underlying historic circumstances of this movement. In addition to defending revisionism against the Stalinist interpretation of Marxism, seen as impeding the formation of a national theory of revolution in Brazil, he indicates the need to improve Marxism in the dialectic sense of improving-conserving it, of conceiving of it as a part of social science, developing it and not taking it as a finished product.

The sixth chapter, “Organization Man and Parenthetical Man”, deals with the problem of organization from the point of view of the political theory of socialism and the proposal of the parenthetical attitude as the basis of existentialism in the sociology of knowledge and political sociology. Authors such Ferdinand Tönnies, Karl Mannheim, Wright Mills, Norbert Wiener and Robert Michels are discussed. According to Guerreiro Ramos, the organization is the key to servitude and emancipation, conferring power

to agents over itself and circumstances in the face of the spontaneous tendency of social life towards disaggregation. The subject of organization had already been the subject of reflection by Guerreiro Ramos in his thesis, "Industrial Sociology – Formations and Current Trends", of 1949, for his entrance into the Administrative Department of Public Service (DASP). In 2009, it was republished by the Federal Board of Administration under the title "An Introduction to the History of the Rational Organization of Work". In this text, the author ponders the historic limitations of Fordism and Taylorism in regions in which industry was incipient, such as Latin America. In *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution*, the subject of organization is presented in its connection with politics, showing that as a social entity, it can serve the purpose of domination or can contribute to emancipation.

Against the evils of organization, "the secret of human servitude", he proposes an antidote: a parenthetical attitude, an examination of human action through an organizational prism of "reflected will", a reflection on what conditions social existence, criticism, critical behavior and the emancipation horizon. Based on the fundamentals of this concept from the angle of the organization, he criticizes the theory of a unified party, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the democratic centralism defended by Lenin, Lukács and Stalinism as the "product of bourgeois ideology" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 236). He was aware that without praxis, criticism by itself does not transform relationships. "Only the organization corrects or educates against the evils of an illegitimate organization [...]. Thus, the fight against a mystified organization cannot be the mere criticism and denouncing of its negative aspects, but has to be its substitution by another organization, appropriate to the new valid criteria" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 218). These are very modern teachings from this institutional architect.

In the seventh and last chapter, "Brazilian Revolution or Journey of Fools?", the discussion of the revolution is subsumed by the Brazilian case in the scenario which predated the coup of 1964, seen as a peculiar revolutionary situation, without the duality of powers in which the forces of the left were represented in the government. The history of the country and the references to Brazilian intellectuals are notable in this chapter, in which a diagnosis is made of how the crisis of power was manifested and what were the objective possibilities of the Brazilian revolution, among which is cited failure. Transformation is defined as "[...] institutional reorganization, in order to readjust the State, not only making it the reflection of the correlation of the dominant classes in society, by virtue of their development in the past few decades, but also to prepare them for new functions" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 251). This proposition is the result of a particular pattern of the revolutionary phenomenon in Brazil, present in the Revolution of 1930 and the State Coup of 1937, characterized by "[...] institutional scale modifications and the advent of new content in terms of class and the balance of power" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 255). For this reason, the author's criterion is recomposition, "with new content in terms of classes and the political leadership of the nation" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 251). This concept is distant from coups, collapses, and civil war and proposes institutional changes.

In Appendix I, "The Philosophy of Guerreiro without a Sense of Humor", there is a quite critical review of the book by Álvaro Vieira Pinto, *Consciência e realidade nacional (Conscience and National Reality)*. Appendix II, contains a declaration by PTB drafted by the author, "The Worker Movement and Marxism-Leninism". The thesis defended by the author in *The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution* appears in this document: "[...] the PTB, in defense of the interests of the working masses, proclaims its socialist vocation, but does not accept any pre-fabricated figure of socialism, which can only succeed in Brazil to the extent that it is generated by conditions particular to the history of our people" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 294).

Of the objective possibilities identified by sociology, neither revolution or a journey of fools took hold, but rather counter-revolution. History has revealed that the rhinoceroses were in the political camp opposed to Guerreiro Ramos, to use his words, extracted from his typology, they were "conservative circles", which repelled "with efficiency, a grave threat to their essential interests" (RAMOS, 2016, p. 261). The rhinoceroses were not the communists and other fellow travelers whom Guerreiro Ramos disagreed with. The "rhinocerositis", to tell the truth, was occurring in the other political pole, within the social forces which opposed the Brazilian revolution and basic reforms, precisely those who placed this book in the *index*.

In effect, the coup of 1964, by interrupting the short congressional career of Guerreiro Ramos, also made the continuity of reflections about the theory and history of revolutionary ideas and socialism present in this book inviable, given that Brazilian society followed a path contrary to that which he desired. He exiled himself in the United States, where he pursued a career as a university professor.

*The Myth and Truth of the Brazilian Revolution* places this Bahian sociologist in the lineage of Brazilian and Latin American intellectuals who saw in "[...] socialism, a way to resolve national and social issues at the same time" (IANNI, 1988, p. 19). However, its formulation could not import a socialist revolutionary model adverse to its reality. In this way, in questioning the validity of exporting socialist models of revolution, the sociologist reflected on the extent to which historical socialist experiences would be solutions of a universal character. Guerreiro Ramos faced a problem of political theory with great erudition and astuteness, making use of Marxist and non-Marxist intellectuals to defend his thesis in terms of the need for a Brazilian path towards socialism.

## REFERENCES

- AZEVEDO, A. Apresentação. In: RAMOS, G. **Mito e verdade sobre a revolução brasileira**. 2. ed. Florianópolis: Insular, 2016.
- BARIANI, E. Certidão de nascimento: a redução sociológica em seu contexto de publicação. **Caderno CRH**, Salvador, v. 28, n. 73, p. 15-25, jan./abr. 2015.
- BRANDÃO, G. M. **A esquerda positiva**: as duas almas do Partido Comunista (1920/1964). São Paulo: Hucitec, 1999.
- FREIRE, A. O social-trabalhismo do deputado federal Guerreiro Ramos. **Cadernos EBAPE.BR**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 13, n. esp., set. 2015.
- FURTADO, C. **A pré-revolução brasileira**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fundo de Cultura, 1962.
- HALLEWELL, L. **O livro no Brasil (sua história)**. São Paulo: T. A. Queiroz; EDUSP, 1985.
- IANNI, O. A questão nacional na América Latina. **Estudos Avançados**, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 1, p. 5-40, jan./mar. 1988.
- LOWY, M. Introdução – Dialética revolucionária contra a ideologia burguesa do Progresso. In: MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. **Luta de classes na Rússia**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.
- MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. **Luta de classes na Rússia**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.
- MOTTA, L. E. A política do Guerreiro: nacionalismo, revolução e socialismo no debate brasileiro nos anos 1960. **Organizações & Sociedade**, v. 17, n. 52, p. 85-101, 2010.
- PIZZA JUNIOR, W. Trajetória parlamentar de Alberto Guerreiro Ramos. **Revista de Administração Pública**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 31, n. 5, p. 24-28, set./out. 1997.
- PRADO JÚNIOR, C. **A revolução brasileira**. 6. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1978.
- RAMOS, G. **A crise do poder no Brasil**: problemas da revolução nacional brasileira. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1961.
- RAMOS, G. **Mito e verdade sobre a revolução brasileira**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1963.
- RAMOS, G. **Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. UFRJ, 1995.
- RAMOS, G. **Mito e verdade sobre a revolução brasileira**. Florianópolis: Insular, 2016.
- SAMPAIO JUNIOR, P. A. **Crônica de uma crise anunciada**. Crítica à economia política de Lula a Dilma. São Paulo: SG Amarante, 2017.
- SHIOTA, R. R. **Brasil**: terra da contrarrevolução. Revolução brasileira e classes dominantes no pensamento político e sociológico. Curitiba: Appris, 2018.
- TOLEDO, C. N. Intelectuais do Iseb, Esquerda e Marxismo. In: MORAES, J. Q. (Org.). **História do marxismo no Brasil**. Teorias e interpretações. 2. ed. Campinas: Ed. Unicamp, 2007.
- TORRES, A. **A Organização Nacional**: primeira parte. 3. ed. São Paulo: Nacional, 1978.
- VIANNA, O. **Instituições políticas brasileiras**. v. 2. Metodologia do direito público. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1955.
- VIANNA, O. **Populações meridionais do Brasil**. v. 1. Populações do Centro-Sul. 3. ed. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia, Ed. UFF, 1987.

Ricardo Ramos Shiota

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8932-8130>

PhD in Sociology from the State University of Campinas (UNICAMP); Recipient of a Capes Scholarship for Graduate Study in Political Sociology at Darcy Ribeiro North Fluminense State University (UENF), Campos dos Goytacazes – RJ, Brazil. E-mail: rrsiota@gmail.com