

# Between the Beauty of Death and the Excesses of the Living: folklore and traditionalism in Southern Brazil<sup>1</sup>

Letícia Borges Nedel\*

## RESUMO

O artigo examina a participação gaúcha no autodenominado Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro, entre as décadas de quarenta e sessenta. Os participantes locais são divididos em duas categorias de folcloristas: os folcloristas do tradicionalismo e o grupo de intelectuais e artistas da Comissão Estadual de Folclore (CEF), representante oficial da Comissão Nacional de Folclore (CNFL) no Rio Grande do Sul. Desiguais em autoridade e posição social, a assimetria dos dois grupos nas esferas regional e nacional de reconhecimento mútuo é a base sobre a qual os atores conceberão distintamente a própria ancestralidade, sua atividade profissional e a finalidade social dos estudos de Folclore.

Palavras-chave: Rio Grande do Sul; folclore; historiografia.

## ABSTRACT

This article examines the participation of *Gauchos* in the self-named Brazilian Folkloric Movement (*Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro*) between the 1940s and 1960s. Local participants are divided into two categories of folklorists: traditional folklorists and the group of intellectuals and artists from the State Folklore Commission (*Comissão Estadual de Folclore* – CEF), official representative of the National Folklore Commission (*Comissão Nacional de Folclore* – CNFL) in Rio Grande do Sul. Unequal in authority and social position, the asymmetry between the two groups in the regional and national spheres of mutual recognition is the basis on which the authors distinctly see their ancestry, professional activities, and the social purpose of folklore studies.

Keywords: Rio Grande do Sul (Brazil); folklore; historiography.

The oscillation between romantic particularism and Enlightenment universalism permeates the ways knowledge with an ethnological content was conceived by the lettered elites of Rio Grande do Sul between the end of the nineteenth century and the years immediately after the Second World War. In

---

\* Professor, Department of History, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Campus Universitário Trindade. Departamento de História. 88040-970 Florianópolis – SC – Brasil. leticiabnedel@gmail.com

the interval corresponding to the inaugural phase of the invention of regional attributes, folklore becomes much closer to art – specifically literature – than science, although it was also regarded by the latter as being part of physical anthropology or philological studies, due to its collections of vocabulary.

It was only during the redemocratization of the country and in the middle of a process of the expansion of the areas of the production of knowledge and the diversification of the market of ‘authentic’ local goods, that two generations of cultural mediators recognized in the internal otherness of Rio Grande, and in particular in studies about *popular culture*, a subject and a specialty to be methodologically tested *in loco* – which implied taking their materials of ‘analysis’ from *field work* rather than literature. Engaged in a national federalized and integrating movement – self-labeled *Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro* (the Brazilian Folklore Movement) – those interested in coordinating efforts in the area saw the opportunity to update the formulations inherited from the historical and literary tradition founded in the previous ceremony, creating new professional expectations and expanding their concrete bases of sustenance.

This article deals with the conditioners of this engagement, prioritizing the operability of the approximation of historians, literary critics, writers and *traditionalist* Gaúcho activists with folklore studies. The intention is to observe in the intersection between the practical order and the order of languages, the means for the neutralization of the arbitrary intrinsicness of the stereotypes that these authors deal with. In short, this involves – in accordance with the suggestion of Rodolfo Vilhena<sup>2</sup> – understanding the inter-relationship, in two spheres, of the formation process of three complementary identities: the professional identity of scholars, the specialty they helped to found, and the territory in which the phenomenon studied are located, since one can recognize in these a series of intrinsic determining properties of a privileged mode of accessing the nation.

## AREAS OF MOBILIZATION

The movement which attracted the attention of scholars and traditionalists in Rio Grande do Sul was coordinated at the federal level by the *Comissão Nacional de Folclore* (CNFL – National Folklore Commission). Organized in the capital of Brazil as part of the international convention that created UNESCO in 1947, it organized the actions of intellectuals from various states for the institutionalization of these studies in Brazil. Thus was done in an

intermediate point on the trajectory of the social sciences, amongst which were the theoretical foundations of new questions, such as social mobility, economic development and the modernization of Brazilian society. In a decisive scenario for the development and consolidation of third level teaching and research in the country, the Commission, and from 1958 onwards the *Campanha de Defesa do Folclore Brasileiro* (CDFB – Campaign in Defense of Brazilian Folklore), ran a study program with the following aims: primarily to hold an ‘inquiry into Brazilian folklore.’ Second, the struggle to preserve regional cultural inheritances and their integration in the national civic calendar. Finally, the introduction of folklore in formal education at the primary and university levels (Vilhena, 1997, p.173-175). These measures were understood as a precondition for the “scientific understanding of popular culture.”<sup>3</sup> However, it was not restricted to this; its strategy was to act on two fronts, combining the formulation – with intellectuals from different states in the country – of secure criteria for working in an area that tended towards amateurism, to longing for what was gone (*saudosismo*) and to desk work, and to a civilizing action with a strong celebratory content, committed to the inclusion of rural populations in national society.

At the state level, there were two competing groups of interested parties. On the one hand, the official representatives of the National Commission, meeting in the State Folklore Commission (*Comissão Estadual de Folclore – CEF*), created in Porto Alegre in April 1948. On the other a novice group, formed by young people who during the following two decades ended up creating an elite of ideologues called the *Movimento Tradicionalista* (Traditionalist Movement).

*Traditionalism* was started by eight secondary school students who, a year before the creation of CEF (in 1947), founded under the leadership of João Carlos Paixão Cortes a ‘Department of Gaucho Traditions’ in the Student Union of the Julio de Castilhos State College. After throwing themselves in to the public eye by organizing pickets and horseback parades in official ceremonies related to national independence and the Farroupilha Revolution, they immediately became known as the vanguard of a movement of the masses, whose initial mark would be retrospectively delimited by the founding of the first Center of Gaucho Traditions – ‘CTG 35’ (*Centro de Tradições Gaúchas*), created in Porto Alegre in the same year as the creation of the folklore commission.<sup>4</sup>

Regarded as the driving force which led to the spread of other CTGs throughout the state (and a little later throughout Brazil), in the same decade

these and other self-labeled *traditionalists* were concerned with acquiring, in addition to public recognition for their self-confessed patriotic intentions, the social capital and instrumental technique necessary for the conquest of an institutional space of action, to be made concrete through approximation with the political class and local scholars. While with the expectations of these youth to achieve the condition of peers of regionally important authors was frustrated, the intention of exercising a certain ‘specialized traditionalism was widely rewarded. Starting with the means of communication in which in the middle of the 1950s Antônio Augusto Fagundes, Carlos Galvão Krebs, Luis Carlos Barbosa Lessa, Paixão Cortes and Glaucus Saraiva already had an important role. All of these participated in radio programs meant for *traditionalist* propaganda, while widely circulating newspapers, such as *Diário de Notícias*, *A Hora* and *Jornal do Dia*, guaranteed the regular publication of articles interviews and open letters in specialized columns in the topics of *regionalism and tradition*.

The investment was also recognized by the state government, which incorporated the rituals of ‘folkloric projection’ invented by the traditionalists for official civic ceremonies. Furthermore, the alignment of the ‘cult of tradition’ with folklore research allowed them to enter the public machine. This occurred in the final year of the mandate of the former *interventor*, and at that time PTB governor Ernesto Dornelles, when the Legislative Assembly approved the reform project in the State Department of Education. The reform created, together with another six cultural bodies, an institution made to serve as a shelter and place for the technical training of those who practiced that cult: *Instituto de Tradições e Folclore* (ITF – Institute of Traditions and Folklore). There, ten years later in 1965, the director Carlos Galvão Krebs would create the first undergraduate course in folklore in the state – the Higher School of Folklore (*Escola Superior de Folclore* – ESF), part of the Division of Acculturation of the State Department of Education and Culture, aimed at training primary teachers.

The group that enlisted renowned intellectuals in the area of folklore in Rio Grande do Sul was CEF. Unlike ITF, which achieved public recognition for a group of apprentices learning about the tasks of culture, the commission brought together luminaries from various areas, such as musical education, literary criticism, dance, the fine arts, philology and historical research. Led from its foundation in 1948 until 1992 by one of the best known local historians – Dante de Laytano – the majority of members belonged to the generation of polyvalent intellectuals who had started in literature, in criticism and in

journalism in Porto Alegre in the second half of the 1920s. Many of these had actively participated in the 1930 revolutionary campaign, and were part of the well known 'Bookshop Group of Globo,' attended dinners and rallies with political authorities or also ran the principal cultural bodies in the state. The nominations of members were attended by members and directors of IHGRS, professors of history, literature and music in the Faculties of Philosophy and Arts, and writers in the principal magazines and newspapers in Porto Alegre, in short "all the expression of Rio Grande culture," as emphasized by the secretary.<sup>5</sup>

Although the effective participation of members was unequal in the commission's work routines, it managed to develop a varied and intense role of activities. It held folklore congresses and festivals in the capital, was a member of organizing commission of congresses held in other states (to which it sent delegations and submitted papers); it held further education courses on folklore as part of the Brazilian Civilization course in the philosophy faculties of PUCRS and UFRGS (courses which were headed by Laytano), as well as numerous conferences and radio programs transmitted for more than ten years on 22 August, 'Folklore Day.' An illustration of this performance is the third position achieved by the Gaucho commission among the publications in the annals of CNFL.<sup>6</sup>

One of the reasons for such an interest in the promotion of folklore studies among intellectuals in the South came from the expectation, nurtured by those authors, of improving the secondary position of the state in relation to the principal cultural centers of the country (São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro), and overtaking the competing regional centers of production, such as Recife and Bahia. The 'indifference' of the cosmopolitan centers to the internal realities of Brazil functioned as a structuring element of the local cultural market, figuring as an argument constantly used in the works of the authors involved in debates about the contours of the *region* since the beginning of the century. At that time, Alcides Maya, considered the founder of *regionalist* prose in Rio Grande, complained that Rio Grande was unjustly accused by the "fine *helenes* who walk along Rua do Ouvidor" of being "a type of backward and barbaric Macedonia" (Maya, 1979 [1909, p.20]). The reason for this the author argued was that Brazil as a whole was nothing other in aesthetics than a dependency of the Federal capital.

Considering the longevity and recurrence of this complaint, the perspective opened by the calling of Renato Almeida to the join the effort for interregional team research, could have served as a stimulus for regionally

famous, but nationally unknown, authors to carry their historic banner of the 'decentralization of letters' beyond Rio Grande. It is not by chance that Renato Almeida's sensitivity to 'provincial intellectuals' was always the focus of the obvious recognition of the secretary of CEF in the Porto Alegre press. There Dante de Laytano published an article dedicated to the president of CNFL, praising the democratizing qualities of the coordinator and the movement:

Renato Almeida knew how to go to the provinces, he remembered the states of the Brazilian Federation and did not forget the workers who toiled almost without qualifications and with few expectations in the arduous task of the immense commitment to produce literature, science and art in the state capitals of the interior, where the echoes of their own words disappeared muffled in the silence of the almost always tranquil streets...<sup>7</sup>

On the other hand, the opportunity for these authors to expand their connections with the Brazilian intellectual community was presented at the moment when the heroic versions of *Gaúcho regionalism* were losing legitimacy<sup>8</sup> and the social function of research was being questioned by interpretations which attacked the ideological content of previous formulas of historic elucidation. Reacting to the pressure of the methods of the best regarded disciplines, such as the emerging sociology in the center of the country, folklore researchers thus claimed the intellectual inheritance of the 1920s and 1930s – an epoch in which 'modernists,' 'traditionalists' and others from the Southeast and Northeast consecrated a pluralist and regionalized pattern of the aesthetic representation of the nation. By returning to these models of comprehending national reality, local scholars tried to explore the heuristic and integrating potential of objects, personalities, methods and sources that were not usual in local historiography, since the allied campaign to prove, based on documentary sources, the 'innate republicanism' of the Gaúcho, described as the guardian centaur of the frontiers of the Empire. Alongside this, themes such as 'family life,' 'daily life,' 'anonymity' and the oral tradition began to awaken a greater interest on the part of academics and literati in the 1940s and 1950s, concerned with enlarging the niche of the *region* and its spokespersons in the national symbolic repertoire. 'Seen from below,' the history of the Southern formation stopped being just a chapter in the military history of Brazil to be incorporated in the most valorized pages in the *Luso-Brazilian civilization* built in the tropics.

An enthusiastic adept of the spreading of the work of Gilberto Freyre in and about the state, the president of CEF thus affirmed the affinity between history and folklore studies, and the solidarity of both with the broader project of reviewing the means of affirmation of Southern Brazilianness. It thus pointed

to the need to update the rural and militaristic image of the Gaucho portrayed in the founding texts of historiography: “The Gaucho has not died. He has evolved. The historical cycles had to be checked, placing his virile, extraordinary personality of a warrior or revolutionary in epochs of the past.”<sup>9</sup>

For the traditionalist youth, however, the inventory of regional folklore was precisely the means to reanimate this Gaucho from the past. The ‘retromania’<sup>10</sup> introduced by the traditionalist wave in the 1950s brought a diversity of agents to compete in a freely expanding market of ‘authentic’ cultural goods. Through the proliferation of CTGs, the promotion of Gaucho festivals, rodeos, parades, competitions and other forms of inclusion in this market with numerous interested parties in folklore, who were not necessarily linked to the intellectual sphere, the emblematic figure of the *centaur of the pampas* imposed himself at the center of collective reflection about the past, which was no longer limited to be inventories, but is presentified through the ritual cult of *tradition*.

## FOLKLORE FOR AMERICANS TO SEE: THE 35

There is a place in ‘35’ for all those who want to work with Gaucho traditions. The door of ‘35’ is open to all those who wish to help. It is not only abandoned Gauchos we need, as is shown by our *invernadas*. In order to fully achieve our objective, we need the cooperation of all, principally intellectuals and artists, whom we seek to demonstrate the wide range of elements which Rio Grande provides to all cultural works.<sup>11</sup>

With this call to arms, published in a report signed by Luis Carlos Barbosa Lessa for *Revista do Globo* in 1948, the secondary student Antonio Cândido, a native of Dom Pedrito, a future doctor and then *patrão* of the 35 CTG stressed the culturally responsible character of the most recent ‘Gaucho center’ created in the capital, and the willingness of members to fulfill a common design, useful to the artists and intellectuals of Porto Alegre. This was the inventory of folklore which had been regarded as having disappeared from Rio Grande.

The report – whose text badly disguised the personal sympathy of the reporter with the cause being publicized – was structured in three times, in order to represent the destitute past, the promising present and the glorious future of this preservationist intent. The first moment is represented by a ‘muggy afternoon’ in 1946, in which a couple of photographers from *Reader’s Digest* – “with strangely blond hair and an appearance that smelt of far distant lands” – appealed to the editors of *Revista do Globo* for help to publicize abroad the picturesque scenarios of the southern point of Brazil. Justino Martins, the

legendary director of the magazine, explained in bad English to the out-of-towners “that an authentic Gaucho is a real rarity in Porto Alegre and its surroundings.” The only way would be to travel to the countryside. Lacking time for this, Mr. Beening (as one of the photographers was called) “turned about” and left the state the following day, without having got anything “that spoke about our Gaucho” (Lessa, 1948).

Second moment: October 1948 – six months after the foundation of the 35, one month before the publication of the report. The story is similar, but the ending is different: Ruth Anderson, a photographer for the *Hispanic Society of America* in New York, also went to the editors of the *Revista*, this time asking the illustrator Nelson Boeira where to photograph Gauchos and Gaucho costumes. Boeira answered in Portuguese that this would be possible in the 35 Center of Gaucho Traditions. The illustrator (actually through his newsroom colleague, Barbosa Lessa) contacted a group of youths. In one of their weekly ‘*chimarrões*’ they quickly put together a ‘rapid course of regionalism’ for the traveler.

Brightening the ‘attendance Book’ of that ‘Creole shed,’ the photographer had the opportunity to search ‘the archives in formation of the 35.’ As part of what can be called the indoor segment of the aforementioned ‘course,’ she was presented with typical Gaucho clothing ‘from the period of colonization to the current day,’ as well as ‘popular songs on typical instruments’ and ‘a group of Gaucho women dancing regional dances.’ Lacking the time or money to accompany her to the frontier, the open air demonstration took place in a ranch of an acquaintance in the neighboring city of Viamão. There ‘two Gauchos from the 35’ – the *patrão* Antônio Cândido and the ‘1º *Agregado das Pilchas*’ (the treasurer) João Carlos Paixão Côrtes – showed Ms. Anderson the vigor of countryside work. ‘Helped’ by the employees of the establishment, they paraded before the eyes and lenses of the photographer all the tasks which characterized ‘life in our ranches,’ from the ‘washing of cattle’ to the ‘breaking of foals.’ At the end came the recreational part, crowned by a fat barbeque, watered with *caninha* (alcohol made from sugarcane) from Santo Antônio da Patrulha. All duly registered in almost one hundred photographs which reported the existence of the Brazilian Gaucho to New York.<sup>12</sup>

The journalistic clothing applied to the episode left the reader with the impression that the 35 was a well equipped cultural complex, a type of theme park built as an urban branch of a rural livestock ranch. It was barely noticeable at the beginning of the narrative that the popular songs presented to Ms. Anderson by the ‘teachers of *gauchismo*’ were actually songs written by a



diminutive cast of students and scouts recently ‘converted’ into *Gauchos* – or that they had started their adherence to rural customs and values precisely because they have moved to the capital. This readily available troop of troubadours, dancers, poets and storytellers of the ‘causos,’ with the exception of a few members, had only an indirect familiarity with countryside life. The majority of the boys had learned what they knew from books, and the reading of these had only begun a short while before, when in informal meetings in the houses of friends in the intervals of work and schools they dressed ‘in character’ to drink *chimarrão* around a ‘ground fire’ and “to mutually teach each other the facts of our history, things of countryside life, important aspects of our formation, and bibliographic and linguistic curiosities” (Ferreira, 1987, p.55-56).

From these meetings and from the improvised imagination of the *Palmeirense* merchant Wilmar Winck de Souza, treasurer and 1º *Trovador* of the 35, the ‘authentic ballads’ heard by the photographer must have emerged. The ‘causos’ were often colorful versions of stories heard by Cyro Dutra Ferreira when he spent his holidays on the property of his father in General Câmara. The ‘typical instruments’ were the responsibility of the ‘1º *gaiteiro*’, Paulo ‘Grosso’ Caminha – a scout who also sang with Antônio Cândido, – the reporter Lessa and Jacinto Camargo – the latter already a grown man, described as a ‘quiet and reserved’ instrumentalist who apparently only appeared at the rehearsals (Ferreira, 1987, p.75).

There were three declaimers. In addition to Paixão Côrtes, who did a little of everything (he was also a singer, dancer, actor, and choreographer) and Dirceu Tito Lopes from Uruguaiana – who, according to Cyro, “declaimed with an unusual feeling and corporal expression [but] only liked (or only knew) one poem, the ‘*Carreirada*’ by Vargas Neto” – there was Glaucus Fonseca Saraiva. The latter, a scout born in São Jerônimo who worked in insurance in the vague hours, and was also a boxer and aspiring poet, would become known as the author of the most famous *traditionalist* poem (*Chimarrão*), as well as for the idea of adopting the designations of a ranch for the positions within the association. ‘Tio Waldomiro,’ the oldest member among the twenty-four founders,<sup>13</sup> was a neighbor of Côrtes, who because of his ‘wisdom’ and his personality was often asked to presentations – in which the *causos* and the declamations, due to the sparse choreographic and musical repertoire available, principally served to ‘fill in spaces’ (Ferreira, 1987, p.76).

The ‘Gaucha girls’ (a year later baptized as ‘prendas’),<sup>14</sup> were the sisters, cousins, colleagues and girlfriends of the boys. Dressed in calico, they

reproduced the choreographed bricolage which Cortes, together with Barbosa Lessa, had arduously put together based on descriptions in almanacs and annuals, in the writing of Cezimbra Jacques, Apolinário Porto Alegre, and Von Koseritz<sup>15</sup> in *regionalist* literature (such as the work *Os amores do Capitão Paulo Centeno*)<sup>16</sup> and more recent collections by folklorists, such as Augusto Meyer, Walter Spalding and Dante de Laytano.

As the Italian proverb says, *se non è vero è bene trovato*. What the US traveler saw was a somewhat rougher version of future *traditionalist* performances with ‘folkloric projection’ – which from 1950 onwards would appear in festivals and congresses, radio programs and tours in theaters in the interior of the state, other state capitals, and even in 1958 in the Olympia in Paris. At this point, having a more profound contact with the bibliography and scholars of the subject, the traditionalist folklorists came to call their artistic creations projections, in recognition of the fact that no ‘original,’ i.e., spontaneous folkloric elements, were being exhibited in them. Confirming the unanimously recognized thesis of the disappearance of folklore in Rio Grande, they assumed the role of the restorers of this lost archive, by defending the incorporation of stylized – but nonetheless based on documents – variants of a heritage which had “existed previously and disappeared.” After all, nothing could prevent these arts from one day “being folkloric again,” when the “popular mass [would interpret them] with the same spontaneity and topicality with which they speak or work, without the self-consciousness of being artistically worshipping traits of the past.”<sup>17</sup>

Before looking at this argument a little more deeply, it is worth making a parenthesis to identify the different stages of its preparation. The objective is to verify in the trajectory of this restoration project important points of inflection for the problematic raised here – which is the competition created by the diversification of the social spheres and modes of production of social memory in Rio Grande do Sul. The periodization covers the events involved in two essential mutations – first, the transformation of a club (the 35) into the HQ of a movement (*traditionalism*); second, the incorporation of this movement and the celebratory practices it used in the ‘lost’ heritage which the traditionalist experts wished to unveil.

Following the documental tracks left by this mobilization and using for this procedure both the content of the texts and the actual variation in the quantity of sources available, three key periods in this process can be established: 1948-1952; 1952-1956; 1956-1965. In the first interval the most rarified interval of the news reports about CTGs indicates that until 1950

traditionalist activists consisted of the 35, two more groups in the capital and four in the interior of the state.<sup>18</sup> Connected to the 35, the leaders were concerned with, on the one hand, the organization of the structure and internal directives to the center, and, on the other, with propaganda, complying with the regimental aim of stimulating the proliferation of these groups across the state. In this phase the most immediate concern was precisely to give social visibility in the form of the proselytism it had started. For this, at the same time that it promoted interventions, rituals and informal events in the public space of Porto Alegre, the apprentices invested in the initiation of research in folklore, seeking the approval of the intellectual community.

The next phase, marked by the expansion of the ‘cult of traditions,’ defined the ill-fated destiny of this alliance between the ‘novices’ and ‘masters.’ It began with the accelerated multiplication of CTGs, and was marked by the appearance of more active centers in the interior of the state, and in the capital by the strong penetration of *traditionalists* in the written media and in the cultural industry (cinema, music, publicity and tourism). From the doctrinaire perspective, the high point is the holding of annual congresses, in which the ideological unification of CTGs will be pursued from an eminently ‘popular’ and anti-academic directive, officially assumed in 1954. In the words of the actors involved, this moment represents the phase of the ‘transcendence of tradition.’ Recognized as representative of a mass movement, the activists announced the mission of making “conscious the spontaneous and raw *Gauchismo*” of the “people,” through “highly stylized and improved work.”<sup>19</sup> This would not only result in the progressive merging of the recently invented ‘traditions’ with ‘folklore’ – the object of the ‘scientific interest’ of authors linked to CNFL –, but in the rupture between two generations of cultural mediators.

Finally, in the last part of the decade a third phase began with the rise of a more specialized traditionalist elite in governmental institutions. In this context the consolidation of the intellectual formation of the ideologues, in addition to causing open rivalry between the ITF and the CEF, insinuated within the movement the tensions between the ‘specialists’ and the ‘amateurs,’ between the ‘authentic’ and ‘commercial’ or ‘festive’ traditionalism. Simultaneously, in the field of civic intervention, the *old Gaucho* was no longer the ultimate object of the celebration, but the *current Gauchos*, represented by the pantheon of the founders of the *traditionalist* festival, already incorporated in the ‘popular’ cultural repertoire of Rio Grande do Sul as an uncontested type

of ‘emergent folkloric fact.’ To use Daniel Fabre’s lapidary synthesis, the ‘spectacle of history’ gives ways to a ‘history of spectacle.’<sup>20</sup>

This parenthesis obliges us to recognize that at the time of Ms. Anderson’s visit, ‘traditionalism’ was nothing more than the subject stubbornly adhering to the values and uses of the past. In fact *traditionalism* as such had not even been invented and the word did not even appear in the discourse of those interviewed by Lessa. Perhaps for this reasons, their plans remained until then more concerned with proving their own qualifications in folklore, history and literature, than the ‘awareness of the masses’ and the ‘acculturation of immigrants.’

At the beginning, for the oldest and best situated scholars sympathizing with the promotions of traditionalists students – whether through their presence in ceremonies, conferences and dances, or through public declarations of support for the ‘Gaúcho youth of the 35 CTG’ – meant in a certain way complying with the legacy of the transmission and valorization of *regional* themes, works and authors. Within this proposition, the curiosity of former students for a subject which had not appeared in the curriculums of secondary and third level education since the *Estado Novo*, demanded the personal collaboration of specialists in the subject. In contrast, the somewhat speculative character of ‘well intentioned’ juvenile activism in relation to civic aspirations, but precarious in relation to the *scientific* foundations that should guide it, suggest that there was a need for vigilance.

In practice the two demands were satisfied by an informal initiation (in the sense of not being taught by official teachers), offered to potential disciples by names of weight in the local ‘folkloric’ debate, such as Ênio Freitas e Castro, Dante de Laytano, Manoelito de Ornellas and Walter Spalding. Through these authors in its initial years CEF carried out an intense and systematic exchange with the 35, offering assistance and prefaces to Barbosa Lessa and Paixão Côrtes, evaluating their research, loaning documents and intermediating with the government the transfer of museum collections to CTGs.

However, although it was assiduous, the interaction between *traditionalists* and erudite was not pacific. Despite the initial enthusiasm of some of the latter towards the ‘young devotees of Rio Grande,’ the majority of authors linked to CEF not only began to disagree with the emphasis given by the former to the old Gaúchos, but began to suspect that this Gaúcho never actually existed – at least not in the form portrayed in the *traditionalist* dances and parades. The manner of speaking loud in a manner incomprehensible to the man in the field, the luxury of the vestments – which not only included a scarf, *bombacha*

trousers and boots, but also work instruments, some of which were already unused such as the *boleadeiras*, as well as slingshots, ropes, spurs and other paraphernalia which hindered movement – reports about fights and shots being fired in the middle of traditionalist congresses fed by much alcoholic drink, all financed with public money – seemed absurd. The ‘false’ Gauchos in the CTGs not only remembered the ill-fated *caudilho*, who took so much time to be expelled from historiography, but also injured the somewhat aristocratic *ethos* of intellectuals, inspired by the reproduction of what they understood to be the cordiality of the Brazilian man.

As a result, shortly after a really ‘cordial’ beginning between ‘young apprentices’ and ‘masters’ experienced in intellectual activities, initially highly impressed with the civic valorization of their native land by the youth, then began to accuse the latter of imprecision, excesses and the *particularist exclusivism* defended by the former. From 1955 onwards in the interviews, articles and abstracts of the older scholars, declarations became common concerned with separating for the science of the general public the popularesque chaff from the folkloric wheat: “We should not confuse the civic worship of tradition with the scientific rigor of folkloric research. I am the first to applaud the creation of the ‘Centers of Gaucho Traditions’ but always within the rigorous discrimination of their necessary limits,” Meyer said to *Revista do Globo* in 1956.<sup>21</sup>

Érico Veríssimo, the most famous member of the prestigious group to whom Paixão Côrtes and Barbosa Lessa presented their first results in na Farsul, soon abandoned any possible sympathy he may have had for the movement. In an article entitled “Um romancista apresenta sua terra,” (A novelist presents his land), in refuting the “Spanishification of Rio Grande”, rejects the wide use of “*buenas, chê, a la fresca* and *quejantos* which have practically disappeared from the Portuguese of Rio Grande do Sul, now only being used by those who, bovaristically wanted to affirm their ‘festive Gauchism’.”<sup>22</sup> Dante de Laytano, who until then had during the elections of the patrons of the Porto Alegre CTG, manifested the harmony “of this agency [the Julio de Castilhos Museum], where the state itself maintained the cult of the history of the past” with the ‘35’, in correspondence exchanged in 1955 with friends in the higher echelons of CNFL, he referred to traditionalism as a ‘carnival mask’ and pejoratively to the CTGs as ‘dance societies.’<sup>23</sup>

Courage was really needed to position oneself against a movement which, emerging from the telluric excitement of secondary schools and the scouts – thus initially being seen as inoffensive, – was born sanctioned by proximity

with power and with the sympathy of multitudes. By opting for these, *traditionalism* immediately began to influence the state of forces reigning among the elites, causing disputes within the scholarly community. Being for or against the movement became a controversial question among the members of CEF. While Manoelito de Ornellas and Walter Spalding sustained alignment as the only form of ‘moral’ reins and the ‘cultural’ rigor of *traditionalism*, for Laytano it seemed better to avoid confusions by remaining quiet: “Nothing of speaking in a beehive, not evening of getting near...”<sup>24</sup>

In later publications, with the ‘commemorative wave’ over and its social representation confirmed by the sponsor of the media, the employee class and the government, the secretary of CEF, without expressing the same forcefulness, distinguished in complementary terms the folklorist, who is the ‘anonymous collector,’ from the cultivators of ‘neo-regional’ tradition:

Having overcome the natural impediments to novelties, the CTGs are at full strength and with this traditionalism can live and coexist with the contemporary world. Nevertheless, it has to be considered that the CTGs were the dynamic agents of the restoration of a neo-regionalism. Folklorists on the other hand are the subjective agents of scholarly investigation, classifying, analyzing and actually manufactured by the people. The two complement each other. (Laytano, 1981, p.144)

The root of this divergence, hidden in the complementarity highlighted by Laytano, in relation to the criteria of authenticity used in the two cases, can be sought in the crossed negotiations between the territorial and social identities (or professional) of the actors. In this sense it is worth highlighting the following: while the *traditionalists* authorized their statements through *coexistence*, presuming an organic identity with the bearers of what should be preserved (specifically the ‘Gaúcho *campeiro*’), the belletristic *ethos* linked to ‘scientific’ curiosity, sustained by the *polygraphs* of the previous generation, imposed as a duty of office of the allegoric function of the *typical* belletristic, the diversity of gentile *gaúchos* and the documented basis – in other words *authentic* – of the *historic Gaúcho*. While subjective adhesion mattered to the first group, through the *material reproduction* of *regionalism* by individuals converted to ‘*campeiro*’ style, in the second relations with the object of proselytism were indirect because the scientific legitimacy of discourses about folklore depends on the ‘professional’ integrity of the commentators.

On the other hand, at that moment the national leaders of CNFL sought to build on the same dichotomy the autonomy of their discipline, when they

tried to give theoretical density to the target of their analyses. Here the significant data is that the principle initially adopted, respecting the ‘anonymous’ and ‘traditional’ character of the ‘folkloric fact,’ hindered them from justifying as *folkloric* their own creations – this was the case of Darcy Azambuja, for example, who had built his reputation as a *regionalist* writer – and the almost always literary sources, dealt with as part of oral documentation (for example the works of Simões Lopes Neto and Antônio Chimango, based on ‘anonymous’ inspiration but whose authorship was known).

For this reason, and also to adapt the material to the presumed ‘unfinished’ nature of Brazilian social formation, at the I Brazilian Congress in 1951 ‘spontaneity’ and ‘collective acceptance’ were established as criteria for the validation of phenomenon, as well as their collection and ‘analysis’ (classification). However, the abandonment of ‘traditional’ material had two complicating effects. First, instead of bringing the discussions to an end, it resulted in contradictory resolutions on the part of the National Commission in relation to the convenience of encouraging public intervention in ‘popular’ cultural practices, taking into account the risk of their adulteration, or even the favoritism of some to the detriment of others. In second place it opened a breach for *traditionalism* to legitimate itself as if it were an ‘emerging folkloric’ fact, since the masses had been ‘spontaneously’ adhering to the habits and customs reinvented there, and because the authorship of many of these inventions was already ‘degraded’, so that the ‘collective acceptance’ of the movement was an uncontested fact.

Without entering into the theoretical discussion in any great depth, the *traditionalists* openly assumed their instrumental vision of the knowledge they used to create the spectacle they called the ‘folkloric project.’ Among them the concern common among ‘scientists’ appeared in an inverted form: this involved imposing, despite all the intellectual investment necessary for implementing the ‘restoration’ intentions of the movement, a *popular* and informal identity of those engaged. The *Carta de Princípios* (Letter of Principles) of Traditionalism, approved in the 1954 Congress, showed very well this logic of the appropriation of theories seen as scientific by identity based revivalism. In his justification of the objective of the movement, Barbosa Lessa was prodigious in his listing of assumptions extracted from what became known as the sociological bibliography of the Chicago School, citing two of the best known representatives of this school in Brazil – Donald Pierson (whose student he had been in ELSP) and Ralph Linton.<sup>25</sup> However, after these postulates about the importance of *local groups* as the transmitters of culture and the

means of social cohesion, the ideologue proclaimed his eminently anti-speculative nature, willing to act “within the collective conscience.” He stated that: “ Traditionalism has to be a clearly *popular* movement, not simply intellectual ... Traditionalism, which is a *movement*, should not be confused with Folklore, History, Sociology, etc. which are *sciences*.”<sup>26</sup>

While it may be true that the “idealization of the popular is so much easier when done in the form of a monologue,”<sup>27</sup> the use of this notion points to the competitive interaction between the mediating groups of culture, as well as becoming an instrument for the demarcation of identity by the agents who use it. Among the *traditionalists* the summary identification with the man of the countryside served as an argument to criticize the habits and inhabitants of the capital, pointing to the lack of ‘telluric commitment’ of intellectuals who complained about the ‘non-authenticity’ of the traditions the former had invented. Inversely to the well known names who were the ‘Globo’ authors on the commission’s list of members, the young *traditionalists* coming from the interior of the state did not aim to impose themselves on the intellectual ‘circles’ in the center of the country, but rather were only concerned with the state capital. Here the privileged interlocutors are the urban residents and intellectuals (most subject to the ‘desegregation of customs’), to whom they directed themselves as spokespersons of the countryside populations, elected guardians of tradition. While the members of CEF used to legitimate themselves evoking the inequality between the center and the periphery (since their relatively consecrated regional position was compensated by their isolation from the national scenario), the tension manipulated by the *traditionalists* intended to reverse the stigma of the *rude interiorano*, operating an internal declination of *regionalism*: country/city antagonism.

While according to the discourse of *scientific neutrality*, *traditionalism* sinned through ‘popularesque’ excesses, in the festive and heritage instrumentalization of folklore, the category *popular* represents, more than the object of study or the source of aesthetic inspiration, the agent directly responsible for the political sustenance of the movement – and for doctrinaire effects, for the ‘moral regeneration’ of a society corrupted by cosmopolitanism and progress. For the young traditionalist leaders, the investigations subsidized a celebrative practice committed to ‘returning’ the cultural heritage to the populations studied by *science*. Giving greater value to what was experienced than learned, and associating knowledge more with experience than with science, this ‘sub-intellectuality,’ which was not accepted in the more respectable ‘academic’ institutions, choose specific themes inherited from older



competitors to concretely perform everything which – in the eyes of the cultured *regionalist* tradition – embodied the Gaucho universe: rusticity, frankness, physical strength, courage and proximity to nature.

Under the cloak of atavisms inherited from a regional character created in the frontier struggles, the *traditionalist ethos* composed a vision of the world in which the use of firearms – another heavy criticism of the movement – physical fights, aggressive or eschatological words, far from being eccentric attitudes, reinforce the personal identity of individuals indentified as the Gauchos of yore. This aspect appeals to the real carnivalesque feeling of the movement, by now already transformed into an inversion ritual. The barbeques and dances held by the CTGs during congresses, inaugurations and *invernadas*, constituted a sacred space for *living* an ethic in which ‘natural’ impulses took the form of audacity and bravery. Even in the ‘work meetings’ of congresses – and to the contrary of the care with which the folklorists of CNFL sought to suppress the divergences that emerged on the floor – the rule was heated disputes, argumentation in verse, debauching the actual seriousness of the event.

Symptomatically, this antagonism between new and old ‘folklorists’ was reinforced to the extent that *traditionalism* acquired a political and social dimension previously unsuspected – which allowed it to establish itself as an ‘emerging folkloric fact’ and to form its own intellectuals. This passage was experienced by the older folklorists as a type of resurrection of the ‘dead’ mentioned by Certeau. The *traditionalist* festivities, incorporated both by ‘popular culture’ and the cultural industry, placed before them a not at all comforting ‘emerging folkloric fact.’ Because, concretely, this abstract entity, the ‘popular’, instead of serving as a safe-conduct for the updating of lettered production, carries within it the threat of the intellectual disqualification of that production. The dead do not speak, but the living-dead have spokespersons and what is most serious is that, having created a ‘lesser’ intellectuality within the metropolitan scenario, and being the most loquacious and the most heard, they began to claim scholarly authority – speaking to the other *Rio-Grandenses* and Brazilians in the name of the practitioners, but also the as the interpreters of *regionalism*.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Located in a *longue durée* perspective of the process of the construction of the practices and values associated with Southern cultural heterogeneity, the advent of the *traditionalist movement*, especially the creation of the first Center

of Gaucho Traditions in 1948, was distinguished as a new discursive and institutional mode of the so-called *gaucho regionalism*. In other words, as a mark of social diversification and the formal innovation of the uses of history in Rio Grande do Sul society. This event marked the modernization of previous forms of identity mediation in the Brazilian state. With its new celebratory rituals, it carried out the dramatization imperative of a common past which extended from academia and museums to social movements and the media, becoming part of a process of the progressive assumption of local memory by heritage.

In the conjuncture of the crisis in which this happened, the re-founding of the *regional* eschatological repertoire is submitted to the primacy of experience. This subordination was justified by *traditionalist* leaders as a necessary engineering to overcome the general state of anomie or – to use an expression from the time – the ‘social desegregation’ caused by the ongoing processes of modernization. The challenge highlighted here is the *cultural de-characterization* associated with the economic decadence of the civilizatory habitat of the Gaucho (the *campanha* zone on the southern frontier of the state) and the growth of the rural exodus – simultaneously to the political and numerical rise of descendents of European immigrants which seemed to threaten the permanence of *autochthon* traditions.

Although they were all subject to the pressures of the epoch, the protagonists of this process of the *aggiornamento* of Rio Grande do Sul regionalism, holding unequal prerogatives of authority and prestige, mobilized distinct criteria and resources to format *regional* classifications and their semantic derivatives (*Gauchism, regionalism, traditionalism*) in relation to their own visions of the world and purposes. Clarifying the meanings of these notions, especially in the discourses which repeatedly try to distinguish between one mobilization and another, requires taking into account the interlocutions sustained by the enunciators, according to the respective positions in the cultural production scenario – in summary, this involves investigating the logic through which the groups self-define themselves in complementary and at times conflicting terms.

In fact, the updating of the paradigmatic models of interpretation of *regional character* were being produced, as always happens, in a field of possibilities subject to advances and retreats, according to the actual conditions of the moment and the space in which the actors circulated. Their preparation supposed, therefore, both calculation and improvising, both the strategic search for institutional channels to make this feasible, and tactical alliances,

based on interaction with other agents and intellectual projects at play and in conflict. The initial aspect to be considered is related once again to the polysemy assumed by folklore, to the extent that the category comes to play a central role in the understanding that cultural producers have of themselves, of their time, their society and the otherness it contains. It is precisely at this point, in which the subject figures as the link common to the two generations of mediator, that it is worth asking about the meanings attached to the construct which folklorists frequently resorted to claim the legitimacy of their discourses: the *people*.

The different forms assumed by the analogy between *people* and *territory* appears to be the discursive key that specifies the relations of strength between *scientific* folklore brought by ‘historical sociology’ or ‘social history’ – and claimed by a generation of cosmopolitan authors who, praised in Rio Grande do Sul, wanted to be respected in Brazil – and *revivalist* folklore spread in the capital by youths from the interior of the state, ideologues of a legion of ‘anonymous practitioners.’ Without discarding previous forms of erudition, they proposed the unprecedented imperative of a present sensitive to the past in social life. (Fabre, 2001, p.31). This present, in turn, is capable of introducing new habits which ended up installing their own celebration and their founding heroes on the pedestal of *regional* memory.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This article is a revised version of the final chapter of the doctoral dissertation *Um passado novo para uma história em crise: regionalismo e folcloristas no Rio Grande do Sul (1948-1965)*, presented to PPG, História, UnB, in 2005. The research received support from CNPq.

<sup>2</sup> “Without understanding the manner in which these three identities – that of the folklorist, that of ‘folkloric phenomena’ and that of the nation– are linked, we will not understand the development of the institutional struggle undertaken by the folklore movement and the results it achieved.” (VILHENA, L. R. *Projeto e Missão: o Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro (1947-1964)*. Rio de Janeiro: Funarte; FGV, 1997. p.126).

<sup>3</sup> ALMEIDA, Renato. *Inteligência do folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: Livros de Portugal, 1957. p.9.

<sup>4</sup> The Centers of Gaucho Tradition, known as CTGs, are non-profit making civil society organizations which function as clubs with unlimited members in the cultural area, in other words they do not allow any explicit political or religious affiliation. The themes evoked in their designations obey the Gaucho symbology, giving expression to values, language, gastronomy, landscape, emblematic animals and other typical motives of Rio

Grande do Sul. 'Pala Branco,' 'Quero-quero,' 'Mate-amargo,' 'Rincão da Lealdade,' 'Desgarrados do Pago' (name of a CTG in Rio de Janeiro), and 'Armada Grande' are examples of the nomenclature used. Independent of the variations in profile between more inclusive and more elitist centers, all these bodies valued historical erudition, literature and folklore studies to obtain from them the dances and allegories which composed their 'cultural *invernadas*,' *fandangos*,' 'festive *chimarrões*,' 'rondas', parades and 'rodeos', amongst other forms of the ritual staging of the habits of the countryside called '*campeiros*'. In relation to CTGs, see MACIEL, Maria Eunice de Souza. *Bailões, é disto que o povo gosta: análise de uma prática cultural de classes populares no Rio Grande do Sul*. Thesis (Masters in Social Anthropology) – Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre, 1984; OLIVEN, Ruben George. *A parte e o todo: a diversidade cultural no Brasil-nação*. Petrópolis (RJ): Vozes, 1992.

<sup>5</sup> He was referring to the historians Walter Spalding and Othelo Rosa, the musicologists Elpídio Ferreira Paes and Ênio Freitas e Castro; the architect and sculptor Fernando Corona; the art critic Aldo Obino, the writers, literary critics and historians Moysés Vellinho, Guilhermino César, Col. Luiz Carlos de Moraes, Manoelito de Ornellas, Athos Damasceno Ferreira, the successor of Alcides Maya in *regionalista* short stores, Darcy Azambuja, and the Gaucho novelist with the greatest national projection, the "writer of multitudes," Érico Veríssimo. LAYTANO, Dante de. *Folclore do Rio Grande do Sul: levantamento dos costumes e tradições gaúchas*. Caxias do Sul (RS): Educus, 1987. p.146.

<sup>6</sup> Of CNFL's *Documentos* series 47.7% came from state commissions. Among these the CEF of Rio Grande do Sul was responsible for 10.5% of the total articles published, after São Paulo (26%) and Bahia (35%). Cf. VILHENA, 1997, p.303. Some of the better organized state commissions, such as São Paulo, Espírito Santo, Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul published their own periodicals, such as the quarterly *Folclore* and the annals of the Rio Grande do Sul CEF, though the latter was published irregularly.

<sup>7</sup> LAYTANO, citado em VILHENA, 1997, p.250.

<sup>8</sup> CORADINI, Odaci Luiz. As missões da 'cultura' e da 'política': confrontos e reconversões de elites culturais e políticas no Rio Grande do Sul (1920-1960). *Estudos Históricos*, Rio de Janeiro, n.32, p.125-144, 2003.

<sup>9</sup> LAYTANO, D. *O linguajar do gaúcho brasileiro*. Porto Alegre: Escola Superior de Teologia São Lourenço de Brindes, 1981. p.231.

<sup>10</sup> The expression is from Jean Pierre Rioux. La mémoire collective. In: RIOUX, J. P.; SIRINELLI, J. F. *Pour une histoire culturelle*. Paris: Seuil, 1997. p.235-253.

<sup>11</sup> LESSA, Luís Carlos B. Trinta e Cinco. *Revista do Globo*, Porto Alegre, n.471, p.37-39; 74-75, 20 nov. 1948.

<sup>12</sup> As a result the founders chose where the 35 would be based. At this time it had been transferred from the houses of Paixão Côrtes and Cyro D. Ferreira, on Rua Sarmiento Leite, and the basement of the residence of the PSD senator Carlos Alfredo Simch (father of José Laerte Simch, one of Julinho' students), to the offices of the Rural Federation of Rio Grande

do Sul (Farsul). Cyro Dutra Ferreira, son of one of the founders worked in Farsul as an attendant and reports how the 35 moved in the representative agency for livestock raisers in the state: the “Movement, which began humbly and discreetly within the Júlio de Castilhos State School... the urgent search for a place that was bigger and more dignified became an urgent necessity, since the Saturday afternoon meetings were frequented by more than 50 people. At this time Farsul was asked. Since I was an employee there (1942-1950), and my father, Normélio G. C. Ferreira (the founder in 1927) was the secretary general, I asked my much missed old man to ask the then president, the *Alegretense* from Guassu-Boi and extraordinary *Rio-Grandense* Pedro Olympio Pires, for a small room on the terrace and the ballroom for our Saturday meetings” Cf. FERREIRA, Cyro Dutra. A Farsul e o Movimento Tradicionalista Gaúcho. *Sul Rural*, n.209, jan. 2001 [online]. Available at: [www.senarrs.com.br/SulRural/E209Janeiro2001/Artigo/SulRuralA05.htm](http://www.senarrs.com.br/SulRural/E209Janeiro2001/Artigo/SulRuralA05.htm). Accessed on 20 Nov. 2002. Other versions of this history can be found in FERREIRA, Cyro Dutra. 35 CTG. O pioneiro do Movimento Tradicionalista Gaúcho – MTG. Porto Alegre: Martins Livreiro, 1987, p.55-56.

<sup>13</sup> The Foundational Act of 35 was signed on 24 April 1948 by: Glaucus Saraiva da Fonseca, Luís Carlos Barbosa Lessa, Antônio Cândido da Silva Neto, Francisco Gomes de Oliveira, Luiz Osório Chagas, Carlos Raphael Godinho Corrêa, Dirceu Tito Lopes, Valdomiro Souza, Hélio José Moro Mariante, Luis Carlos C. da Silva, Hélio Gomes Leal, José Simch, Ney Borges, Guilherme F. da Cunha Corrêa, Wilmar Winck de Souza, Paulo Godinho Corrêa, Paulo Caminha, Robes Pinto da Silva, Venerando Vargas da Silveira, Flávio Silveira Dann, João Emílio Marroni Dutra, Valdez Correa, Flávio Ramos, J. C. Paixão Côrtes. In a revision of the statutes, these were joined as founders by the participants in the so-called ‘*Piquete da Tradição*’ (Picket of Tradition), a guard of riders who had accompanied the remains of David Canabarro in September 1947.

<sup>14</sup> ‘*Prenda*’ was the word chosen to designate the traditionalist woman, because ‘*china*’, the companion of the old Gaucho, was a synonym of prostitute. The terminology obeyed similar criteria to those of ‘*pilcha*’, used to nominate the typical costume. The two terms are related to something of value – in the first case money and in the second a prize or reward. It is interesting to note that the dances and accessories related to women were designed after a trip of the youths to Montevideo in 1949, when they watched pair dancing, though it was better prepared when the ‘Festa no Galpão’ was held – the Gaucho part of the folklore festival organized by CEF in 1950, during the III National Folklore Week. In this land the founders of the 35 stated forcefully that the stylization was necessary due to perennial female submission to fashion, which had prevented them from keeping any traditional costume. Glaucus Saraiva, in his *Manual Tradicionalista*, stated that the “Gaucho woman does not have and never had her own clothes... It is nothing other than a convention to give the ‘*prendas*’ typical clothing which they do not know how to use through our sociological education, and this is for a very simple reason: the universal vanity of women who always seek to follow ‘fashion’ wherever it may go” (SARAIVA, Glaucus Fonseca. *Manual do Tradicionalista: orientação geral para tradicionalistas e Centros de Tradições Gaúchas*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, s.d., p.57-58. In relation to this and other traditions invented by

traditionalists, see OLIVEN, R. O maior movimento de Cultura Popular do Mundo Ocidental: o tradicionalismo gaúcho. *Cadernos de Antropologia*, Porto Alegre, n.1, p.22-26, 1990; and MACIEL, M. E. A atualização do Passado. In: FELIX, L. O.; RECKZIEGEL, A. L. S. *RS: 200 Anos: definindo espaços na história nacional*. Passo Fundo (RS): UPF, 2002. p.202-203.

<sup>15</sup> Kozeritz would include in the *Quadrinhas Populares* series published by *Deutsche Zeitung*, the famous song *Prenda Minha*.

<sup>16</sup> The book, published in 1935, was a literary transposition of the play written by Felix Contreras Rodrigues for the festivities of the Farroupilha Centenary. In the book there appeared scores for the folkloric rhythms known as *caranguejo* and *chimarrita*, which had been staged. Looking for the choreography, absent from the book, Paixão Côrtes and Barbosa Lessa decided to meet the author of the play on his ranch in Bagé. Beforehand they contacted Ary Veríssimo Simões Pires, one of the authors, and discovered that what had been danced on stage had not been the songs from the book, but a large *tirana*. To the deception of the youths, “when he described to us his figures – promenade, *caminho da roça*, *ramallete de damas*, *faz-traz* – we realized that the great *tirana* was nothing other than a small *quadrilha* (square dance).” This case portrays the two principal difficulties which marked the mounting of a ‘typically Rio Grande’ musical and chorographical repertoire by the 35. The first referred to the ‘lack of originality’ of the old dances are reported by local scholars, which prevented their exhibition as something that reflected the Gaucho and differentiated him from the *caipira* or the *sertanejo*. The other complication is that when following the tracks of the sources used before by maestros and literati interested in folklore, it was hard to find a choreographic description to accompany the score. For this reason, the boys decided to copy the music composed or collected by some, with choreographic steps invented or documented by others. For example, the choreography of a *chimarrita* ‘collected’ by Tony Petzhold with the score of *Os amores do Capitão Centeno*. Later their going to the countryside through the interior cities of the state would increase the repertoire invented by Lessa, Saraiva and Côrtes.

<sup>17</sup> CÔRTEZ, J. C. P.; LESSA, L. C. B. *Danças e andanças da tradição gaúcha*. Porto Alegre: Garatuja, 1975. p.11-12.

<sup>18</sup> In Porto Alegre there was the *Grêmio Gaúcho*, an association which predated the CTGs but came to adopt the 35 standard. The other existing center was led by members of the *Brigada Militar*, the Farrapos club. In addition there were centers linked to schools, such as the Cultural Department of Julio de Castilhos College and the students of Rosário College, and recreational groups such as Glória Tennis Club (close to the residence of Walter Spalding), where the ‘*Estância da Amizade*’ was based. In the interior of the state the CTGs founded in the first two years following the creation of the 35 were ‘Fogão Gaúcho’ from Taquara; ‘Minuano’ from Iraí, ‘35’ from Palmeira das Missões and ‘União Gaúcha Simões Lopes Neto’ from Pelotas, re-founded in a traditionalist mold.

<sup>19</sup> PRATES, Gilberto Antônio da Silva. “As três fases do movimento tradicionalista gaúcho”.

Thesis presented by CTG 'Mello Manso', Cruz Alta, ao III CONGRESSO TRADICIONALISTA DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL). In: CLUBE FARROUPILHA, Ijuí, *Anais...*, 1956, p.31.

<sup>20</sup> A synthesis applied to the specialization of scholars linked to the production of foreign shows in the interior of France. FABRE, Daniel. L'histoire a changé de lieux. In: BENSA, Alban; FABRE, Daniel. *Une histoire à soi: figurations du passé et localités*. Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 2001. p.13-41. p.32.

<sup>21</sup> Cited in MEYER, Irene. Augusto Meyer e a cultura rio-grandense. Entrevista. *Revista do Globo*, Porto Alegre, n.678, p.22 e 25, dez. 1956. p.22.

<sup>22</sup> VERISSIMO, Erico. Um romancista apresenta sua terra. In: \_\_\_\_\_. et al. *Rio Grande do Sul: terra e povo*. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1969 [1964]. p.3-14.

<sup>23</sup> AMJC, CE 1955, v2, AP 1034, Of. 541 s.d., de Dante de Laytano a Renato Almeida.

<sup>24</sup> AMJC, CE 1955, v.2, AP1034. Of. 541 s.d., de Dante de Laytano a Renato Almeida.

<sup>25</sup> In relation to the experience of Barbosa Lessa in ELSP and the role of traditionalism in the vulgarization of concepts taken from American anthropology at the turn of the century, see OLIVEN, 1992, p.81 *passim*. In relation to ELSP, see BOMENY, 2000; KANTOR et al., 2001; MAIO; VILLAS-BOAS, 1999; and CARVALHO, 1987.

<sup>26</sup> LESSA, L. C. B. O sentido e o valor do tradicionalismo. *Província de São Pedro*, Porto Alegre, v.10, n.20, p.133-138, dez. 1954. p.137, original emphasis.

<sup>27</sup> CERTEAU, Michel de. A beleza do morto. In: \_\_\_\_\_. *A cultura no plural*. São Paulo: Papyrus, 1995, p.55-86. p.59.