

ETHNIC GROUPS AND CULTURE

In a very penetrating paper on “The Concept of Jewish Culture,” presented to the World Congress of Sociologists held in Zurich in 1950, Professor Henrik F. Infield pointed out that “some people born in one culture may find attractive the offerings of another culture.” Men born into some European cultures have for centuries experienced a special attraction not only toward tropical cultures but also toward tropical existence, life, and nature, with tropical women subsumed in nature and culture.

For a considerable number of Europeans through successive generations, the tropics, as represented by these values, have meant a sort of messianic condition in existential terms. Living in the tropics, however—and living there permanently and not as transient adventurers—has not meant for some of these Europeans surrender to a non-European environment or culture of all the values taken by them to the tropics as part of their sometimes Christocentric rather than ethnocentric culture. Most of them have rather become residents of the tropics without losing entirely their European or Christian “consciousness of kind.” They have thus contributed to make tropical populations, with whom they have

Ethnic Groups and Culture

associated closely and intimately, acquire some of their European and Christian memories, sentiments, and attitudes and to share their experience and history, just as they, Christians and Europeans, have assimilated much from tropical populations through intermarriage and other intimate contacts through a mutually interpenetrative process. This mutuality has been attained without a complete loss of the "original cultural identity"—as a sociologist would say—either on the European or Christian side or on the tropical or non-European side. This explains why a modern Brazilian—a typical product of this sort of symbiosis—may feel, as so many do, that his historical past is primarily European, Latin, Hispanic, and Christian, without, on the other hand, repudiating an anthropological past that binds him to the tropical environment of Brazil and of America and even, to a certain extent, to that of Asia and Africa.

There was a Brazilian sugar planter, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, who was famous for his aristocratic manners and his hospitality. A descendant of a Dutchman, Gaspar van der Lei, who established himself as a planter in Brazil in the early part of the seventeenth century, he belonged to one of the most endogamic white families of North Brazil: the Wanderleys. But he took a special pride in considering himself a *caboclo* (descendant of Amerindians) and in demonstrating how telluric a Brazilian or a man of the tropics he was by repudiating European food and drink to eat manioc flower and to drink cashew wine with the utmost pleasure, and by preferring a good hammock of Amerindian style to the best European bed. He was, however, a patriarch in the best Portuguese-Christian tradition, who had been famous for his kindness toward his black slaves and for his care in assimilating them to a Christian and European civilization.

On the other hand, a well-known case in Brazil is that of a man whose mother was an African slave but who became a distinguished journalist and public speaker (one of the best orators of his time) at the end of the nineteenth century. This man, almost totally black, is reported to have said quite naturally in the course of a speech that he spoke as "a member of the Latin race." He felt so; there was no scandal about it, for everybody in his audience understood that he was a product of the Portuguese interpenetrative process, both biological and sociological, and that he might even be more Latin than the pure Caucasian Brazilians who had not made an intensive study of the Roman classics such as he had done, thanks to his brilliant mastery, through intelligence

and literary talent, of the memories, history, sentiments, attitudes, and characteristics of the Romans and of the new Latin peoples, and consequently of a Latin ethnocentric civilization, if not actual race.

His case perhaps would be ridiculous outside Brazil—in the United States, for instance. But it was perfectly natural in Brazil just as it would be perfectly natural in modern Goa—whose political problem in relation to Portugal or to the Indian Union does not concern me here—to have an Indo-Portuguese intellectual, of pure or almost pure Asian race, consider himself a member of the Latin civilization, if not of the Latin race. When M. André Siegfried addressed, a few months before I did, a distinguished Indo-Portuguese audience in Goa, he had the impression of being among Latins, just as I had the impression of being among Brazilians. Indeed, it was in Goa that I perceived how clear a reality is the civilization developed by the Portuguese in the Asian as well as in the African and American tropics as a product of a symbiotic process in the survival of European and Christian decisive values, made possible by the relative—not absolute—surrender of the Portuguese to tropical influence and conditions that other Europeans have refused to accept or to assimilate. Marriage with tropical women is one of them. Another is the tendency to adopt essential, and not only picturesque and superficial, tropical styles of living, food, and dress. For biocultural mutuality is only possible through this exchange of intimate, essential, existential values that has made it desirable for some tropical peoples or hybrids of European and tropical races to adopt from the Europeans the values that may be considered decisive from the point of view of the definition of their sociocultural situation as an extension and a variant, with creative possibilities, of a sociologically Christian civilization. This they do rather than set up a passive, imitative, static sub-European situation or an anti-European situation characterized by the desire of reversion of the European part of the population to a purely tropical or non-European culture or civilization. This seems to explain why the modern anti-European, and not merely anti-capitalistic, Chinese nation is becoming the really messianic nation for certain Asian populations whose predominant attitude toward Europe is at present one of rejection of European values, said to be imperialistic: an attitude that seems to include Communist Russia among the European imperialistic powers.

The objection has been made by some critics that the success of the interpenetration process characteristic of the relation of some Europeans

Ethnic Groups and Culture

with non-European peoples has depended largely, if not entirely, upon a sort of paternalistic system followed by the same Europeans. If it is so—some of these critics say—it is an archaic system, for modern men are everywhere hostile to paternalism.

It seems to be a fact that most of the European success in building a new type of civilization in the tropics, through a symbiotic process, has depended upon a paternalistic system of assimilation of tropical values—human, natural, and cultural—not through the state or the church but through a patriarchal family organization, such as the one developed by the Portuguese in the tropics. This organization has taken, since the fifteenth century, so important a part in the colonization of tropical areas and has contributed so effectively, by the adoption of tropical children by Christian families and by the growth of the Portuguese population through polygamous activities of some of the Portuguese heads of large families necessary to so immense a task as the one assumed by that European people during the sixteenth and part of the seventeenth century. This immense task was the one of establishing themselves in so many parts of the tropical world, aiming to Christianize and, to a certain extent, Europeanize numerous non-European and non-Christian populations.

In his paper on Jewish culture Professor Infield refers to aspects of the specific problem he dealt with that are also aspects of the subject I am trying to discuss here—the concept of a transnational culture whose vitality in tropical areas (the result of a symbiotic process of interpenetration of European and tropical values) is a Portuguese achievement effected more through a family patriarchal system than through a state, economic, or church organization. Crucial questions could be formulated in relation to this culture, just as they are being formulated on the problem of a Jewish culture outside of Israel, or of an Arabic culture, or of the Hispanic culture in general, as it is developing or being preserved in America. As in the case of these other transnational but coherent cultures, one may ask, in relation to a Portuguese-tropical culture such as the one that has made Brazil, Portugal, and Portuguese provinces or colonies in the East and in Africa live for centuries a similar and continuous group existence—as if they were all situated in the same area, as part of the same system, and under the same ecological and sociological influences—what common causes, besides common memories, sentiments, attitudes, give this binational culture its coherence? Questions such as these require answers based on something more than

“statistical compilation” or “conventional community studies,” indispensable as such undertakings might be at a preliminary stage. What is needed, Professor Infield suggests, is “an approach oriented by theory which lends itself to empirical verification.” If possible, this theory should be capable of yielding “objective methods of fact-finding.” In short, a sound scientific procedure is called for, which, as far as the social sciences are concerned, is still largely indicative of their level of “aspiration” rather than “achievement.”

Though one is inclined to agree with Professor Infield that what is probably the most significant attempt to close this gap between aspiration and achievement has been made, to some extent, in connection with problems of Jewish group existence, the fact is that the problems of Portuguese-tropical group existence in different parts of the world, although less dramatic, are not less significant as a challenge to social scientists to study group existence as a transnational and not merely national or subnational phenomenon. For this analysis the studies of Kurt Lewin may furnish students of the latter situation with useful methods on group dynamics, intergroup conflicts, and group participation, based on the central concept of considering the group to be studied as a sociological whole with dynamic properties of its own, such as organization, stability, and goals. One does not have to go so far as to accept Lewin's idea that such interrelations may always be described in scientific and even mathematical terms, through what he calls “topology” or the geometry of social relations, based on the relationship between part and whole or the concept of “being-included-in.” Nor must one believe that it will always be possible to determine in a geometrically precise manner the position, direction, and distance, within the life-space, even in such cases where the position of the person and the direction of his actions are not physical, but social, in nature, to see in Lewin's methodological contribution a tool that may be applied to the comparative study of subgroup behavior within the large Portuguese-tropical group in such a manner as to detect what, in this aspect of behavior, and in the interpenetrative process characteristic of most of it, accounts for the fact that the same Portuguese-tropical group continues to be paternalistic or authoritarian—though, at the same time, democratic—in contrast with *laissez faire* methods. For it is known that Lewin's technique has been applied to the study of both authoritarian and *laissez faire* group atmospheres. Though its further systematic advance is considered to be necessary and even essential, incomplete as it is, Lewin's theory seems to be

Ethnic Groups and Culture

a valuable tool for social anthropologists and sociologists. It is a tool particularly useful for the study of the Portuguese-tropical group and the common goals and interrelationships—paternalism included—that have characterized and continue, to a certain extent, to characterize its social existence apart from others which exist in tropical areas where the European presence has been prominent through different forms of imperial dominance—imperial and authoritarian without authoritarianism of a family which has its force mitigated, as among the Portuguese, by an opposite but equally persistent tendency toward ethnic democracy through both cultural reciprocity and biological miscegenation.

Through this and more subtle methods of research it may be possible to ascertain what, in the Portuguese-tropical group, as well as in other European-tropical groups of a similar type, gives a coherent sense to the aggregate of acquired meanings attached to and implemented, as Professor Infield specifies, “in material and non-material objects which decisively influence the manner in which human beings tend toward interest so as to satisfy their needs.” Based on this, sociologists have asked if Jews have needs that can be satisfied best by specifically Jewish meanings and group existence, just as other anthropologists and sociologists may ask if members of the Portuguese-tropical group have now, after more than four centuries of symbiotic interrelationship between the Portuguese and tropical native and tropical cultures, needs that can be satisfied better than in any other way by specifically Portuguese-tropical meanings and group existence.

To answer this question in anthropological or sociological terms, one would have to admit, as modern sociologists and anthropologists do, that every cultural system is always a set of patterns for dealing with a given situation in the interests of the population which it serves. In these situations, as Professor John Gillin suggests in his essay on “The Principle of Compatibility,” we can distinguish “different types of components.” These general components of cultural situations may be described, he says (and his views represent an important body of modern sociological theory based on anthropological research), as (1) the human component, (2) the environmental component, (3) the social component, and (4) the not invariably present foreign cultural component. The principle governing the adjustment of these components would be that of compatibility, according to which a cultural system is compatible with its situation, or any component elements of it, to the degree that the performance of the system has the effect of maintaining the integrity and functional capacities of the social group practicing the system.

The human component of a situation should be an element ecologically compatible with its environment. And here we would have to admit, as Professor Gillin and other anthropologists and sociologists point out, that certain genetic groups are better adapted organically to certain environments than others, this seeming to be “clearest”—according to anthropologists who have studied the subject—with respect to the advantage apparently enjoyed by Negroids over other races in the ability to adapt organically to wet tropical environments. It is also significant from the point of view of compatibility as the basis of cultural systems adapted to situations that Negroes also seem to have greater inherited resistance to malignant malaria than do whites. This would be the chief explanation for the fact that, despite customs and artifacts compensating for their lack of organic resistance to the wet tropical environment, such as sun helmets and restricted hours of labor in heavy sunlight, the whites on the whole have not shown much success in establishing permanent, stable settlements in the low wet tropics, as A. Grenfell Price, considering the subject “as a matter of history,” admits in his *White Settlers in the Tropics* (New York: American Geographical Society, 1939).

We would have also to admit that the tropical environment itself lays specific conditions upon the development of culture, European or non-European. Though man is now able to produce artificial cool climates with air-conditioning, these cultural alterations are themselves, as Professor Gillin reminds us, “adjustments to the natural environment, even though they modify it or partially remake it.”

The social component of a situation is a result mainly of the size and spatial distribution of population, both affecting the interaction between the members of a group, their mobility in space, their cultural patterns, the form or type of the family organization, kinship constellations being a basic factor in the social component of any cultural situation.

Another component of a situation remains to be considered according to the so-called principle of compatibility: the foreign cultural component. This is a factor that has become increasingly important with the development in frequency and volume of communication between societies and between regions. This development is a phenomenon that has become prominent during the last four centuries: exactly the period during which the establishment and development of a Portuguese-tropical civilization has taken place, using in behalf of its members in tropical or semitropical territory a number of values, customs, and techniques taken from other non-tropical civilizations besides the European: the Chinese, for instance.

Ethnic Groups and Culture

It is evident that the Portuguese-tropical civilization, now spread over Asian, African, and American territory with a more symbiotic character than any other European civilization in similar territories, owes its development, as a civilization apart from other modern civilizations (though not considered important enough by Professor Arnold Toynbee to deserve special mention in his now famous classification), to the fact that there has been compatibility between its decisive human element, the European, and the situation that has been met by this civilization as a specific answer to a challenge, the tropical situation. The compatibility, in this specific case, has been between this human element, the Portuguese, and the human element found by the Portuguese in the tropical spaces where a new civilization has successfully developed during the last four centuries; between the Portuguese, a European element penetrated by Moorish, Jewish, and, to a less extent and only in certain areas of the population, by African Negro blood, and the tropical physical environment, climate included; between this human element, the Portuguese and the hybrids of Portuguese and tropical combination, and non-European and non-tropical civilizations, like the Chinese, from whose wealth of techniques and customs a number of values were taken by the Portuguese and by their descendants, established in the tropics, and were adapted to tropical conditions. This is what happened, for instance, with the Chinese tile and style of roof, used widely in Brazilian architecture with considerable advantage from an ecological point of view. The tendency to assimilate values and suggestions from various origins and adapt them to a tropical situation seems to explain why modern Brazilian architecture is successfully continuing the tradition of Portuguese architecture in the tropics, as a building technique whose technicians and artists have had the courage to combine European skills with the specific needs of a civilization that has become extra-European without acquiring any anti-European bias, but, on the contrary, insisting on maintaining European values and in adapting them to new conditions. This is perhaps the main characteristic of the Portuguese-tropical civilization in every respect, including race relations.

Nothing is sociologically more significant in this civilization than the fact that the Brazilian Negro, for instance, does not think of himself as primarily a Negro—like the American Negro of the United States—but as Brazilian. The fact that this consciousness of kind has been developed in a part of the Brazilian population under an assimilative system that even today shows in Brazil a few paternalistic survivals (survivals that remain prominent in Portuguese Africa) seems to show—to come back

to this point—that authoritarian or paternalistic methods within the family relations have not meant the exclusion of the elements thus assimilated to a community predominantly Christian and European in its cultural patterns, nor have they nourished the conviction, in regard to the Africans, of inferiority and of not-belonging to the Portuguese-tropical group except as servants and manual workers. The fact that, in Brazil, descendants of non-European elements consider themselves primarily Brazilian and observe only secondarily their non-European ethnic origin or condition makes it difficult for race prejudice to attain in Brazil or in the Portuguese East or in Portuguese Africa the importance that it has reached in other tropical areas where the European presence has made itself felt through the so-called color bar.

If the basic principle in a program for race and class harmony is, as Dr. Henry C. Link suggests in his book, *The Rediscovery of Morals with Special Reference to Race and Class Conflict* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1947), that primary emphasis should be placed on people as human beings, the nearest approach to this program has been for centuries the Portuguese policy in the tropics and in relation to tropical populations, so far as the neglect of race is concerned. This, I repeat, despite paternalism and paternalistic survivals among the Portuguese that may sometimes contribute to aggressive attitudes on the part of some of the non-European or non-Christian elements in relation to or against the European or Christian ones. A psychological consideration of the problem, however, seems to indicate that a moderate paternalism has been necessary in the relations of Europeans with non-Europeans when these non-Europeans have been peoples of a primitive, or little more than a primitive, culture.

In connection with this point, I might recall here that when, at a conference of social scientists held in Paris in 1948, I referred to excessive paternalism as a source or cause of aggressive attitudes, one of the greatest European authorities on the subject, Professor Horkheimer, commented that, while this is the general tendency,

important though it is to eliminate authoritarian methods from home and school, we should carefully avoid evoking in the child and the adolescent an irrational longing for authority because of an unwarranted lack of it in education. . . . The declining economic position of the middle classes, a direct factor in the history of European fascism, also exercised an indirect influence through the degradation of the father and, in consequence, the teacher in the eyes of children. They lost the acquiring of a love for cultural ideas through identification with an admired person. Instead, they developed a readiness to succumb to hateful leaders and philosophies.

Ethnic Groups and Culture

And his conclusion was that the inability to perceive authority in this first and positive connotation, an inability which is one aspect of the loss of genuine experience and its replacement by a stereotype in modern man, contributes as much to authoritarianism as to authoritarian methods themselves. Therefore, we must avoid the acceptance of an artificial, ideological form of equality, the fear of authority, and develop instead "the disposition to look for and recognize authority when it appears in its rational form." Professor Horkheimer further agreed with me that the combination of "caudillism" and "liberation movements" in economically and technically backward countries is one of the most confusing political aspects of our time.

The need to perceive authority in its first and positive connotation, in connection with an assimilative process, seems to be a need as much of culturally primitive and semiprimitive populations in their phase of transition to civilized culture as of children within civilized societies such as the European. In this phase primitive peoples have the same need as do children of opportunities for acquiring a love for civilized values through an identification of these values with an admired person. For centuries the Portuguese system of assimilation of non-European and non-Christian populations to the Iberian and Catholic sociological forms of civilization and Christianity has been based on this identification of civilized and Christian values with persons whom those populations have had a tendency or a disposition to love: the father and the mother of family organizations to which the non-Europeans have become attached, after their baptism as Christians, as sociological sons of these two types of protectors; or the padre or missionary and teacher. The lack of authority as represented by a sociological father or mother, or by the padre, may leave the African or the primitive, in relation to a European or a Christian civilization, in the same condition as European or Euro-American adolescents who develop an irrational longing for authority because of an unwarranted lack of it in education and in assimilation.

In a book—*The Strength of Nations: A Study of Social Theory* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1942)—that attempts to illuminate some of the modern problems of economics and politics by the recent advances in the knowledge of psychology and psychiatry, George Soule writes that modern psychology would agree that unmitigated parental authority is hampering to the child and that the latter must in some way achieve a responsible independence: "child" in this connotation meaning the so-

ciological child as well as the biological one, and “father,” the father-image. But modern psychology would not agree, he points out, that the best way to achieve this end would be “for the sons to murder the father—either in fact or symbolically. If they do, they are likely to create strong superegos in the father’s image.” More than this, “their bondage to irrational forces will be redoubled,” and “psychological infantilisms” may become “full fledged social neuroses,” as they have become not only in half-primitive, half-civilized societies, like some in South America, when deprived of paternalistic leadership, but also in fully European and civilized Euro-American societies that, in critical moments of their national life, have felt the need of some father-image who would symbolize their longing for security or their fear of losing security. It is probably not absurd to say that even Franklin D. Roosevelt was for some time this father-image for millions of his fellow countrymen and that he corresponded well to his semipaternalistic, semifraternalistic role, never indulging in morbid exaggeration of it, such as may and has happened among the Portuguese-tropical group, although only exceptionally and certainly not as a rule. Monarchy in Brazil, for instance, was a sort of sublimation of a longing for security on the part of Brazilians who were used, through their colonial experience, to the patriarchal forms of family life. But this type of government gave to Brazil a political and social experience of security and freedom in a legalistic atmosphere that was probably the best experience of this kind ever enjoyed by any Latin-American community, or in any modern tropical community characterized by a predominance of European over non-European styles and values of civilization.

Here we pass from ecology, anthropology, and sociology to history and to political history through social history. This seems to be inevitable in the analysis of a group or a culture like the Portuguese or any other European people that has achieved integration in a tropical milieu, and whose past is at once historical—in the conventional sense—and ethnological or anthropological, as a group or a culture that is a combination of civilized and primitive elements. This is the case not only for Brazil but for Cuba, Venezuela, Peru, Paraguay, Angola, Moçambique, and Cape Verde. For a long time the mistake was made by historians and sociologists of dealing with the past or the social structure of a very complex whole, as, for example, the Brazilian, as if it were a purely historical past or a purely civilized structure, with a few ethnographic problems here and there that would not fit into such

Ethnic Groups and Culture

schemes but were not considered important or significant enough to be taken into consideration in the main analysis and interpretation of that complex reality.

It is only recently that attempts have been made, or are being made—especially in Brazil and as a contribution of Brazilian analysts of tropical man to a general science of man—to combine and interrelate the methods of anthropology, social ecology, sociology, psychology, and history (social history, including economic history) for the study not only of Brazil, apart from the other subgroups that are part of the Portuguese-tropical sociocultural complex, but also of Brazil in connection with Portugal, the Portuguese East, Portuguese Africa, and of Brazil as a variant of European civilization. The study of the Brazilian social past, as an anthropological as well as a historical past, is also being attempted, as well as the study of its structure as a whole, one in which the so-called primitive elements have been, or are, socially, culturally, and psychologically present, beneath or beside the civilized ones, or blended with them. This mixture, rather than an ethnic or cultural pluralism understood as coexistence of almost independent ethnic or cultural subgroups within a national or transnational group, has been, and is, characteristic of the Luso-tropical structure of which Brazil is at present an expression, just as it is characteristic of other Hispanic or Iberian or European societies in the tropics—integrated through amalgamation with tropical peoples.

Students of the sociocultural or supercomplex, described by some as the Luso-tropical complex, have found it necessary to give more attention to neglected and obscure aspects of the Portuguese tropical reality than to the more apparent ones. Hence the unusual interest on the part of the same students—an interest that some outsiders have found exaggerated—in sexual history and sexual behavior as a particularly important part of a social past and a social structure where sex has played an extremely important role, not only biologically, creating as it were almost a new race, but socially, breaking or shortening the social distance between masters and slaves, Europeans and non-Europeans, civilized and primitive, in an atmosphere of sexual adventure not only in its crudest aspect of mere pleasure-seeking but of romantic love and family-building as well. Some of the unions of Europeans with non-Europeans within the Portuguese-tropical group have become, since the sixteenth century, part of a sort of romantic tradition in the relations between the two races and the two cultures and have contributed as such to give so-

cial value and psychic charm, in Brazil, to mestizos and to marriage outside not only one's class but even one's race.

For the study of such aspects of the social past and the social structure of a group among whose members these unions have been frequent within certain classes and not actually rare among other classes, it is evident that the student both of Portuguese-tropical history and of contemporary Portuguese-tropical society, has to follow paths that are not the conventional ones, since he must deal with a hidden, intimate, disguised history that Unamuno, the Spanish essayist, once called *intra-historia*. That history is similar—though deeper, being anthropological as well as purely historical—to the history that the Goncourt brothers attempted in France, calling it *histoire intime* and considering it, even for the past of a civilized society such as the French, not only as a sort of *roman vrai* but *la vraie histoire humaine*. *Roman vrai* was also Proust's type of history, although disguised in fiction, just as Unamuno, disguising himself as a unique type of novelist, dealt with some extremely significant aspects of the development of the Spaniard as an equally unique personality with a unique history and situation—both psychological and cultural—in Europe.

Modern students of the Portuguese-tropical social past and social structure, considering these in their most intimate and perhaps most significant aspects, think that it is possible for them to analyze and interpret such obscure aspects of a general reality through methods that, being scientific (insofar as the social sciences are scientific), may also be Proustian—not in the sense of being like the techniques of fiction but rather in the sense of being emphatic as historians and anthropologists have the right to be emphatic; that is, to identify themselves with certain situations unknown to them in their full reality to the point of making them real, in their essentials, through the assembling or reunion of as many concrete, vivid, real details as possible. This is why these modern students of that past and of that structure use in an intensive way—one which was probably never used anywhere before for the study of a mixed society, half-civilized, half-primitive—not only intimate personal but apparently commercial documents like bills and advertisements that are also basically personal, as well as information on sexual and domestic behavior to be found in the Inquisition and the church private colonial papers, where short, concrete references are made to the most secret sins of pioneer colonists of the sixteenth century in their relations with slaves, with Amerindians, with Negroes recently

Ethnic Groups and Culture

arrived from Africa, and with animals. They also confuse Roman Catholic with Jewish rites and with Amerindian and African religious practices, some of them connected with sex and love, with marriage and children.

Should these methods of analysis, part historical, part anthropological, part scientific, part humanistic, be extended to other societies? For societies where there is, or has been, a similar interpenetration of races and cultures, I think that the answer is "Yes." A Cuban critic, Juan Antonio Portuondo, has expressed the desire to see them used in the study of other Hispanic-American communities besides the Brazilian one. Anglo-American historians, anthropologists, and sociologists have expressed the same desire concerning certain areas of the United States whose ecological conditions and historical experience make them similar to the tropical and quasi-tropical spaces where Portuguese or Iberian colonization has prevailed in America.

Other critics have expressed their doubts as to the possible universal value of these methods, objecting that if they are, as has been said, Proustian, they are literary and not scientific, although it has been said of Proust himself that he was at once scientific and poetical in his ways of analyzing the most secret or intimate aspects of human behavior. Here the problem has to do with the relationship between social science and humanism—a subject that is now a source of frequent discussion among social scientists and social philosophers. In regard to a method or a combination of methods—the scientific and the humanistic—that has been followed by Brazilian social analysts as pioneers for more than a quarter of a century, it is interesting to gather the opinions of some of the most modern anthropologists and sociologists of Europe and the United States.

One of them—a very modern Anglo-American anthropologist, Robert F. Spencer—has pointed out in a recent essay, "The Humanities in Cultural Anthropology," that, because anthropology and the humanities interest themselves in the same kinds of phenomena, the intimacy which can exist between them should be given its proper place, and the benefits to be derived by anthropology from close association (with the humanities) should no longer be ignored. "Like the historian," he adds, "the anthropologist is in search of evidence demonstrating 'descriptive integration,' as Evans-Pritchard and Kroeber put it." As a consequence of the search, with the goal of understanding cultural behavior, whether holistically, comparatively, or in diachronic or synchronic

terms, anthropology must remain, according to Professor Spencer, an empirical discipline, utilizing all methods which come to hand. The task of analyzing, comprehending, and depicting cultures as growths or wholes creates a dependence on the findings of various of the natural sciences as well as those of history and the humanities. Here he is following the orientation of older anthropologists, such as not only Evans-Pritchard and Kroeber but also Ruth Benedict and Robert Redfield. It is well known that Professor Evans-Pritchard goes so far as to define anthropology as a branch of the humanities. All four approve of the Brazilian combination of the two methods—the scientific and the humanistic—in social analysis that was introduced even before 1933.

One thing is generally accepted by modern anthropologists who are extending to civilized or mixed cultures methods formerly applied only to primitive cultures, that, in “getting the feel” of the culture with which he is working, the field anthropologist employs the same kinds of perception utilized by the literary critic or the artist. Just as “the humanist tries to see the whys of the *Don Quixote*, to drink in its flavor, and to appreciate and evaluate the total of Cervantes,” so the anthropologist tries to immerse himself in the “shamanistic seance or folktale and to fathom their implications.” Though aiming, as he does, for a greater degree of objectivity in his pursuit of facts relating to other cultures, the anthropologist, “in fact and practice,” when “working in new situations, has only his critical judgments and his intuitive perceptions on which to rely.”

It is true, however, as Professor Spencer and other anthropologists admit, that many social scientists, not excluding anthropologists, have become so jealous of the scientific label that the very word “intuition” has been thrown into the “lexical dustbin.” True, also, that “the humanist, versed in some special aspect of a single culture, lacks the anthropologist’s goal of perceiving the integration of the parts”; hence the deficiency of studies on national or transnational sociocultural complexes—studies whose importance has been stressed by Morris Ginsberg in a brilliant sociological essay—when written by men with a purely humanistic point of view and from a purely humanistic approach. For it is necessary that in such studies the analyst, instead of binding himself entirely to special aspects of a national or supernational culture, assumes that the culture he is analyzing is the product of innumerable diverse and intangible threads and that it is comparable to other cultures. It is when the spatial and synchronic interests of the anthropologist are brought to

Ethnic Groups and Culture

gether with the diachronic and evaluative treatment of the humanists that—according to Spencer—“a mutual undertaking of great value can begin.” And he gives as an example of this combination of the humanistic with the scientifically anthropological approach the recent essay of Professor Lowie on the social and intellectual development of the Germans.

In order to understand a culture, Spencer concludes, the anthropologist thus may safely employ the subjective insights and approaches of the conventionally defined humanities in his resolution of human problems. And Kroeber agrees with the view expressed by younger anthropologists, as well as by social psychologists of his own generation, such as Gordon Allport, that we may therefore expect a continuance of rapprochement, humanistic studies becoming increasingly “pan-human in their range” and increasingly historical at the expense of their normative constituent, natural science taking cognizance and making greater use of the humanistic data and the results of the humanistic studies. In the investigation of national or supernational culture wholes or civilizations, such as the Portuguese-tropical sociocultural complex, it is Kroeber’s view that “anthropology must necessarily take most of its data from historians and other humanists; but its task is the association of parts.”

I would like to add to these quotations from some of today’s leading anthropologists that the best connection between the data gathered by historians and humanists and the anthropologist’s endeavor to associate parts seems to be the one offered by social history and social anthropology combined: a transit field where anthropology and history may meet; and, as such, of special value for the study, the analysis, and the interpretation of a mixed supernational culture whole like that of the Portuguese-tropical, where “civilized” and “primitive” elements are found in a constant process of interpenetration.

As Cassirer has pointed out in his *Substance and Function* (Chicago: Open Court, 1923), problems of constancy of elements tend to become problems of constancy of relations. In the analysis of a sociocultural complex such as the Portuguese-tropical or other European-tropical complexes of a similar type, the isolated study of the ethnic and cultural elements that have come together to form these complexes (the European, the Moor, the East Indian, the Amerindian, the Negro) is becoming less and less significant. For the analysis of these elements should be done not in isolation one from the other—an isolation that

would make the task of the anthropologist one task and that of the historian another—but in their constancy of relations or interrelations. In the study of this constancy of interrelations in a mixed culture it is necessary, if not essential, for the analyst also to use a mixed approach, humanistic as well as scientifically anthropological.

This has been done in Brazil and in the Portuguese language in a crudely pioneer way in anticipation of more recent and more refined studies in English and French by British, French, and American social analysts of a new type: analysts willing to add humanistic techniques to scientific ones in the analysis or the study of certain human problems.

Proust himself—to return to the problem of a possible Proustian method in social analysis—has said that one of his aims as a novelist “in the search for lost time” was to see different sides of a town from windows of a train winding through it. He thus developed, apparently from Bergson, a conception of psychological time that made him think that, as there is a plane geometry and a geometry in space, so, for the novel as he conceived it there should be not only a plane psychology but a psychology in time.

Is it not proper to say, in connection with anthropological or sociological studies that are also psychological, that in the case of the analysis of certain groups made up of subgroups, each one of these subgroups, living, as Professor Georges Gurvitch would say, in its own space time, the analyst should attempt to do not only plane sociology but sociology or social anthropology in time? Should he not attempt to see different sides of a group from the windows of a train going through it and to catch rhythms of a complex and apparently unified, though in certain aspects plural or diversified, human behavior?

It is a Proustian principle that, in a man's life, the past is that which has ceased to act but has not ceased to exist. So it seems to be in the life or existence of a group like the one I am attempting to describe as Portuguese-tropical. In the life or existence of such a group the past no longer acts upon its different subgroups in a standard way but rather at clearly different rhythms, thus making it impossible for an analyst to separate, for the entire group, past from present and present from future. Past and present tend to merge one in the other in vaguely different temporal ways, not through a standard time, thus making the psychology or the sociology in time of a complex group or a society with a plural culture a very complex one. This happens, I know, with any large transnational group; but it seems to happen in a particularly

Ethnic Groups and Culture

intensive way with the Portuguese-tropical population scattered in the East, in Africa, and in America, on account of the interpenetration, within the limits of these tropical areas, of cultures whose ecological or physical bases for the notion of time are radically different from the European one. Europeans have the year divided into four seasons. In the tropics time flows through practically the same physical conditions year after year, thus making it difficult for a tropics-minded member of the group to think in terms of the European four seasons and to have the same definitive notions of time and of its effects upon human behavior, in its psychological and social aspects, entertained by a typical European.

When one considers the fact that some anthropologists who have studied primitive cultures have reached the conclusion that some primitive peoples cannot speak of time, as the civilized European or Europeanized man does, as though it were something actual, which passes, can be wasted, saved, and so forth, one begins to see the importance of a somewhat Proustian analysis of the different social and psychological times that coexist, sometimes in a rather antagonistic way, in some of the modern European-tropical societies. These societies have to be studied through methods of social analysis that take into due consideration these and other problems, very difficult to be perceived through purely conventional techniques either of history or of anthropology or sociology. Since most primitive peoples have a tendency to live wholly in the present and in the unreliably recollected past, it is easy to understand why, in mixed societies, where Europeanization does not do away radically with primitive cultures, these cultures offer a particularly strong resistance to the European time dimension so often peculiar to only a small, completely Europeanized group among them.

It is in the comparative analysis of the behavior of different subgroups of a large group like the Portuguese-tropical one—more European in certain areas, more tropical in other areas—that a student of sociology appreciates the convenience of studying social human behavior as a sociology in time: as an unrolling of life, with the effects of time on people revealing themselves in different ways, according to their cultural and ecological situation; but every subgroup is “inevitably touched by Time,” as Mary Colum, author of *From These Roots* (New York: Scribner’s, 1937), has said in her comments on modern experiments, like the Proustian one, of transferring to literature the philosophy of Bergson and the scientific psychology of Freud: “inevitably

touched by time, changed by time, not only in themselves but in their relation to each other.” The fact is that if one adopts in social history and social anthropology some of the suggestions of Proust’s methods of searching for lost time, he is using a synthesis of philosophical and scientific methods of knowledge—Bergsonian and Freudian—that was used in a special type of novel before it entered into anthropological-historical studies apparently only by an accident, because it happened that Proust, being scientific as well as poetic or artistic in his analytical approach to human behavior, instead of following methods predominantly scientific, followed principally—but not exclusively—humanistic and artistic ones. For behind his humanistic or artistic approach to human behavior there is a subtly disguised scientific approach, perhaps acquired from his father, who was a doctor. Similarly, there has been a subtly disguised humanistic and artistic approach behind the scientific one followed by sociologists and social anthropologists like Thomas and Ruth Benedict, or like Simmel, the two Webers, and Lowie.