

mentary duty is to satisfy the basic needs of each and every citizen, then what ce appeared to be utopian and complex becomes feasible and easy.

A change of priorities constitutes the decisive step in the transformation of city. This new faith in collective well-being is the seed we plant to produce the of a new life. If we do not embrace the change, if we fail to endorse the new th, it is clear that we will continue in old patterns to the further ruin of the tion and its people.

Among the most important principles contributing to the Doctrine of Guaranteed Minimal Quality of Life are:

1. The State, the Province, and the Community have as primary goals and obligations to work first and foremost to implement the Doctrine so that all citizens of this country will benefit from it.
2. All other activities are secondary; indeed, they are illegal if they tend in any way to detract from or postpone the primary goal.
3. The constant and foremost ideal of the State, Province, and Community will be to fulfill first and to the fullest extent possible the feeding, clothing, and sheltering of everyone.
4. Medical assistance, justice, and education always must be free and accessible since they are vital to the well-being of everyone.
5. The availability of a job for everyone is indispensable for individual and community well-being. That well-being is understood as physical, moral, and mental, and it is the key to social happiness, harmony, and progress. Thus, the highest duty and aspiration of each citizen is legitimate, honest, and productive work that benefits the social community.
6. No work can be considered legitimate if it is in any way detrimental to the individual, family, or society. . . .

Essentially the Doctrine of Guaranteed Minimal Quality of Life is a statement of faith, a new, simple, and just way to understand and experience human conditions. It is a new concept of life, a new form of consciousness, a new configuration of institutions.

What once was given mere lip service now becomes the foundation for institutions; what once people received as charity now becomes their right; what once is treated as purely secondary—figuring in budgets, laws, and morality after matters of sovereignty, progress, enlightenment, international affairs, and public plays—will now rise to the primary plane of consideration.

We now declare that the right of each person to at least a minimal quality of life is an *absolute right*. The duty of the collective to ensure that each individual enjoys a minimal quality of life now becomes an *absolute duty*.

If these concepts capture and move the consciences of every person—the oppressed and the oppressors, the exploited and the exploiters—then the Doctrine of Guaranteed Minimal Quality of Life will flourish within our institutions, laws, and customs. It will renovate our patterns of life. Our nation and society will transform themselves slowly and surely under its moral influence. . . .

How can we make this Doctrine a reality? Let us use every means possible, one already known and those still to be improvised. We can ask ourselves where

do we get the money to make wars, to build roads, to send ambassadors abroad, to finance an infinity of institutions that sometimes are not only useless but harmful? If we are able to find money to build theaters, barracks, hospitals, and schools, if we can purchase cannons, war planes, and thousands of other similar items, it is because we give them priority, believing them to be both useful and necessary. Belief and faith dictate our priority of expenditures. People imagine that it is both good and necessary to establish embassies abroad, to asphalt streets, to open conservatories, to organize exhibitions, to purchase war machinery, to build radio stations; they believe that a failure to do so contravenes duty, destiny, and faith in progress and civilization. Once they believe that the Doctrine of Guaranteed Minimal Quality of Life is correct, just, and necessary, they will reprioritize laws, regulations, and budgets in order to put it into effect. To carry out that goal, they will reorganize property, work, production, and consumption in such a way that with a job every person of good will can enjoy a minimal quality of life. In that way, the Doctrine, like the present pursuit of progress, will rank first in priorities and achievements. Let us undertake the obligation of redirecting our energies, talents, and finances. □

## Nationalism and Development

Reacting after 1930 to the economic dislocations brought about by the Great Depression, nationalists honed their prose in favor of accelerating industrialization, limiting foreign penetration and control of local economies, and repossessing foreign-owned natural resources. While vigorously proclaiming programs designed to encourage economic development, they accused foreign investors, allied with part of the native oligarchy, of perpetuating the colonial past in order to preserve their power, privileges, and profits.

Intellectuals like the Brazilian Nelson Werneck Sodré promoted nationalism as the ideological force to destroy the colonial past, to diminish foreign control, and to redeem Latin America. Thus, he built on the ideas of his compatriot Alberto Torres. An articulate spokesperson for developmental nationalism, he boldly asked in 1939, "Why Nationalism?" and then proceeded to offer a convincing response.

**WHY NATIONALISM?** Because now foreign economic forces are the most powerful obstacle to our development and their internal allies decline in resistance, they no longer tutor the nation. For any country with a colonial past, with an economic structure subordinated to foreign interests, to create itself nationally is to accomplish a task in many ways identical to what the European nations accomplished at the dawn of the Modern Age with the defeat of feudalism and the advance of capitalism. What for them were feudal relations, restrictions on development, are for us all that still remain of the colonial past. Nationalism thus presents itself as liberation. From its possibilities as a liberating force arises the impassioned atmosphere which surrounds it and which causes its enemies to

Source: Nelson Werneck Sodré, *Raízes Históricas do Nacionalismo Brasileiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Educação, 1960), pp. 30-35.

consider it more passion than politics. It is proper to emphasize that passion in the abstract does not exist and that Nationalism interprets a truth—truth within the historical context, and that truth is concrete.

To those who find difficulty in placing Nationalism in the economic realm, who judge false the declarations by which it is presented as a shield against various forms of real foreign aggression, perhaps it is more easily understood within its political framework where the lines are more precisely drawn. In that framework, Nationalism represents the democratic ideal, supported solely by the rising classes, which need liberty as the human body needs oxygen, which live by the enlightenment of opinion, which need to discuss and to debate publicly. More than anything, they need popular support and only that reveals the essential democratic character of the nationalist position. The opposition forces, quite to the contrary, have lost the conditions for open life and exercise varied and repeated attempts to limit freedoms, to restrict opinions, to reduce politics to the old formulas of the combinations of a few, of clandestine decisions, of summit statements with a characteristic horror of anything that smacks of the masses.

Nationalism appears, then, on the historic scene as the escape from a difficult situation whose symptoms appear in day-to-day life. It answers the present demands, concrete necessities—it was not invented, it did not come from the imagination of a few, it does not live in theory but in practice. It is a spontaneous solution, and this seems to be one of its limitations because it is difficult for it to take on organized forms in the political struggle. Organized it is invincible. The feeling of passion which accompanies it, a positive sign of its force and not a symptom of its weakness, points out the generality and profundity of its effects: it reveals that Nationalism is popular, which should not surprise anyone, seeing that everything that is national is popular.

Inaccurate are the comparisons, slyly put forward as accusations, that Nationalism is historically outdated—so is colonialism—and that it can lead to what happened recently in other countries, particularly in Germany and in Italy. It is clear that Nationalism can lead to anything, but there is no relationship whatsoever between the situation presented by a country like Brazil with an economic structure still strongly contaminated by colonialism and the nations, like those mentioned, in which the capitalist system was fully installed. Likewise, it would be simple to establish other distinctions by an easy comparison: the economic forces which aided nazism and fascism are the same which here oppose the growth of Nationalism.

Nationalism springs from the necessity of creating a new scheme of coordinating class interests, or reducing them to a minimum common denominator, for the struggle in defense of what is national in us. It is imperative to overcome the disagreement between the national bourgeoisie and the working class which adopts Nationalism as an opportune political expression. It is understood that only by minimizing, without denying or obscuring, the contradiction between the class which furnishes the labor and increases its consciousness every day and the class which needs to strengthen itself through capitalization of the national resources and their proper use, we will be able to endure as a nation which pre-

sents Nationalism as the natural solution and gives to it that force, that penetration, and that catalytic power which the simple observation sees in it.

To set up all the obstacles to the creation of a framework in which the forces interested in national development are harmonized becomes the essential task of those who oppose Nationalism, of those who see in it the direct menace to what they represent, of those who see and fear the existence of a possibility for Brazil to overcome the remnants of colonialism by making itself into a nation. The simplest process is to divide those forces by establishing as fundamental the contradiction which separates them, by aggravating the conditions of life to force to desperation those who work and to distress those who compose the varied range of the middle class. For these reasons we see the dangers of an economic and financial policy which generates the conditions of uncertainty and propitiation of those of subversion and the anomalies of a country furnished for capital export—capital, of creating difficulties for the equipping of factories which use national capital, of systematizing the desperation of those who have the right of expecting equal treatment when they do not receive preferential treatment for the simple fact that they live, invest, and work here.

Then, what is old and what is new in this phase [of the growing Brazilian Revolution which began in 1930]? Old doubtless are the semi-feudal relations which impede the amplification of the internal market; old is the policy of spreading the economic setbacks among all the classes by reducing the acquisitive power of the masses; old is the orientation of relegating the State to inertia; old is the mercantilism which requires us to ship more abroad and to receive less for it; old is the rule which imprisons us in the role as a tropical producing plantation of primary materials for foreign industries; old is our subordination to foreign reasoning, no matter how valid it might be abroad; old, particularly, is the idea that Brazil can only develop with outside aid and principally with foreign capital.

And what is new? New is the social composition which includes a bourgeoisie capable of becoming a class and beginning to understand that its opportunity is now or never and that it is a middle class attentively and ideologically receptive, through the major part of its elements, to the clamor which is raised in the depths of history in the sense that we must organize ourselves for the task we have to fulfill, and a working class which acquired a political conscience and mobilizes itself for the purpose of sharing the national undertaking, seeing thereby the opening of perspectives to its historical role. New are the people. Nothing more will occur without their participation. New is the national industry, which has passed the stage of consumers' goods to producers' goods, limited, however, by the backwardness in the acquisitive capacity of the internal market and burdened by a policy of obstacles and doubts. Volta Redonda [Brazil's first steel mill] is what is new that is altering the Brazilian scene and Petróbras is what is new which affirms our capacity for progress without interferences. New, in short, is Nationalism, which corresponds to what pushes us forward and breaks with what held us back.

Between the new and the old the choice is not difficult. Between the past and the future, no doubt exists. We choose the future. We do not intend "to lose the continuity of history."<sup>1</sup>