

Author's Note

To diminish confusion when using the term “state,” I have opted to capitalize “State” when referring to the overarching institutions of government. When I use “state,” I refer to the provinces that were redesignated as “states” under Brazil’s republican 1891 Constitution. Because of changing rules governing spelling in Brazilian Portuguese, I have preserved original spellings of names as well as titles of books, documents, and articles in most instances. In some cases, terms or names have been adopted to contemporary spelling standards for clarity.

Where possible, I have tried to use the language of Brazilian historical actors to describe racial and ethnic identities, but for the convenience of certain types of analysis, I have at times used categories that would likely have seemed alien to many of the individuals who appear in this study. Terms such as “nonwhites” are utilized to distinguish those who identified themselves or were identified by others as not being of “pure” European descent. The term Afro-Brazilian is employed at times to distinguish those with black African descent from those who did not recognize this racial heritage as part of their own identity or who were perceived by others to possess this heritage. Over centuries, Brazilians have devised a plethora of racial categorizations that belie the simple binary categorizations that contemporary scholars attempt to impose. Most Brazilians of African descent in the late 1800s would have much more readily emphasized black and brown identities with myriad gradations within each grouping. It is important to note, however, that Brazilian historical actors themselves did not always employ racial and ethnic terms consistently.

I would refer interested readers to Ada Ferrer’s insightful and more detailed discussion of these issues on the use of racial terms by North American historians and other scholars in the introduction to her book *Insurgent Cuba*. I would add to Professor Ferrer’s analysis that similar caution and attention should be paid to the use of terms for a variety of social categories used to distinguish class, sexual, gender, and age identifi-

cations among others. I have tried to present the terms utilized by historical Brazilian actors with each of these categories, but as with race, some compromises had to be made for analytical reasons or the lack of a tight linguistic fit for Portuguese terms translated into English. For instance, most of the Brazilian poor in the late 1800s distinguished stratification among their ranks with the terms “protected” (those with a prominent patron) and “unprotected” (patronless poor). Brazilians tended to use these homegrown terms rather than, for example, the exotic language of Karl Marx to distinguish between the proletariat and the lumpen proletariat (even though many Brazilians came to be exposed to these terms by way of the Brazilian labor movement beginning in the late 1800s). Different terms and competing conceptions of class, racial, sexual, ethnic, gender, and age identities coexisted, and in most cases, they continue to coexist in contemporary Brazil. I share Professor Ferrer’s hope that attention to these distinctions will lead scholars toward a fuller examination of how these unnatural identities were formed and remade “on the ground” in specific historical settings.

Scholars often use the term conscription as a synonym for impressment. The tendency to conflate the two terms is heightened by the fact that there is no equivalent of the noun form “conscript” for impressment. In the text, I at times reluctantly resort to neologisms such as “dragooness” and “inductee” to avoid both this imprecision and more cumbersome phrases such as “men pressed into service.” I am careful to distinguish between these two distinct types of recruitment for military mobilizations because they are so different that to confuse them is similar to equating indentured servitude and debt peonage. There were times when these two forms of recruitment overlapped. The Brazilian government called up a number of enrolled national guardsmen for service in the Paraguayan War (a method I would regard as a type of conscription), and when many failed to report for duty, it empowered recruitment agents to hunt down and press draft-dodging guardsmen.

Both conscription and impressment are ultimately coercive forms of tribute labor recruitment, but their methods and the meanings attributed to them are distinct. *Conscription* comes from Latin meaning “to enlist or to select from a list.” This referred to the obligation of Roman citizens of the Republic (men who satisfied minimum property requirements) to enroll as able-bodied adults liable to be periodically called up for military

service. Conversely, *impressment* describes coercive recruitment performed by police or press gangs. These agents most often targeted men without property, including vagrants and lawbreakers. Impressment did not rely on selecting men from an enrollment list, the act from which the term *conscription* derived its meaning. When reformers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries spoke of conscription, most understood it as an enrollment of mostly law-abiding male youths from which recruits would be selected for service on the basis of a lottery. I thank my colleague Professor John Eadie for his insights on the origins and practices surrounding conscription in the Roman Republic and Empire.

Finally, I have adopted ratios of the rate of exchange of the Brazilian currency the milréis to the U.S. dollar to estimate comprehensible values for the reader which take inflation into account. I made these estimates based on data compiled by my colleague Hendrik Kraay in appendix 4 of his dissertation, “Soldiers, Officers, and Society: The Army in Bahia, 1800–1889.”