



Introduction

As a subject, São Paulo—province and provincial center to 1889, state and state capital thereafter, section and city throughout—has long inspired metaphor, superlative, simile, and metonym. Passing through in 1889–90, a North American visitor described the region as “the garden of Brazil” and the country’s “most highly-favored portion.” Ten years later, another U.S. correspondent referred to its capital as a “Yankee City of Brazil,” an appellation echoed at a dozen-year lag by a visitor from Colombia (he may not have seen the appellative itself as entirely complementary), who also described “the beautiful City of Sao Paulo” as “one of the most magnificent cities of the Western Hemisphere, surpassing those of Europe and the United States in the breadth of its avenues and in its tropical luxuriance.” Approaching the city in 1927, Rudyard Kipling saw “several immense Madrids breaking half the horizon”; within the city limits, he found “cars and lorries mov[ing] everywhere, like electrons in the physics primers.” Three years later, Paul Vanorden Shaw—born in the city of São Paulo to North American parents in 1898—described the state as “the economic foundation of the entire nation” and “the motor” of Brazil. The Viennese exile Stefan Zweig opted for the anatomical over the architectural or mechanical: for him, São Paulo was Brazil’s “centre of muscles, its organ of strength.” As for metonymy, as early as 1906 visitors were repeating a turn of phrase that would long infuriate Brazilians from elsewhere in the federation: “São Paulo is Brazil.”¹

Whether second-hand or spontaneous, and leaving aside the responses of other Brazilians (many of whom were themselves given to celebration of things *paulista* in not unsimilar terms), one thing is clear: there was much to be impressed by in São Paulo during these years.² For by the 1880s, São Paulo was already Brazil’s greatest export producer; by the 1910s, it was its greatest industrial center; and, by the close of the 1930s, it was its most populous unit.

During these same years, São Paulo played host to some of Brazil’s

most important political, intellectual, and social movements. From the 1870s through the 1880s, it was home to Brazil's most noteworthy movement of antimonarchical opposition, which sought to replace the country's centralized "imperial" government with a federal republic. During these same decades, the province was also the proving ground for the greatest of Brazil's antislavery campaigns. With the victory of the two good causes between 1888 and 1889, the state came into its own in political terms, and over the course of the next four decades, four Brazilian presidents would emerge directly from its political machine. Only once would its chosen candidate fail, in 1909–10, when the São Paulo state machine backed Ruy Barbosa, a son of the northeastern state of Bahia, in what is remembered as the country's first contested presidential election.

Beginning in the 1880s, São Paulo also served as the destination of choice for the greatest number of immigrants seeking Brazilian shores. These immigrants and the expansion of public education helped to rank São Paulo among Brazil's most literate provincial units. By the turn of the twentieth century, São Paulo was also Brazil's most lettered unit, home to ever-increasing numbers of morning and afternoon newspapers, weekly and monthly reviews, and almanacs and other annuals. Beginning at around the same time, paulista men and women of letters made what now appear to be a series of bids to become Brazil's most literary unit: in their literatures of heritage and heraldry, of folkloric naturalism, and of cosmopolitan modernism.

While the aesthetically minded gathered in São Paulo salons, practical men of affairs met in the halls of the state's associational bodies, from its early, but still extant, business-and-industry "commercial associations" to its industrial-interest "centers." For and by the associative among paulista workers were analogous groupings: mutual aid societies, workingmen's federations, and—by the close of the 1920s—at least one intensely politicized trade union.

The activists who led the latter group were, at least in theory, militantly internationalist in orientation, but movements characterized by narrower loyalties were to be found in São Paulo as well. In the 1910s, mobilizationist nationalism enjoyed its vogue, not only in the state capital, but in the interior as well. In 1924, mobilization of another sort came to the state unexpectedly, in the form of a military rebellion led by mostly young, mostly junior officers whose troops captured and held the city of São Paulo and much of the rest of the state for weeks. Two years later, the state capital was the site chosen for the founding of the age's

most important civilian opposition movement, a political party that challenged the state's republican machine in liberal, constitutionalist terms. Four years on, in 1930, the new party's leaders tied their fortunes to extra-regional machine politicians in what has come to be known and renowned as the "Revolution of 1930."

Throughout these years, São Paulo—city and section—was setting and subject for the elaboration of a deep and abiding sense of regional difference and distinctiveness. This peculiar tradition, elements of which were taken up by outsiders beginning in the nineteenth century, received its most prolonged, emphatic statement in the assembly and remembering of what has come to be called the "Constitutionalist Revolution" of 1932, Brazil's last great regionalist revolt.

For all of their importance, excitement, and dynamism, the politics of these years have yet to receive their historiographical due. To be sure, they have long been pointed to as formative in the making of modern Brazil, but their examination in bits and pieces (a party or person here, a municipality or magazine there), while yielding very fine monographs that have made signal contributions to our existing body of knowledge, has left the problem of broad interpretation virtually untouched.

At the broadly interpretive level, the case could be made that in no other period of Brazilian history is the literature as thick with cliché and received wisdom. Indeed, in reading about politics in Brazil from the late nineteenth century through the early decades of the twentieth one quickly comes up against layers of verities, understandings that have proven remarkably durable, not only in what public imagination can be said to exist, but also in the works of professional historians.

Republicanism may again be taken as a starting point. Republican politics, so the story goes, was the exclusive preserve of a comfortable few (in São Paulo, rendered variously as the "coffee aristocracy," the "coffee bourgeoisie," or the "coffee oligarchy"). Beyond tending to the narrow economic interests of this privileged group, republicanism had only the most tenuous connections, if any at all, to other spheres of human activity, cultural, intellectual, and social. The resulting political culture was exceedingly thin in content and extremely limited in its reach.

Political opposition is attributed to conflict among these comfortable few (thus the unintentionally oxymoronic "dissident oligarchs") or to a *deus ex machina* summoned from elsewhere (a "rising middle class," a presumed institutional ethos peculiar to Brazil's military, the emergence of industrial capitalism). Whichever the scenario, with the partial exception of works relying on the no less ghostly and mechanistic explanatory

device of “nationalism,” the resulting politics is understood as having been as thin in content and limited in appeal as that it opposed.

When one gets to the grander dates of national history, the tendency toward reification of particular period-portraits of the past becomes even more marked. Ruy Barbosa’s campaign for the Brazilian presidency in 1909–10 was one fool’s errand (and its 1919 sequel unworthy of mention, much less serious consideration). The labor militancy of the late 1910s was heroic and important on its own, but had no influence upon republican politics. That the great military rebellion of 1924 occurred in São Paulo meant little; it may well have occurred in Piauí for all of its involvement with and influence upon paulista society. And 1930, 1930 was the greatest of partings-of-waters, after which everything was forever changed and the past no longer held any sway over the future, at least in matters political.

Evidence unearthed in the monographic work of the last ten years calls into question certain of these understandings. We now know, for example, that men of the middle (not coffee aristocrats, coffee bourgeois, or coffee oligarchs) occupied leading positions in the local republican parties of places like Rio Claro in the early decades of the twentieth century. However, the weight of received wisdom is such that even findings like these are pressed into the existing interpretive framework and the resulting works are catalogued at Brazil’s National Library under the subject heading “Brazil—coffee oligarchy,” without having made any impression on more general understandings of paulista politics.³

Given this situation, it is more than apparent that the further accumulation of monographs will not force a rethinking of the political history of São Paulo from the 1880s through the first third of the twentieth century any time soon. Rather, a broad reinterpretation, one bringing together synthesis and original research, is in order.

Origins and Expectations

A thoroughgoing reinterpretation of paulista history through the early 1930s was among the furthest things from my mind at this project’s inception. Indeed, had I known where my work would lead, I would like to think that I would have had the good sense to acquire a different interest, perhaps to choose another calling.

My initial goals were nothing if not more modest. I sought to map the participation of ordinary paulistas (“nonelites” was my inelegant term) in

what could be, and indeed was, seen as a set of “liberal-constitutionalist” or “liberal-reformist” movements, the best documented of which was the Democratic Party of São Paulo, founded in 1926. Whistling while I worked, and repeating to myself more than once, “There can be no high politics without a good deal of low politics,” I set about collecting my raw material.⁴ The documentation did not disappoint. Indeed, I soon found more and better material than I had dared hope. But as I looked ahead to writing, and in so doing connect my findings to the existing scholarship, I was increasingly troubled.

The more I learned about reformist “low politics,” the less satisfactory the existing interpretations of the reformist movements themselves seemed. The same was true of incumbent politics, only more so. Indeed, it became clear that not only was the extant scholarship on paulista politics insufficient as background for the kind of study I had set out to write, it was itself deficient in certain important respects.⁵

As I turned from my original, monographic point of inquiry to a broader course of study, new problems presented themselves. Once-key concepts and conceptions revealed themselves to be useless (my own “nonelites,” to begin with) or worse (*coronelismo*, for example).⁶ Understanding paulista politics demanded a better understanding of the press; in turn, “the press” itself became a portmanteau that demanded unpacking. Where before I had envisioned my original research as being limited in geographic scope to the state capital and a few secondary cities, I now found myself ranging over all of São Paulo: capital, coast, and countryside. Most importantly, and most interestingly to me, were the people whose stories emerged in the documentation and confounded existing understandings of Brazilian republicanism, including my own: election-day entrepreneurs, small-town reformers, rabble-rousing beat reporters.

Context and Comparisons

In considering late-nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century São Paulo within its Brazilian context, a number of facts present themselves. The first couple of these may seem both banal and redundant, but they bear restatement.

First, of course, is São Paulo’s importance in economic and political terms. One can, I hope, write critically about aspects of a region’s self-image without losing sight of the same region’s actual import.

Second is the appropriateness of the provincial unit (the state) as the

scale of analysis during this time period. The extreme federalism of Brazil's post-imperial system makes this fact plain for those scholars interested in administration and government, but the usefulness of the state-level approach does not end there. In an age in which sectional identities were as deeply held as or more deeply held than national loyalties, in which there was only one institution that was truly national in scope (the army, an institution that was also decidedly unpopular, in almost any sense of the word), and in which extra-local exchange—commercial, intellectual, and social—occurred overwhelmingly on a regional basis, national history is elusive and local history incomplete. The seeming exception comes in studies of the city of Rio de Janeiro, which are, of course, completely local.⁷

Third, there is São Paulo's status as setting for so many of Brazil's most important developments from the making of nineteenth-century republicanism through the outbreak of the regionalist revolt of 1932. Some of these developments were solely paulista in scope, but national in importance. Other social, intellectual, and political movements arose most dramatically in the paulista context, but were experienced elsewhere as well: labor militancy and aesthetic modernism are two of the most celebrated examples. Another example, the reformist party politics of the 1920s, is often thought of as being uniquely or especially paulista, but its leaders found allies and imitators in states throughout Brazil.⁸

It is almost unnecessary to add that further parallels may be found still farther afield. São Paulo's republican machine, with its managed elections and patronage appointments, possessed analogues from Buenos Aires to Brooklyn. Not for nothing is there a Spanish cognate for the Portuguese-language term, *chefe político*, and an English equivalent for both. Likewise, the comparison between Brazilian ruyismo and Mexican maderismo is now four decades old; via maderismo, the same comparison was made to U.S. progressivism, Argentine Radicalism, and Uruguayan batllismo, among other movements, and has since been extended to the Radicalism of France's Third Republic.⁹

Prolonged ruminations on these and like comparisons are fewer than they might be in the pages that follow, for various reasons. At one point in my work, I had the grandest expectations of stepping out from São Paulo and extending comparisons from Rio de Janeiro to the Río de la Plata, whence from Córdoba to Coahuila, then to the Atlantic crossings of the Progressive-Era United States and Third-Republic France. The old parallels are still there to be drawn, between republican machines of widely

varied hue and between reformist movements of similarly varied aspect, as are some comparisons that have not, to my knowledge, been made (between Getúlio Vargas and Hipólito Yrigoyen, for example), but I no longer believe that I am the one to make them at any length, at least not in this particular work, for combining research-driven revisionism and high-flying comparativism is a tricky task. Readers will detect few parallels of approach or outlook between this work and Florencia Mallon's *Peasant and Nation*, aside from the authors' starting points in what seems increasingly quaint to call "political history from below," but I think that Mallon was absolutely right to make her comparative case on the basis of more or less equivalent archival diggings.¹⁰ Without having built the kind of mental map of Rio de Janeiro or Buenos Aires that I have assembled for the city and state of São Paulo (and for the state's subregions), I could not be sure that I was not committing the fallacy of comparing my own understandings of paulista politics with the kinds of hoary received wisdom that were so clearly inapplicable in my own area of specialization.

My reluctance to engage in extended comparisons between my findings on São Paulo and the existing literatures on other regions, countries, and cultures should not be taken to mean that I consider the paulista case to be *sui generis* or that I have not found inspiration, succor, and support in these literatures throughout the formulation of this work. On the contrary, even my belief in the merit of this particular approach has been encouraged by my experience outside of the archives and arcana of paulista history. Although I lived in Brazil as a child, my introduction to the historian's craft did not begin with the study of the South American giant. Instead, I cut my historiographical teeth on a tradition that rightly insists on the worthiness of studying, on its own terms, the complex history of another land of the future. On that basis, too, it seemed to me that the history of the Brazilian state of São Paulo was worthy of careful, attentive, solitary study.

Project and Projections

The result of such a course of study is a work that aims to make a series of contributions to the historiography of modern Brazil and, it is hoped, to understandings of modern politics and political and cultural change more broadly. These contributions begin with a reconsideration of republicanism in São Paulo.

Paulista Republicanism Reconsidered

The much-mentioned “coffee oligarchy” finds scant purchase in the chapters that follow. Instead, one finds a set of political structures and practices that displayed a statewide unity, including in areas where little or no coffee was to be found.

These structures and practices showed a marked continuity with those of the preceding political dispensation, a fact that will be of little apparent surprise to most scholars, but that bears repeating in this context, as does their comparability to analogous arrangements the world over. As in Richard Graham’s neo-Namierite nineteenth-century Brazil (and in Lewis Namier’s own eighteenth-century England), the structure of politics in São Paulo during these years was characterized by patronage and personalism, fraud and favor, corruption and clientele-building.¹¹

There are, however, distinctions to be made. More than its predecessor regime, and perhaps more than many similar sets of political and administrative arrangements, the paulista machine of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth was characterized by the thorough interweaving of party and government. Where there had been two parties of government, there was now one, and while the national head of state had stood above both parties, the state executive now emerged from the single party in the field. In what might seem a paradox at first glance, conflict within this one-party system was every bit as heated as it had been under the previous regime, in contests between and among in- and out-of-power factions ranging territorially from the paulista littoral to the furthest reaches of frontier settlement.

These patterns of incumbency and opposition, and the means by which the two positions were exchanged, involved a far greater number and variety of players than has heretofore been imagined. Teamsters, tax collectors, folk healers, factory foremen, judges, builders, postmen, police delegates, professors of law, solicitors, schoolteachers, state’s attorneys, coffee merchants, claim jumpers, Indian killers, land developers, small-town scribblers, neighborhood newspapermen—all played their parts. The relationships that tied these players together involved complex processes of give-and-take, the take increasing with the exaltedness of the particular player in question.

Republican Political Culture

In outlining the structure of republican politics in São Paulo, I was able to draw upon a sizeable body of work, ranging from the recently classic to the remote and obscure.¹² Examining republican political culture—the

ideals, imagery, symbols, stories, and language of paulista republicanism—required that I go it alone. What studies we have of political culture in Brazil, and there are some very fine ones, have taken as their setting the country's nineteenth-century margins or its mid-twentieth-century capital, while the political culture of republican São Paulo has gone unexamined.¹³

Undertaking such an examination, one soon finds that republican political culture was neither so thin in content nor as limited in appeal as has been supposed. Its sources were manifold: classical and modern republican precedent, gendered notions of honor and community standing, nineteenth-century civilizational optimism, Portuguese-derived municipalism. Perhaps most importantly, and almost certainly most potently, there was São Paulo's distinct patriotic tradition, which encompassed a sense of regional difference approaching, and at points becoming, outright chauvinism.

These aspects of paulista political culture found expression in legislative addresses, post-electoral processions, and newsprinted comment on the events of the day. That appeals to certain elements of republican tradition were most often made in a spirit of purest cynicism is clear, but further tenets were widely shared and deeply held.

Particular aspects of republican political culture were likewise subject to capture by paulistas who were openly critical of the structure and practice of republican politics in their society, often with at least one eye on really existing republicanism elsewhere. These critics had recourse to a republican ideal that was liberal, popular, and potentially democratic, even as they disagreed among themselves as to what liberalism or popular sovereignty, to take two examples, might actually mean. The critical, cosmopolitan appeal to reform was thus intrinsic to the republican tradition.

Culture, Criticism, Opposition

The capture of aspects of republican political culture by the opponents of particular republican power-holders and by critics of republican politics-as-practiced was especially evident from the later 1910s onward. Among the challengers were idealistic students, ambitious newspapermen, insurgent workers, rebellious military officers, disaffected patrians, and out-and-out political novices—angry planters, anxious urbanites—each of which appealed to elements of the republican tradition, to some degree or another, to greater or lesser effect.

Even as familiar patriotic, republican ideals and imagery were re-

heard, so too did the existing republican idiom expand with the incorporation of new ideas and points of emphasis. The idea of the secret ballot, borrowed from post-Saenz Peña Argentina, was one such neologism. It was joined by war-era mobilizationist nationalism, concern for what was called the “social question,” and appeals to interest group representation, among other elements.

Bundled together or picked apart, these ideas inspired and informed, to greater and lesser degrees, anti-machine movements through at least the 1920s. Among these movements, each of which further added to the warp and weft of paulista political culture, were Ruy Barbosa’s twilight campaign for the presidency in 1919, the efforts at mobilization surrounding the military revolt of July 1924, and the founding and subsequent campaigning of the Democratic Party.

São Paulo’s republican host endured these varied challenges. Indeed, its younger, sprier leaders made some attempts to learn from them. Throughout, contenders old and young struggled among themselves in the contests for patronage, party leadership, and prestige that defined the structure of republican politics.

Republic and Public

The leaders of the state’s republican machine may have held the balance of formal political power through the late 1930s, but the exertions of their disparate challengers were at least as important in the longer term. Not only did the critics and counterparties of the 1910s and 1920s contribute to the deepening and diffusion of São Paulo’s regionally distinct political culture, they converged upon and contributed to shaping a broader and more participatory public sphere, one that may have been put to ends that present-day sensibilities find off-putting but that was nevertheless impressive in its time and place and that, despite its many exclusions and other ugly facets, was not without its democratic potentialities.

Hilda Sabato, who has contributed more than any other scholar to the adoption of the “public sphere” concept by historians of Latin America, has also noted great variance in its use among historians in general. “Historians,” she writes, “have frequently made a rather eclectic use” of the idea. This work, like Sabato’s own, is no exception. Indeed, in both cases the term “elastic” might be more apt than “eclectic.”¹⁴

In her fullest, most recent statement on the subject, Sabato identifies a public sphere as having come into existence in Buenos Aires in the 1860s and 1870s, where it “became a space of mediation between civil society

and the state, and for the participation of vast sectors of the population in the public life of the city.” This *porteño* public sphere was a “new and expanding space, [in which] different groups and sectors of society voiced their opinions and represented their claims directly, avoiding the specifically political path.”¹⁵ Encompassing certain institutions, “the different types of associations, the press,” it excluded others: “political institutions such as the parties or Congress,” which “were closely tied to the state, and may be understood as part of its sphere of action.”¹⁶

The public sphere upon which the anti-machine contenders of São Paulo’s 1910s and 1920s converged was also an “expanding space” in which “different groups and sectors of society voiced their opinions and represented their claims.” It, too, spanned a vibrant print culture and a rich associational life. But there are important distinctions to be made. Unlike its *porteño* analogue, the paulista public sphere included politics as they were understood to exist, the politics of party, faction, and election—or, at least, of certain kinds of party, faction, and election.¹⁷ Where the Sabatian public sphere was characterized by comity and affected unanimity, São Paulo’s public sphere afforded room for conflict within and between distinct groups. Indeed, at points its opinion leaders countenanced degrees of disorder that would have been beyond the *porteño* pale.¹⁸ Another distinction concerns questions of scale and scope: while Sabato’s public sphere was strictly municipal, São Paulo’s encompassed a much greater geographic area; its center was the state capital, but it included a vast hinterland. As a result, and in more ways than one, the paulista public sphere was regional, a fact that also distinguishes it from another national-capital counterpart, that of the city of Rio de Janeiro.¹⁹

A public sphere, of course, demands a public. Here, too, differences may be found with the Sabatian model. Sabato asserts that her *porteño* public sphere was “new and expanding,” but otherwise one is left with little sense of change, still less of genesis. *The* or *a* public sphere appears in Buenos Aires in the 1860s and lasts through the 1870s, only to disappear at some point thereafter. Its basis or character is elusive: in an early interpretive piece Sabato labeled it “bourgeois,” linking its emergence to Buenos Aires’s “increasingly bourgeois character” and explaining “because in Buenos Aires the public sphere was largely organized by bourgeois and petit-bourgeois elements”; now it is undone after 1880 as “Buenos Aires turned decidedly modern, capitalistic, and—in the word of José Luis Romero—‘bourgeois.’”²⁰ Despite Sabato’s interest in citizen-

ship as a category of social-science analysis, she does not delve particularly deeply into how the “citizen” (or the member of the public) was envisioned in the period under study.²¹

The anti-machine politics of São Paulo’s 1910s and 1920s would have been inconceivable without the growth of an actual public over the first three decades of the twentieth century. Population growth, an increase in the number of readers, and the expansion of the range and reach of press outlets and the variety of associational groupings, were among the markers and manifestations of this development, which had its roots in the nineteenth century but which was experienced with increasing urgency after the turn of the twentieth. As to the character of this public, it included men and women from a fairly wide cross-section of paulista society, but its exemplar—its “model citizen”—was represented as literate, modern, and respectable, of middling or better means (but not idly rich), viriliously male, and (often, but not always) white. The politics of the 1910s and 1920s, old and new, displayed an ongoing, take-and-give relationship with these representations of the paulista public, appropriating them and elaborating upon them by turn.

*From the Social History of
Politics to a Political History of Society*

Historians, particularly historians at the beginning of their careers, are faced with tremendous incentives to assert scholarly innovation, even to the extent of imagining that they have rediscovered gravity. One result is that scholars only too ready to identify invented traditions in the historical past find themselves attempting to pass off such invented novelties as the “new political history” in their professional present.

In this work, at the risk of being barred from more than one imagined community, I have endeavored to resist the temptation to claim conceptual or methodological novelty. Rather, my goal has been, in Emilia Viotti da Costa’s words, “to conceive [a history] in which politics . . . is seen in connection with other aspects of human life,” in particular “the interconnections among economic, social, political, and ideological institutions and structures,” a statement of purpose first set in type more than twenty years ago and anticipated by work going back decades earlier, including work by Viotti da Costa herself and by scholars rooted in distinctly different traditions, historiographical and otherwise.²²

Affinity is not identity. As should be clear from the foregoing, I have accorded culture a good deal more attention and a greater measure of autonomy than Viotti da Costa might have, at least until the relatively

recent past.²³ As far as the paulista politics of the first third of the twentieth century are concerned, cultural conflict (in the form of rival claims to certain traditions and challenges fired by particular political ideas) was in almost every instance more important than conflict issuing forth from distinct economic interests. By the same token (and taking only one example), the relative success of the Democratic Party for the first few years after its founding had a good deal more to do with cultural capital than it did with coffee capital. Taking a longer chronological view, among the most important aspects of the politics of these years were ongoing efforts to define São Paulo as a society, efforts that were, by their very nature, cultural.

Returning to the comparison with Viotti da Costa's work, I have also been at pains to emphasize the experiences of individual human lives to a greater extent than she did, at least in the first edition of her *Brazilian Empire*. This emphasis is more than a holdover from my original envisioning of a social history of a certain kind of politics (though it may be that, too); it is also an inextricable part of a larger attempt to restore a sense of perspective and of possibility missing from much of what has been written on the politics of these years. The fools' errands subsequently scoffed at by historians were not seen as such in their time. Even in disappointment, disillusionment, and defeat were contained lessons for the future and the lineaments of conflicts to come.

In looking at these individual human lives in their local and regional contexts, influenced by national and international developments, I have attempted, through most of the text, to enmesh analysis and narrative. This approach was the only one I found that served to recreate the feeling of movement apparent in the evidence left by actual participants without losing track of important institutional and cultural continuities, the weight of which are more than attested to by the mood of most subsequent scholarship.

Six chapters follow, beginning with one designed to situate readers amid the places and people that made up São Paulo between the 1890s and the 1930s. Of the five chapters of greater heft, chapter 2, "A Republic of Layers," offers an extended, but still introductory, interpretation of paulista republicanism as a structure, as a set of practices, and as a political culture from the 1890s onward. In looking at republican political culture, in particular, special attention is paid to the cosmopolitan and reformist strains that grew up alongside official republicanism. The resulting ambivalence and potential for conflict is further explored in the

context of the 1909–10 presidential campaign, which, arguably foolhardy, was no one man's errand.

So much for chapter 2, if not its republic of layers. The remaining four chapters unfold more or less in chronological order. Chapter 3 takes as its starting point the mid-1910s, when the cosmopolitan strains of paulista republicanism, and the cosmopolitan nature of paulista society more generally, meant that affairs abroad, from Argentine democratization to Europe's self-immolation across the Atlantic, would command considerable attention throughout São Paulo, from belle-lettered opinion-makers to guttersnipe news-gatherers, well-heeled readers to streetwise rowdies. As the European war staggered to its standstill, these developments intersected with events at home, all of which, in turn, came to influence the formal politicking of the years 1918–19, which featured an ideologically inspired opposition, with the 1919 campaign for the national presidency as its exemplar and apogee.

Venality, violence, and internal weakness condemned the movements of the late 1910s to insuccess, to the great satisfaction of the kingpins of the state's political machine. The latter group, however, found itself facing a more serious threat in the military revolt of July 1924. The rebels of 1924, in addition to driving the state government from the city of São Paulo, attracted allies of conviction and of convenience throughout the state and deepened ongoing debates regarding the potential reform of Brazilian and especially paulista politics. In the longer term, the rebel officers themselves became iconic figures for all manner of opponents of the existing political order. These connections between the rebellion of 1924 and the society and politics of São Paulo are the subject of chapter 4.

Chapter 5 deals with the Democratic Party of São Paulo, which was among the most important institutional spinners of the military-rebel mythos. A broad and often fractious host, the Democratic Party represented the temporary coming together of several distinct varieties of criticism and opposition, which together mounted an important but ultimately unsuccessful challenge to the republican machine, with several notable longer-term effects.

In 1929–30—the years covered by chapter 6—events abroad and out-of-state again exerted their influences upon paulista politics, though hardly in the simplistic fashion that the existing literature presents. Inter-regional brinkmanship, economic collapse, and military conspiracy each played a part, to be sure, but so did São Paulo's existing structures of politics and patterns of conflict.

A conclusion draws together some of the most important motives and meanings of paulista politics between the 1890s and the early 1930s, including the many ways in which São Paulo's pre-1930 political experiences prefigured and paved the way for the regionalist revolt of 1932. Appended to this conclusion is an epilogue hazarding a discussion of selected aspects of São Paulo's subsequent history. As one of my subjects might have remarked, *pro brasilía fiant eximia*.