

Du côté des Anglais rien de tel. Les traductions de ces ouvrages (celui de Rochefort, par exemple) n'eurent qu'une diffusion limitée. Les grands théoriciens de la politique, Hobbes et Locke, font entrer les Caraïbes dans l'illustration de leurs théories, mais comme confirmation « a contrario » de leurs thèses. Et Daniel Defoe reprend dans *Robinson Crusoé* tous les clichés négatifs les concernant.

Plusieurs conclusions nous restent en tête à la suite de la lecture de ce volume. Retenons celle qui est liée au cannibalisme. C'est en fait tout un ensemble qu'il faudrait considérer ici. Les Européens ne comprirent pas ces nations « qui défiaient les lois de la sociologie », comme on l'a dit récemment en parlant des Jivaros (voir les commentaires du *Monde*, 7 janvier 1994, sur le livre de P. Descola, *Les lances du Crépuscule. Relations Jivaros Haute-Amazonie*, Paris, Plon, 1993). Leur rejet de la hiérarchie sociale, de la propriété privée, de la retenue sexuelle, en faisait déjà des « êtres inférieurs ». À cela s'ajoutait le cannibalisme, qui pour eux représentait le meurtre rituel ou la punition imposée à leurs ennemis, comme chez les Iroquoïens. Toutes ces caractéristiques, la dernière surtout, en faisaient des candidats parfaits à l'esclavage. Belle façade que tout cela, et qui en impressionna plusieurs, alors que peut-être la raison fondamentale de leur mauvaise réputation venait du fait qu'ils opposèrent une très ferme résistance à ceux qui envahissaient leur territoire. Voilà un petit aperçu de ce que présente à notre réflexion ce livre stimulant.

Jean-Claude Dubé
Université d'Ottawa

Thomas H. Holloway — *Policing Rio de Janeiro: Repression and Resistance in a 19th-Century City*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993. Pp. 369, illus., maps.

Recent historiography on Brazil has produced a growing number of studies directed toward either reinterpretation of the political history of the Empire (1822–1889) or what might be termed the social history of its streets. The first direction has been concerned with elucidating the meaning of Brazilian liberalism, even where primary attention has been paid to the break with European colonial rule. Alternatively, the evolution of the modern state and emergence of a national political party system, in tandem with the articulation of powerful patronage networks, have received important re-examination. The second direction has moved from original preoccupation with slavery and its abolition to assessing the implications of “gradual emancipation”, especially in urban contexts. The latter focus has opened a rich vein of social history, exposing the everyday lives of those who moved from slavery to freedom, while paying much broader attention to those whom Patricia Aufderheide termed the “patronless poor” (“Order and Violence: Social Deviance and Social Control in Brazil, 1780–1840”, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1975). After mid-century, this population increasingly circumscribed those of free birth, whether descended from African slaves or composed of newly arriving Portuguese immigrants.

In *Policing Rio de Janeiro*, Thomas H. Holloway now offers a means of synthesizing these parallel tracks of historiographical inquiry, fusing a valuable political analysis to an even more illuminating foray into the social history of the imperial capital's streets. By exploiting over seven decades of police archives — “Scott's official text” — for the unique purpose of laying out the institutional evolution of nineteenth-century police power, he manages to say a great deal that is new about “the crowd” in Brazilian history. His study will be applauded for revealing the heretofore hidden side of police power in Brazil's imperial capital, simultaneously the venue of the New World's largest African population.

Holloway appears to be exploring a familiar Weberian formulation that many scholars have fruitfully applied to change in nineteenth-century Brazil. By adopting a dual focus that on one hand assesses the institutional evolution of Rio de Janeiro's (especially military) police as a repressive apparatus and on the other evaluates the resistance the patronless poor offered in return, however, he takes his study in an imaginative new direction. In a painstaking reconstruction of an indispensable institutional genealogy of police power, the author explicates post-Independence patterns to determine that usually they were no more than literal heirs of the colonial authoritarian patterns deriving from French-inspired absolutist reform. Alternatively, he shows that models imported by Brazilian liberals of the 1830s, whether derived from Napoleonic France or borrowed from English industrial cities, fundamentally turned out to be *sui generis* in Brazil.

If Holloway had merely described the progression of institutional change in police and judiciary from independence to republic, his book would be an invaluable contribution to Brazilian historiography. He has attempted to make sense of evolving police power in terms of one analytical category that nearly everyone else has neglected to fathom, however, namely, that it was intrinsically judicial power. Hence, the focus on the wedding of judicial authority to police power demonstrates one important respect in which historians of Latin America have been returning to the “old wine” of legal institutions and judicial reform. Happily, in this case, the author's intent is not to serve it up in “new bottles”, but rather to savour the full body of the repressive state apparatus as one whose roots reached deeply into eighteenth-century absolutism. Although kicking around liberalism in Brazilian history has now become a jaded exercise, many readers will be grateful to the author of this illuminating book for delving so deeply into the official record. The deliberate, institutional recasting of the national judiciary, epitomized in the notorious “Law of December 3” (1841), receives new attention here, extending Thomas Flory's work on the imperial local judiciary (*Judge and Jury in Imperial Brazil, 1808–1871*, Austin, 1981). Holloway argues that the 1841 reform of the judiciary did not really represent authoritarian innovation. Instead, both authoritarian liberals and moderate conservatives were linked through their creation of modern institutions that reach into our own century, determining that “the apparatus of repression was also progressive and farsighted” (p. 290).

It is nevertheless in the historiography of the streets that the author shows his métier. Much more than a refined understanding of authoritarian liberalism, Holloway's book is a systematic exploration of “the interaction of the parts of Brazilian

society where repression and resistance scraped against one another" (p. 17). Because he allows readers to hear the voices of those who felt the new Brazilian state's disciplining arm, the value of this book deserves to be praised in terms more congenial to social historians. Few researchers have been able to piece together how urban slaveowners disciplined their property, mobile and income producing as it was in traversing the labyrinthine streets of old Rio de Janeiro. "One does not guard this property, it walks through the streets," a minister of justice deplored. Holloway reveals, as no historian has, the central dependence of urban slaveowners on the city's police and prison authorities for administering whippings and meeting out jail sentences to Rio de Janeiro's enormous slave population. The masters' declining reliance on the state after mid-century provides a similarly significant shift, which this book also traces. Just as Rio's police chiefs had initially drawn the conclusion that the threat of slave resistance or rebellion was too important to be left to individual owners, so they later perceived the growing population of free people of colour as an equally formidable threat, one dictating a style of police action perpetuated into the twentieth century. Effective police response, Holloway discovered, meant "preemptive" beatings administered in the street at the moment of arrest or immediately following on reaching the jail.

Historians will draw several corollaries from what is a pathbreaking exploration of the working relationship between judicial-police authorities and private citizens seeking to have their property disciplined and punished, though not, in Holloway's view, along Foucaultian lines. One doubtlessly concerns the current tendency in historiography to dismiss distinctions between slave and free, either by resorting to a slave/peasant continuum for rural society or by revealing how the previously unimagined magnitude of gradual emancipation can be explained according to a plethora of urban strategies — dedicated either to individual purchase or intricate testamentary provision. Post-1970 reinterpretation of slavery will now have to be set alongside the institution's legal underpinnings, especially a master's right to have 200 to 300 lashes administered by public authorities to errant slaves. Holloway precisely traces the gradual removal from public view of those whipping posts where police authorities staged as popular spectacles the brutal disciplinings that carried the risk of *de facto* execution. Historians will be moved to reconsider whether slavery in Brazil's cities carried the comparatively benign connotation that many have accorded it.

The author pays equal attention to Rio's free population of colour, specifically pointing out how law and the police heavily qualified its presumably "free" status. His vantage point pursues the absurd legal status and tragic social reality of a previously neglected category of "emancipated" Africans, those rescued from legal sale by virtue of the 1831 Treaty between Brazil and Great Britain — a merely fictive end to the Atlantic slave trade. Parallel discussion of another sector of the "patronless poor", those consigned legally to indentured servitude — increasingly the fate of individuals convicted of vagrancy — dovetails beautifully with Martha Huggins's findings on Recife (*From Slavery to Vagrancy in Brazil*, New Brunswick, N.J., 1985) and Robert M. Levine's more recent revelations about the child survivors ("orphans") of the Canudos campaign. Holloway gives the fate of these

patronless groups a national imprint for the first time, offering their own words on police brutality as a powerful statement about the limitations to both gradual emancipation and citizenship in Latin America's oldest slavocracy. Otherwise, archival gems stud Holloway's cultural exploration of this most African of New World cities.

Those inclined toward Foucaultian theoretical constructs may not be pleased to discover that Holloway concludes on what is a note of dismissal: "The carceral society envisioned by Foucault, in which citizens of the modern state internalized the mechanisms for their own control, had little basis in a society made up of masters and slaves" (p. 45). Yet discerning readers can find some faint resonance with *Discipline and Punish*, despite this disclaimer. Public executions, for instance, demanded strong military escorts to carry out the royal sentence, if only to repress a possibly contradictory popular verdict. For Holloway, however, to apply a Foucaultian optic to the Brazilian Empire only foreshortens the historian's gaze: in "moving out of the penitentiary and into the streets, we must move from a fascination with the grotesque to a more mundane consideration of the banalities of daily life" (p. 289). Only by sifting through the banalities of routine police operations, he rightly implies, can one comprehend the apparatus of repression perfected in the nineteenth century — a development whose results, Holloway reflects, "Brazil lives with ... to this day" (p. 290).

This is a book that will receive major attention from historians of Latin America. It pushes the study of judicial and police institutions, as well as their complex legal underpinnings, in new directions and fills huge gaps in Brazil's nineteenth-century historiography. Above all, it limns the changing parameters of power within which that city's white, propertied elite exercised truly awesome, if deplorably arbitrary, authority.

Linda Lewin
University of California (Berkeley)