


<https://doi.org/10.1590/198053147278>

THE 1959 EDUCATORS' MANIFESTO REVISITED: EVENT, NARRATIVES AND DISCOURSES

 Bruno Bontempi Jr.^I

 TRANSLATED BY Jessé Rebello de Souza Junior^{II}

^I Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo (SP), Brazil; bontempi@usp.br

^{II} Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo (SP), Brazil; jesse.rebello@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents a historical analysis of the 1959 educators' manifesto "Mais uma vez convocados: manifesto ao povo e ao governo" [Summoned once again: manifesto to the people and to the government], made public in response to the proposal of an amendment to the Draft Law of Bases and Guidelines of Education. The text examines the foundations of the manifesto's memory, investigating the reasons and effects of its predominant explanation through its relations to the Pioneers Manifesto and to the Campaign in Defense of Public School. It reconstructs events, agents and meanings, understanding the manifesto as a collective and coordinated action of intellectuals aiming at certain political ends. It concludes by highlighting the manifesto's specificity and historicity, trimming off historiographical misunderstandings that resulted from baseless repetitions and approaches that left gaps in its understanding as a singular event.

INTELLECTUALS • DOCUMENTS • PRESS • HISTORY OF EDUCATION

O MANIFESTO DOS EDUCADORES DE 1959 REVISITADO: EVENTO, NARRATIVAS E DISCURSOS

Resumo

Trata-se de análise histórica do manifesto de educadores "Mais uma vez convocados: manifesto ao povo e ao governo" (1959), divulgado em resposta à irrupção de um substitutivo ao projeto de Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação. Examina os alicerces de sua memória, interrogando as razões e os efeitos da predominante explicação por meio de suas relações com o Manifesto dos Pioneiros e a Campanha em Defesa da Escola Pública. Reconstrói eventos, agentes e significados, compreendendo-o como ação coletiva e coordenada de intelectuais para fins políticos determinados. Conclui-se realçando o manifesto em sua especificidade e historicidade, aparando equívocos historiográficos resultantes de repetições sem lastro e abordagens que produziram lacunas em sua compreensão como evento singular.

INTELECTUAIS • DOCUMENTOS • IMPRENSA • HISTÓRIA DA EDUCAÇÃO

REVISITADO EL MANIFIESTO DE LOS EDUCADORES DE 1959: EVENTO, NARRATIVAS Y DISCURSOS

Resumen

Se trata de un análisis histórico del manifiesto de educadores: “Mais uma vez convocados: manifesto ao povo e ao governo” (1959), divulgado como respuesta a la irrupción de un sustituto al proyecto de Ley de Directivas y Bases de la Educación. Examina los cimientos de su memoria, interrogando las razones y los efectos de la predominante explicación por medio de sus relaciones con el Manifiesto de los Pioneros y la Campaña en Defensa de la Escuela Pública. Reconstruye eventos, agentes y significados, comprendiéndolos como una acción colectiva y coordinada de intelectuales para determinados fines políticos. Se concluye realzando el manifiesto en su especificidad e historicidad, recortando equivocaciones historiográficas resultantes de repeticiones sin respaldo y abordajes que produjeron lagunas en su comprensión como evento singular.

INTELECTUALES • DOCUMENTOS • PRENSA • HISTORIA DE LA EDUCACIÓN

LE MANIFESTE DES ÉDUCATEURS DE 1959 REVISITÉ : ÉVÈNEMENT, RÉCITS ET DISCOURS

Résumé

Cet article propose une analyse historique du manifeste des éducateurs « Mais uma vez convocados: manifesto ao povo e ao governo » (1959), rédigé en réponse à un substitutif du projet de la Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação. Sont examinés les fondements de sa mémoire en s’interrogeant sur les raisons et les effets de l’explication prédominante, à travers les relations qu’il entretient avec le Manifesto dos Pioneiros et la Campanha em Defesa da Escola Pública. Sont reconstitués les événements, les agents et les significations, tout en envisageant le manifeste comme une action collective et coordonnée d’intellectuels visant des fins politiques spécifiques. En conclusion, le manifeste est reconnu dans sa spécificité et son historicité, en dissipant les équivoques historiographiques qui résultent de répétitions non fondées et d’approches ayant conduit à des erreurs de compréhension quant à sa légitimité en tant qu’événement singulier.

INTELLECTUELS • DOCUMENTS • PRESSE • HISTOIRE DE L’ÉDUCATION

I SHALL BE DEALING HERE WITH THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED “MAIS UMA VEZ CONVOCADOS: manifesto ao povo e ao governo” [Summoned once again: manifesto to the people and to the government] (1959), authored by Fernando de Azevedo and endorsed by writers, scientists, politicians, teachers, students, journalists and civil servants. Written within the context of the process of legal approval of the Law of Bases and Guidelines of Education, the document appeared in official publications, as well as in commercial newspapers in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro between June 30 and the July 5, 1959. Taking the opportunity to revisit it, I examined here the historiographical foundations of its memory, interrogating the reasons and effects of its oblique explanation, analyzing connections with the 1932 Manifesto and with the Campaign in Defense of Public School. I looked for its meaning as a unique event and as a speech act of an intellectual collective, by giving flesh to its agents; by unveiling ways of doing, meanings and commitments; by highlighting it in its specificity and historicity.¹

To construct the 1959 manifesto as act and product of the social interactions of intellectuals and of the intentional use they made of language and its supports, I drew from the work of Jean-François Sirinelli and Quentin Skinner. From Sirinelli I take the definition of the intellectual’s “variable geometry”, based on its wide and sociocultural meaning, which includes the cultural creators and mediators, as well as on its stricter meaning based on the notion of commitment. In the analysis of this manifesto, in which a collective of educators made public use of their qualifications for political ends, one can see it as a temporary amalgamation of the polymorphic intellectual milieu, with different varieties of commitment, such as leaders, militants, mediators, interlocutors, free riders, and witnesses (Sirinelli, 2003). The French historian offers two analytical tools that were particularly useful in this study of the relations between intellectual and politics, namely the notions of sociability and generation. As to the first of them, I considered the aggregating and creative force around which intellectuals orbit and attract mutually, construct their identities and produce events, as well as the sociability based on the shared experiences of a repertoire comprised of meeting places, exchanges of correspondence, institutions of formation and work, circulation of articles and subscription to manifestos, experiences and affections that generate sensibilities and define choices, giving substance to the cold letter of the subscriptions. These social practices, by transcending individualities and personal beliefs, help to explain the complex and multifaceted motivations of the convergence that marks the eruption of intellectuals as a discernible political body. As to the notion of generation, I considered important to identify in the three events that are mutually connected in historiography the two generations involved, with their specific commitments and roles. I paid attention to the hindsight illusion in which one projects upon a generation the meanings of effects posterior to the events which, before and during the historical process, made it emerge (Sirinelli, 1986; Alves, 2012). Lastly, I share in the value attributed to the singular event in historical narrative. In the case of the 1959 Manifesto, related as it is to a fact established in the history of education, I have questioned the construction by historiography of the perennial meaning of the Manifesto’s text, and of a memory harried by the agglomeration of other events and distorted by the retrospective projection of a political culture.

1 This article is a product of studies conducted within the research projects “Intellectuals and educational thinking as objects of the history of Brazilian education”, sponsored by the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico [National Council for Scientific and Technological Research] (CNPq – Productivity Scholarship PQ2), Process #304757/2017-9; and “Knowledges and practices at the borders: for a transnational history of education (1810 – ...)”, sponsored by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo [São Paulo Research Foundation] (Fapesp – Thematic Project), Process #2018/26699-4.

With regard to Skinner's work, I assimilated procedures with which I could capture the uses made of language to produce sensibilities and effects, such as alarm, indignation, agreement and adhesion. I considered the mutual connection between the discursive dimension of meaning, related to sense and to the information supposedly linked to words and sentences, and the dimension of linguistic action, related to what enunciators are capable of doing through its use (Skinner, 2005; Vieira, 2017). Considering that a text written and published comprises an intentional and reflected act, I identify how its writer and co-authors used language to represent identity and cohesion; to attribute authority to the intellectual condition; to create emotions in the interlocutors and also among the "public opinion"; to select and integrate discourses into a field of meanings. I proceed in such fashion with respect to journalists, who gave in the news a certain "frame" to the Manifesto, its signatories and the news with verbal-visual apparatuses targeted at the masses, endowing them with other meanings.

A dehydrated event

The 1959 Manifesto made its debut as a historical fact in education in 1978, the year of publication of the first edition of Romanelli's *História da educação no Brasil (1930 – 1973)* [History of education in Brazil], Otaíza Romanelli (1978). After defining the contenders as a "handful of lucid educators" versus "conservative leaders" (1986, p. 176), the author reports the emergence of the manifesto, heralding it as "one of the weapons at the disposal . . . of progressive groups" (1986, p. 177) in the struggle against the possibility of transformation into a law of bases and guidelines of a project contrary to liberal and democratic agendas, supposedly founded on the original project, written in 1947 under the tutelage of the old education pioneers. In previous paragraphs, Romanelli (1986, p. 179) was referring to the Campaign in Defense of Public School, which developed in May 1960, to then go back to July 1, 1959 and report on the launching of "a second educators' Manifesto", signed by "189 people, among which educators, intellectuals and students". The change in the order of the facts serves the purpose of explaining the manifesto in the light of the subsequent movement, given that the author draws on the criticism by Barros (1960) to the foundations of the draft law made by "conservative leaderships" (Romanelli, 1986, p. 179), which was, however, targeted at the draft presented in January 1960 by the subcommittee of the House of Representatives, and not at the amendment that Carlos Lacerda had presented to parliament six months previously.

The amendment was based on the complaint about the monopolist slant towards the State of the original 1947 draft law, against which it defended the right of choice of families regarding private and confessional institutions. Based on conclusions from the Congress of Private Education Institutions (Cunha, 1983), it argued that the State should benefit the private initiative rather than official education (Barros, 1960; Romanelli, 1986; Buffa, 1979). Two weeks before its appearance, a piece on newspaper *O Estado de S. Paulo (Oesp)* reported that the manifesto was "all but finished, waiting only to be typed and signed to be published", and that its immediate motivation was to respond to the Lacerda amendment:

The opportunity to launch a new educators' manifesto emerged from the need to configure with greater precision and objectivity the current situation and the principles and trends of education in Brazil in view of the debates raised by the proposal in the federal House of Representatives of the draft law that establishes the bases and guidelines of national education, and by the introduction of an amendment to this legal document. (Manifesto dos educadores em princípio de julho, 1959, June 20, p. 11).²

2 In the interest of legibility, I have chosen to update the orthography in excerpts of historical documents.

On June 23, the newspaper *Correio Paulistano* published excerpts from interviews with “education authorities” Antonio Ferreira de Almeida Jr., who “already knew about the writing of the Manifesto”, and Carlos Correa Mascaro, who “still had no knowledge of the wording employed by his fellow teacher Fernando de Azevedo” (*Escola pública é o único patrimônio para nossa consolidação democrática* [The public school is the only heritage for the consolidation of our democracy], 1959, June 23, p. 9). Almeida Jr., a signatory of the 1932 manifesto and a member of the counseling commissions to the House of Representatives since 1947, reinforced what had been said in the *Oesp* piece with regard to the motivation for launching the 1959 Manifesto:

as the previous legislature was coming to an end, there came against it [the 1947 draft law] an unexpected opposition, under the truly preposterous allegation that its proposal . . . was a threat against the freedom of education . . . [But] such freedom will be in danger . . . if the opposing opinion prevails. Hence the exceptional importance of the manifesto. (*Escola pública é o único patrimônio para nossa consolidação democrática*, 1959, June 23, p. 9).

Educators were going public, breaking with the intellectuals’ isolation, to claim the “right to unite to strengthen their protest” and the “right to outrage” (Charle, 1990, p. 8) in the face of a threat to education, heritage of civilization, and to democracy, a universal value. The *argumentum ad terrorem* is presented to the public opinion even before the publication of the manifesto, in the newspaper *Correio Paulistano* piece, in which Mascaro says that:

The debates that took place in the House of Representatives around this issue are demonstrating that we are taking large strides towards a crisis of the most grievous consequences for the future of our country. . . . we expect that it [the Manifesto] will be a clear statement of Brazil’s liberal conscience in defense of a heritage, the Brazilian public school, that is the only one with which we can really count to consolidate and perfect democracy in our Nation. (*Escola pública é o único patrimônio para nossa consolidação democrática*, 1959, June 23, p. 9).

Seeing that it was a clear reaction to the threat represented by the Lacerda amendment, the manifesto could not have been, as Romanelli (1986) suggests, one of the “progressive” acts against the approval of a draft that was only tabled in the following legislature; rather, as proposed by Cunha (1986), it may have created a climate favorable to the emergence of the Campaign. Romanelli (1986) may have been induced to enclose one event within the other based only on the collection *Diretrizes e bases da educação*, in which Barros (1960), describing “antecedents” to the Campaign, included a copy of the manifesto alongside parliamentary and press documents. However, the organizer of that work, an active militant in the Campaign, had not signed the manifesto. This discrepancy signals to the fact that they were events with similar agendas, but different circumstances, dynamics and protagonists.

The early dehydration of the manifesto as an event is not only due to its reduction to an antecedent of the Campaign in Defense of Public School. “*Mais uma vez convocados*”, as the title suggests, is shadowed by the Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education (1932). The majority of historians and philosophers of education see it that way, and a significant body of works about the manifesto of the pioneers mention the 1959 Manifesto as its direct heir.³ In the only essay that questions this relation, the argument is frustrating: Warde (2004) says that “surely, the title of the 1959 Manifesto does not refer to the 26 signatories of the 1932 Manifesto; indeed, only 11 out of those 26 signed the new Manifesto, which had 178 new signatures ...”. Apart from the doubtful accuracy of the counting, which I shall consider further ahead, the biographies reveal that for at least eight signatories of the 1932 manifesto there was no other option, since by then they had already passed away.

3 This is the interpretation that prevails in the special issue of *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos* entitled “*O manifesto educador: os pioneiros 80 anos depois*” [The educating manifesto: the pioneers 80 years later]. I wish to underline here the instigating approach by Xavier (2015), in which is revealed how the generation of Florestan Fernandes and Darcy Ribeiro appropriated it critically and, in the light of their convictions and within a different context, attributed other meanings to the agendas and concepts in the 1932 Manifesto.

Such association between the two movements was already present at the moment of the eruption of the manifesto as a strategy, with the clear objective of amassing grounding and legitimacy (J. P. F. Carvalho, 2008), having been worked as a point of attraction in the press, even before coming to light. In a piece published by newspaper *Folha da Manhã* on June 18, 1959, suggestively entitled “Manifesto público de educadores para reafirmação de princípios diante dos problemas educacionais” [Public manifesto of educators to reaffirm principles in the face of educational problems], one reads:

A new “Educators Manifesto” fashioned after the famous “Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education in Brazil” [sic], launched in 1932, will be released to the public shortly in this country The document will receive the signatures not only of the subscribers to the 1932 manifesto, but also of other educators, teachers, students and other people from various Brazilian states, all concerned with the future of Education in this country. (Manifesto público de educadores para reafirmação de princípios diante dos problemas educacionais, 1959, June 18, n.p.).

When published in the newspaper *Diário de Notícias*, the manifesto appeared with a title that did not exist in the original, reinforcing the continuity of the manifestos: “New stage in the movement of national reconstruction” (Manifesto dos educadores mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 2, p. 6). Paradoxically, the association with the legendary struggle, which could have buttressed the cause in the eyes of people at the time, ended up weakening the manifesto as an event in the historical narrative of Brazilian education. By designating it as “a second educators’ Manifesto”, Romanelli (1986, p. 179) opened the way to convert this strategy into fact. Compressed, in the end, between two events, the manifesto lost some of its motivations and effects; by the same token, it acquired meanings extrinsic to it.

Signatures and generations: controversial issues

The manifesto was made public on June 30, 1959, at the 68th session of the House of Representatives, by UDN [National Democratic Party] Rep. Luís Viana Filho. On the following day, it was published in the *Diário do Congresso Nacional* (1959, July 1) and in the *Anais da Câmara dos Deputados* (1959, July 1), preceded by a speech by that Representative. In both publications it received 66 signatures. On the same July 1, it appeared in the newspaper *O Estado de S. Paulo (Oesp)* with 15 new signatures, which would bring the count to 81, if it were not for the fact that five signatures had disappeared. The *Oesp* list of signatories has, therefore, 77 names. In the July 2 *Diário de Notícias* the number grows to 133. Also on that day, the manifesto appeared in the Rio de Janeiro *Jornal do Commercio* with 88 signatures (Mea culpa perante o povo e a mocidade, 1959, July 2, p. 1) and, in that same newspaper, on July 5, it was shown without the signatures (Por um ensino público obrigatório e gratuito, 1959, July 5, p. 8). Later on, it was reproduced in the *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos (RBEP)* (Azevedo, 1959), in the April-June volume – retroactive date –, subscribed by 164 signatures, and it also appeared as an appendix to the book *Memórias* by Paschoal Lemme (1988). To complicate things further, an edition by the Ministry for Education (2010), containing the 1932 and the 1959 manifestos, recorded 161 names, with considerable discrepancies, and without informing the original versions.

The oft-repeated information (Romanelli, 1986; Warde, 2004; Bomeny, 2019) that the number of signatories was 189 has no support. When collecting the sources, such number corresponds neither to the lists of June and July 1959, nor to that published in RBEP. The collection by Barros (1960) is the only one with 189 signatures, but it did not occur to him to inform the source, and later historians preferred to repeat this piece of data instead of consulting the original editions. To the historian interested in the manifesto as a public irruption of a collective of intellectuals, the variation in signatures is significant. Chiefly because no text is a set of ideas purged of their supports, is this case significantly varied. Although the contents are not altered, the change in communication vehicles and in signatures, as well as in the framing of the publications, warns us that we are not dealing with *one* single manifesto. We can observe, for instance, that in the *Jornal do Commercio*, the titles that

announce, respectively, the future release and the full text are “Mea culpa perante o povo e a mocidade” [Mea culpa before the people and the youth] (p. 1) e “Por um ensino público obrigatório e gratuito” [For a free and mandatory public education] (1959, July 5, p. 8), through which the journalists added significant meanings. In *Memórias*, in his turn, Paschoal Lemme (1998, p. 295, our emphasis) changed the title to “Manifesto dos educadores *democratas* em defesa do ensino público” [Manifesto of the *democratic* educators in defense of public education].

With respect to the number of signatories, therefore, we are still far from reliable information, but there are grounds for thought and investigation. If we collect the 1959 lists, we have 193 unique names, out of which only 58 appear in all versions of the manifesto. This “hard core” represents little more than twice the number of signatories of the “Manifest of the pioneers” (26), which strengthens the thesis of a continuity between “pioneers” and “educators”. It is worth noting that 21 out of the 133 signatories of the *Diário de Notícias* version are mentioned in the correspondence of Azevedo and Teixeira between 1950 and 1960 (Vidal, 2000), providing evidence of communication and transit between generations, especially in what concerns the personnel at the regional centers of research, well represented in the 1959 manifesto. An investigation with a larger volume of correspondence between the pioneers could reveal a more significant number of names, shared networks, and relations of sociability between the two generations of educators.

The protagonism of the old generation

Despite the aggregating effect of two generations of educators faced with the new manifesto, the documentation gathered here indicate that the 1932 generation was still in 1959 the main creative and articulating force, and that, in addition to Azevedo, other pioneers were protagonists in the emergence of the manifesto, having contributed to its preparation and reading, gathered support for it, and developed political and journalistic strategies.

The correspondence between Anísio Teixeira and Fernando de Azevedo indicates that in 1951 Teixeira showed no enthusiasm for reviving the 1932 movement. The educator from Bahia describes that in March 1951 he received a telegram from Sólton Borges dos Reis expressing the wish to celebrate de 20th anniversary of the “Manifesto of the pioneers”, with the presence of the signatories. In the words of Teixeira (as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 67) to Azevedo, whose opinion on the subject he asks in a letter of March 31, 1951, “the manifesto is, however, an old seed, despite the fact that everything in it is good and sound. The pioneers today are veterans frustrated in their pioneering dreams”. A few months later, however, in a letter of May 18, Teixeira already considers the possibility of a new reformist “movement” with a view to the education reconstruction: “The movement should now aim less at doctrine than in 1932, and should instead be more concrete, more in the order of assessing the situation and planning the development of education in the country”.

As the 1950s came to its last third, Teixeira began to make frequent comments about issues surrounding the project of bases and guidelines (Vidal, 2000). It was the beginning of his growing involvement with the preparation of this document, in planning actions and articulating political forces. He not only made suggestions to the writing of the document, but also in his position as a senior officer of the federal administration he made use of his knowledge of the legal processes, and probably also of family and personal relationships, to gather support for it. At least two of his fellow Bahians and colleagues from College times, the lawyer and journalist Jayme Junqueira Ayres⁴ and the House

4 The CODOC keeps correspondence between Anísio Teixeira and Jaime Junqueira Ayres from the period between 1927 and 1970, which reveal their strong friendship. In a letter of August 13, 1956, Ayres recalls that they had met as freshmen of the Bahia Law School in 1918, and that in his house he “was received as a son”, and that “no other friend was more unconditional and ready than me” (Letter from Jaime Junqueira Ayres to Anísio Teixeira, 1956, August 13).

Representative Luís Viana Filho⁵, had roles to play here. Ayres wrote the assessment that denied the constitutionality of the Lacerda amendment; Viana, who had been defending Teixeira, the National Institute for Educational Studies and Research (Inep) and the Ministry for Education (MEC) from allegations of conducting a “hidden campaign . . . against private education” (Buffa, 1979, p. 23), was in charge of reading the manifesto in the House of Representatives. In a letter of June 26, Teixeira justified to Azevedo his choice, replacing Santiago Dantas:

The discussion has already reached the committee, with the lines of influence given by Carlos Lacerda and Santiago Dantas . . . For this very reason, the manifesto shall not be read by Santiago, who is, in some way, already a protagonist of the drama, but by Luis Viana, who, being more removed, will give to the document the sense of a proclamation of the national conscience, destined to have an effect upon the deciding body, polarized between the two figures from UDN and PTB. (Teixeira, as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 127).

Teixeira also defined the sequence of events that marked the emergence of the manifesto. Displaying his knowledge of the legal process, and also of extreme sensibility to the institutional affects, he instructed Azevedo to follow the steps that would be eventually taken:

As to the publication, I think that the manifesto should only come to light after being read in the House of Representatives. It would be a tribute from the authors to the conscience of the National Legislative. I trust that you will agree. In this case, the manifesto would be read on Tuesday or Wednesday, and published on Wednesday or Thursday. Only on Monday I will be able to tell you when the reading will occur, because *démarches* are needed in the House to ensure the priority. (Teixeira, as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 128).

Teixeira's position as an officer of a federal department gave him access to information indispensable for the timing of the movement, all of it put to good use. In a letter of January 10, 1959, with the seal of the Ministry for Education – National Institute of Pedagogical Studies, he wrote to Azevedo:

The other subject is the Law of Bases and Guidelines. I have postponed making any statement about it until my return from the USA in February. The information I have is that the subject will only be appreciated by the Senate again in March. However, if the discussion is brought forward, it becomes necessary to articulate São Paulo and Rio and, in this sense, I have asked Darcy Ribeiro to be in touch with you. (Teixeira, as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 123).

This last excerpt reveals Teixeira's command of the articulation between São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, which was instrumental for the irruption of the manifesto and for the multiplication of signatures. As to this latter topic, in a letter of June 26, Teixeira (as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 127) informs that “Paschoal [Lemme] [is] visiting the signatories of the 1932 manifesto at their homes, with the addition of those you suggested and others that we have being proposing. I attach to this letter the list of names we have been preparing.” Judging by the volume of adhesions in the *Diário de Notícias*, Lemme had great success in bringing to the movement intellectuals and teachers from the Federal District.

On the day after the reading of the manifesto in the House of Representatives, Teixeira (as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 129) informed Fernando de Azevedo of a third publication: “The *Diário de Notícias* will publish the Manifesto tomorrow – July 2 – in full”, something for which he probably worked personally. In the same letter, he gave an account of the signatures he collected by “documenting telephone calls, telegrams, understandings”, and attaching a list of them. Lastly, Teixeira's thorough care and political dexterity would influence the contents of the manifesto. In a letter of June 26, having

5 Luís Viana Filho and Teixeira met probably at the Law School in 1924. Representative from Bahia to the Constitutional Assembly of 1946, Viana was reelected for successive terms between 1950 and 1966.

received an early copy of the text, he suggested, and had it accepted, that the expression “let teach anyone who wants to, and however they can” should be removed, since outside the context in which he himself had used that expression previously it could sound contradictory (Teixeira, as quoted in Vidal, 2000, p. 127).

J. P. F. Carvalho (2008, p. 1) confirms through the analysis of the correspondence between Paschoal Lemme and Fernando de Azevedo, that not only the idea of launching a new manifesto was being rehearsed in the 1950s, but that “the concern with making it into a document-memoir was present at every step of its development, until its public announcement”. The author found out that Lemme, frustrated with the lack of articulation and with the apathy of educators, was trying to persuade Azevedo to write and publish a manifesto that resumed the agendas of that man who had been their “great leader”. J. P. F. Carvalho (2008) points out that in May 1959 Lemme obtained the agreement of the “cardinal”, who proposed a division of tasks. He refused it because he did not want to appear before the public as a protagonist:

the movement could be somehow damaged if it became known that the manifesto was created with the direct participation of people “committed” to certain kinds of ideas (which is my case) or of others who are strongly opposed by trends of ideas with great prevalence in this country (as is the case of Teixeira with respect to the Catholics). (Lemme, as quoted in J. P. F. Carvalho, 2008, p. 6).

As J. P. F. Carvalho (2008) suggests, although sacrificing the authorship in favor of the movement, Lemme’s protagonism is revealed in the articulations, ideas, and in the tone the document eventually assumed. In a letter, Lemme suggested to Azevedo names of signatories of the 1932 manifesto that could subscribe to the new one (Carvalho, 2008, p. 14); later on, he made efforts to collect signatures for the publications in the Rio de Janeiro newspapers. His invisible co-authorship finds expression in the similarities between what he wrote to the author and the final document, such as the arguments that the cause would be above political parties and that the defense of public school was not a leftist platform. Moreover, his considerations were accepted concerning the fact that the manifesto should be sufficiently broad to garner the support of “various currents of progressive educators, independently of their personal, political or religious convictions”, and that it should be purged of the “character of religious struggle or of imposition of ideologies” (as quoted in Carvalho, 2008, p. 8).

The Manifesto’s discursive resources

It is evident that much care was taken with the language used in the public demonstration of their outrage, of their principles and values. The educators were aware of the fact that the value of their cause would not impose itself, and therefore made use of enunciation devices to attract support, circumvent controversies, simulate neutrality. The “modes of saying” appear as an act of speech that the exegeses, blinded to the language by the beauty of the cause, usually overlook. In the introductory words, the manifesto expresses the will to “reestablish the truth” in no uncertain terms, because duty does not choose occasion (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8). It warns that there would be no vehemence or brutality, that “men of spirit” are not capable of it, nor do they need it; it points out that signatories have no passions or other interests, nor do they print controversies or personal animosities. Masters of their words, bearers of reason, they present themselves under the effigy of the contemporary intellectual who, making room in the public sphere between government and people, takes them as interlocutors. From this space at the margins of politics they ask for audience and adhesion, so that they can warn of the evil that lies ahead. They are not unnerved by the “fear” and the “threat” with which some try to hide “the needs and real tendencies of education in the contemporary world” (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8).

Nevertheless, the fear exists, and the text attempts to overcome it. The educators speak in the name of principles. Their cause is greater, and their principles universal: truth and liberty impose onto

them the duty and compel them to manifestation; demand that they submit to public judgment the “points of view on problems of the gravity and complexity of those that face education” (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8). The manifesto is presented as a reveal: it decomposes the problem, removes the disguise, unravels, untangles, reestablishes, reconfigures and restores; it reconstitutes the facts and the truth. Unlike the 1932 Manifesto, which established the controversy, the 1959 Manifesto manipulates arguments closer to common sense, supported by facts purportedly evident. The educators present themselves as technical people indispensable to the solution of “difficulties inextricable to those who cannot aspire to anything in terms of teaching, and who had not acquired through daily practice and study special knowledge and experience in administration (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8).

This expertise was corroborated to the House in the opening words given by Luís Viana Filho, in which he emphasized the high quality of the manifestants, “figures of the highest authority in the field of education” (Anais da câmara dos deputados, 1959, July 1, p. 496), their conscience of duty and patriotism:

It is to be expected that such great and valuable contribution . . . will be received . . . as an act of authentic patriotism from these educators who could not rest indifferent, lest they be accused tomorrow by the coming generations of not going to the trenches they were obliged to man. (Anais da câmara dos deputados, 1959, July 1, p. 497).

The obsession to convince their interlocutors about the authority and equity of the statements reaches its peak in the convergence of the discourse and its first printed version, the July 1 publication in *Oesp*. According to the manifesto, the measures of “freedom of teaching” that exempted the Brazilian State from its duties had caused by 1879 the “wrecking of higher education” through the neglect of academia and through the “electric certification” of professionals and Bachelors of Law; by 1911, a “catastrophe in every aspect, including the moral one” (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, p. 8). Both attempts would have been so fruitless that the government had to retreat. The basis for this argument is a citation from the same *Oesp*, under the title of “Paid freedom of teaching”. The suppression from the authorship of Almeida Jr., one of the signatories and pioneer associated since 1947 to the legal process of approval of the LDB (Law of Bases and Guidelines of Education), neutralizes the discourse and turns the newspaper into the source of opinions “authorized and above suspicion” (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8).

It is rather interesting to observe the device of labeling as “above suspicion” the opinions of *Oesp*, precisely because they were “authorized”. Even more intriguing is the suppression, only from the list of signatories published in *Oesp*, of the name of the editor-chairman of that newspaper, Júlio Mesquita Filho, whose name in the other publications of the manifesto appeared just below that of the main author of the text. Just like the hiding of the authorship, this omission served the purpose of simulating the impartiality of the vehicle, whose “unsuspectedness”, however, does not survive an examination of the lists, which contain the names of Paulo Duarte, a trusted aide to the patriarch Júlio de Mesquita, editor-in-chief of *Oesp* until 1950 and director of *Revista Anhembi* (Catani, 2009), engaged in the struggle against the Church’s interests and of education entrepreneurs (Buffa, 1979); and of specialists like Fernando de Azevedo, who wrote in *Oesp* since the 1920s; Laerte Ramos de Carvalho, responsible since 1948 for the section on “news and information” who, in 1959, wrote several notes about the LDB and “freedom of teaching” (Bontempi Jr., 2015), stating the position of the newspaper, which, not by accident, punctuate the manifesto.

The political convictions of the signatories were also hidden. Only in the 10th paragraph the political-partisan meaning of education is brought up, but as a deceiving commonplace:

the right supports, in general, the free school, and the left supports the public school, and because it has been often like that, the tendency is to shift the question that should be put in terms of the general interest and above parties into the terrain of a religious struggle, due to its professional implications, – which is to be avoided by any means, – or of a struggle between political groups, equally damaging to the debate. (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8).

The manifestants do not speak for any parties and State, and affirm, in order to avoid the partisanship of the debate, that left and right would have allied in the past “many times” in defense of the public school. According to the manifesto, “we who have signed this manifesto are all republican and democratic educators, faithful to the highest values of the liberal tradition” (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8). Equally intent on bypassing aversions among Catholics, the manifesto brings the argument of Dominican priest Henri Didon, designated as opposed to the idea of turning religion into an instrument of politics, and who would have said: “nothing in the Catholic faith, nothing in the ecclesiastical authority is opposed to a liberal, republican and democratic opinion” (Mais uma vez convocados, 1959, July 1, p. 8). It is obvious that the author took great care to avoid being seen as antireligious or contrary to the Catholic doctrine, but the use of the words of a priest serves the purpose in the manifesto of targeting its opposers with “friendly fire”.

The opposing Manifesto

Even with every rhetorical care taken by the educators, the reaction to their manifesto was prompt. Thwarted, *Oesp* resigned to publish, not on page 8 as it did on July 1, what on page 21, a manifesto with 187 signatories, designated as “teachers, militant educators and intellectuals” entitled “Manifesto sobre as bases da educação” [Manifesto about the bases of education] (1959, July 26, p. 21). Before reproducing the text in full, the writer introduced:

On the 1st of the current month, “*Estado*” published under the title “Mais uma vez convocados” [Summoned once again] the manifesto of the educators that spoke against the attempt to pass on to private education the larger responsibilities for education in Brazil; an attempt that the signatories considered substantiated in an amendment to the draft of the Law of Bases and Guidelines of National Education, which is now following legal procedures in the House of Representatives. Another manifesto has just come to light expressing points of view contrary to those of the previous manifesto and, under a principle of equanimity, “*Estado*” is publishing it here. (Manifesto sobre as bases da educação, 1959, July, 26, p. 21).

Although it has been referred to by Buffa (1979), the opposing manifesto never deserved the attention of historiography, perhaps because its contents were no different from what is usually abstracted as the “thinking” of Catholic laypeople and education businessmen. However, obscuring it as a collective action regarding the production of knowledge and of memory creates a significant gap concerning the identities of the agents who opposed the first manifesto. It is crucial to lay the opposing manifestos side-by-side, so that we could at once dispel doubts and retrospective projections through which names have been interestedly shown or hidden.

In the historiography of Brazilian education, the manifesto “Mais uma vez convocados” has always been analyzed for its contents end, understandably, dealt with by authors that agreed with its more immediate cause. It is not an exaggeration to say that Barros (1960, p. XIX), who embodied the 1959 Manifesto in the Campaign in Defense of Public School, established the successful interpretation of the opposing groups and conceptions that was to be replicated until it became canonical.

The struggle that takes place in the country today is not, as some specious confessional and commercial interests would have it, between public and private education, between the official school and the private school, between an alleged freedom of teaching and State monopoly, but rather between two philosophies, between two mentalities, between the “two Brazils” of which Jacques Lambert speaks.

The reviling of the opposers to the Campaign can also be found in a text by Florestan Fernandes (1960b, p. 83), in which he says that the “principles” they professed to defend were nothing more than “disguises” for “ideological or pecuniary interests”. This reviling, understandably reproduced in the heat of the hour for political reasons, has, however, contaminated the historiography ineradicably since

the seminal book by Romanelli (1986). For this reason, to this day the biographies of educators that took side with the “conservative leadership” (Dias, 2002; Drummond, 2002; Duarte, 2019; Rabello, 2019; Warde, 2002) against the “lucid educators” omit their subscription to the manifesto (which in its turn was erased) opposed to the Campaign.

The liberals and the socialists: a historiographical reinterpretation

The educators that subscribed to the manifesto and the militants of the Campaign have been signaled differently by historiography, even if in that context their actions and positions were aligned. Among the reasons for that, I note here the intervention of the historiography of education produced during the military dictatorship in Brazil, a historiography that projected onto those events meanings extracted from later facts of the Brazilian political history. This retrospective and totalizing signification, in which the 1959 Manifesto floats between the end of *Estado Novo* and the 1964 military coup, appears in this typical passage:

To some extent, the 1959 Manifesto gives sequence to the 1932 Manifesto, complements it and updates it with a historical vision from 20 years later. The ruptures that would occur following the civil-military movement of 1964, affecting society as a whole, were already visible throughout the 1950s. Those years had then, contradictorily, the presence of the pre-1930 past, its own temporality, and the future, the post-1964 under construction. . . . The political right defending free teaching, and the left the public (state) teaching, with the former more under the cover of a religious struggle. (Sanfelice, 2007, p. 544-549).⁶

The most distorted effect of this superposition of different times can perhaps be seen in the mistakes made by Pasinato (2011) and Lima (2017), who pinpoint Lourenço Filho and Paulo Freire among the signatories of the 1959 Manifesto, ignoring the fact that they did not sign it. Apparently, the former name was extracted from the 1932 list, whereas the latter, who would only acquire fame after the Angicos experience of the 1960s, was retrospectively associated to the progressive thinking that historiography eventually attributed to the manifesto and to the Campaign. By contrast, no article highlighted the presence of Miguel Reale, who appears in every list of signatories of the manifesto. This is most certainly due to the fact that on the occasion of the political intervention of the civil-military coup over the intellectual field, the integralist magistrate not only stood on the right, but actually became a collaborator of the new regime, whereas Paulo Freire, persecuted and exiled, became an icon of the Brazilian left.

It has been seen that Roque Spencer, in the heat of the hour, drew support from the sociological thesis formulated by Jacques Lambert in *Os dois Brasis* [The two Brazils], which affirmed the coexistence of “different historical ages” in the country. According to the author (1969, p. 105), “between the old Brazil and the new there are centuries of distance; through the years, the difference in the rhythms of evolution allowed the formation of two societies, different from each other because they are not contemporary”. The appropriation of the categories “modern” and “archaic” to define the positions on the issue of the LDB constitutes the thread that links the movement of renewal to the Campaign in Defense of Public School, because it updates the well-accepted explanation that Fernando de Azevedo (1971) consecrated for the 1920s and 1930s that the debate around the new school could be reduced to the opposition between “pioneers” and “Catholics”, the “new” and the “old” (Carvalho, 1989).

Grounded in the thesis that the historical formation of a complex, more populous, urbanized and industrialized society, would demand new educational forms and contents (Bontempi Jr., 2005),

6 This premise is present in *História da Educação Brasileira*, an editorial success of the 1980s. Ribeiro (1992, p. 146), whose eighth chapter has as its subtitle “The meaning of the crisis: the period before the 1964 coup”, omits the 1959 manifesto and explains the ideas of the “defenders of public school” referring to the 1932 manifesto.

Azevedo exalts the reformers for their lucid articulation with the present and future times, and condemns the Catholics for their insistence in fighting for values belonging to a past that the nation needed to overcome. Likewise, in the voluminous controversy against the Lacerda amendment, the defenders of public school represented themselves as knowers and bearers of the values and educational measures suitable to the modern, urban, technological and industrial world, whose adoption would be necessary if societies wished to be advanced, developed and democratic (Barros, 1960).

The trend towards the democratization of education, a unifying motto of educator intellectuals of 1959 and 1960, was understood by Florestan Fernandes (1960a, p. 145-155) as a “requisite of the democratic social order” and as a “factor for its improvement”. Curbed or undermined by the whole of the previous history, this trend, if freed, would “*adapt* the teaching system inherited from the aristocratic past to the educational demands of the present” (1960a, p. 159, our emphasis). To Fernandes (1960a, p. 159, our emphasis), the democratization of teaching would “*adjust* education to the economic, political, social and cultural demands of the societal order linked to the democratic regime, to mechanized economy and to the industrial-technological civilization”. It is, as in Azevedo, a question of taking action to synchronize the educational movement to the development of society, so as to accomplish the sociological interpretation of their relation (Bontempi Jr., 2005); as in Azevedo and Barros, the opposers are resisting to what is coming and defending an anachronistic order.

The use of the verbs “adapt” and “adjust” when referring to the relations between education and society is central in Fernandes’ militant production of the 1950s, when he was a student and then professor at Universidade de São Paulo (USP), and in his position as someone “indebted to the functionalist sociological tradition”, through which he looked for a scientificity attuned “to the process of modernization that the Brazilian society underwent” (Ridenti, 1998, p. 172). According to Ridenti (2003, p. 201), in the intellectual circles and social movements to which they associated, there prevailed “the struggle against the remaining power of rural oligarchies and their political and cultural manifestations”, a modernizing optimism and the rising “revolutionary impulse fed by social movements and filled with ambiguities in the proposals for the Brazilian, bourgeois-democratic, or socialist, revolution (for national liberation), with varying intermediate shades”.

After the latter half of the 1960s, the extremity of the civil-military coup and the repression that ensued imposed to the social movements, and to the student movement in particular, the furling of their banners, at the same time that it made more acute the polarization among intellectuals, pressed to define their positions between right and left. In the university milieu, as described by Maria Luísa Santos Ribeiro (1999, p. 124-125), that was the moment when “many of the old militants turned more to the internal dimension of the struggle, which represented making changes to the structure of higher education”, that is to say, to promote the formation of educators “in the light of the interests and objective and subjective conditions of the majority of the Brazilian population”. The turn of the 1970s saw the creation of new graduate programs in universities relatively sheltered from the purging promoted by the regime, for example, the MA in Philosophy of Education at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, to which leftist teachers and students came to complete their formation under the supervision of Casemiro dos Reis Filho and Dermeval Saviani. Maria Luísa Ribeiro (1999, p. 125) defined as a turning point that marked her generation the opposition to an idealist conception of the Brazilian reality:

Thus, it became clear to some (me included) that, from the philosophical point of view, what was fundamentally being questioned was an idealist conception about the Brazilian reality. It was then necessary to seek a more rigorous theoretical formation of materialist-dialectical basis, notwithstanding the censorship after the 1964 coup.

This generational attitude followed the tendency, during the time of the Cold War, of leftist movements and parties, to which adhered intellectuals and artists who valued the action to change

history and to promote the construction of the *new man*, whose model was to be found in the past, in protected ethnic and social roots, safe from the evils of capitalist modernization. “In summary, one sought in the past an authentic popular culture to build a new nation, at the same time modern and non-alienated, ultimately socialist” (Ridenti, 2003, p. 198).

More than one decade after having concluded the MA in that graduate program, Paulo Ghiraldelli Jr. (1999, p. 71) criticized his generation for the ambition of breaking away from ideology and revealing history and the objective social world. For Ghiraldelli, the historians of education oriented by historical materialism saw themselves as possessors of the freedom and radicality inherent to the “epistemologically privileged pole of critique”, that is, to the base of the social pyramid. Established in that way on the side of the people, in the self-conferred quality of “‘functional intellectuals’, as Gramsci would say it” (Ribeiro, 1999, p. 139), historiography assumed its militant character and accomplished, with respect to the memory and history of Brazilian education, dislocations that brought new meanings to the movement of renewal of the 1920s and 1930s and to the manifestations of educators of the late 1950s. Briefly speaking, in those new narratives the “pioneers” found themselves pushed into the thick quagmire of absences and failures of the republican educational past, and accused of the same aristocratic conservatism with which they vilified their adversaries; at the same time, a retrospective reading of the political culture of the 1950s in the light of positions taken after the next decade by those who joined together in favor of the public school allowed their tripartite separation, in which “socialists” were saved from the swamp that would swallow all the others into the murky side of history.

The first step toward this curve was taken even before the first dissertation had been presented to the graduate programs, in the combat texts published by Florestan Fernandes during the Campaign in Defense of Public School. In “A democratização do ensino” [The democratization of teaching], Fernandes (1960b, p. 156), in order to support his thesis about the inadequacy of Brazilian society to the demands for adjustment in favor of democratic education, asserts that between 1889 and 1950 “the Republic did not succeed in the actual pedagogical sphere. It failed to impose new ideals and new educational values that aimed at organizing school according to the new model of man demanded by the democratic social order”. By doing that, he threw the first stone against the edifice of the positive memory of the “renovating” movement of new school, gradually deconstructed under the stream of works that consolidated the history and memory of Brazilian education according to historical materialism, which would become hegemonic in the graduate programs in education between the 1970s and 1980s.

That historiography embraced the thesis that, as professional educators, the *escolanovistas* [supporters of the New School movement] would have reduced the legacy of a broad program of educational action, in which educational questions were examined in the light of historical-social foundations, to a formation program with a “technicist” bias, in which those questions were treated as a specialized and alienated domain. Bent on proving in history Fernandes’ reading that the ruling classes had never allowed the dissemination of a liberating education for the popular classes, this generation inverted the meaning of the action of the pioneers from progressist to conservatist and identified their pedagogical statements as an ideological veil hiding from view the rearticulation of the bourgeois hegemony through which, once again, the proposal of a school for the people was to be denied (Brandão, 1999).

As to the memory of the movements from 1959 and 1960, another of its significations is expressed in the narrative of Saviani (1996) about Fernandes’ participation in the Campaign in Defense of the Public School. Aiming to highlight the “unity and coherence” of the sociologist’s trajectory, Saviani (1996, p. 83) manages to set him apart from that collective of intellectuals, through the classification of the participants into “three distinct groups: the liberal-pragmatists, the liberal-idealists, and those

of socialist inspiration” (1996, p. 79). According to his categories, the first group came from the new school movement; the second one was comprised of USP academics with connections to the newspaper *O Estado de S. Paulo*, namely, Roque Spencer, Laerte Ramos de Carvalho and João Eduardo Villalobos, apart from Julio de Mesquita Filho himself; the third group included Florestan Fernandes, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Octavio Ianni and Wilson Cantoni, and would distinguish itself for understanding “education in its reciprocal relations with society, meaning that the educative process should aim not just at adaptation, but at social transformation” (Saviani, 1996, p. 80). By emphasizing the differences within a wide front, this interpretation not only immobilizes the conscience movement of a whole generation, but also minimizes the differences between what Fernandes thought in 1959 and 1962, when he wrote his combat texts, and in 1966, when, under the impact of the State coup, he recompiled and prefaced his texts of combat and controversy in *Educação e Sociedade no Brasil* [Education and society in Brazil] (Fernandes, 1966).

The deterioration of Fernandes’ identification with the “liberal-idealists” may not have occurred during the Campaign, as suggested by Saviani, but, particularly in relation to Roque Spencer and Laerte Ramos de Carvalho, during a controversy which, as USPIans, they sustained around the reformation of the University statutes between 1962 and 1969. Fernandes, closer to the agendas of the students’ movement than to the conceptions of chairholders, was one of those who, having taken part in parity Joint Committees to reform the statutes, criticized the idealist conception, “alienated and elitist” of the report that the restructuring committee, chaired by his former colleague in the Campaign, Roque Spencer, presented in June 1968, after 18 months of work. As it is known, the report was “overrun” by Federal Law 5540/1968 and by State Decree 52.326/1969, which set the statutes of USP (Cunha, 1988, p. 150), as were also the proposals of parity commissions, motivated by various kinds of frustrations that revealed or accentuated irreconcilable divergences between the agents positioned not only in opposite ends of the political spectrum, but in different categories, careers and institutional positions of power within the university world: students, teaching assistants, chairholders (Cunha, 1988).

As to Laerte Ramos de Carvalho, with whom Fernandes kept quite close personal relations, the distancing was marked by the disastrous experience of his rectorship of the Universidade de Brasília, in which he appeared as protagonist of the firing of “subversives” and, by extension, of the turbulent process that led to the burying of Anísio Teixeira’s and Darcy Ribeiro’s dream for the university (Bontempi Jr., 2018). It seems likely that it was in those moments, and not during the time of their common militancy in defense of the public school, that the profound divergences between Fernandes and the liberal-idealists Roque Spencer and Laerte Ramos emerged. The rear-view mirror outlook, however, made us project onto the manifesto and campaign the differences radicalized in the time of the dictatorship, thereby defining the defense of public school as a platform of the socialist left, in contrast, it must be said, to the liberal-democratic consensus that the collective of intellectuals stated in the 1959 Manifesto.

Final considerations

Through the 1959 Manifesto, a collective of educators created a cause, chose interlocutors and adversaries, engendered a discourse calculated to attract adhesions and, above all, to impact the public opinion, intimidate opponents and pressure the government and representatives to take side with their principles and intents. These strategies, collective and dynamic, were comprised of astuteness in the managing of time, of communication vehicles and public acts; statements and omissions in convenient occasions; subscriptions added and suppressed; citations and recurrences with a view to studied effects. In its different materializations, the manifesto addressed strategies of production of identities, authority, exemption, consensus etc., whose implications exceed the boundaries of exegesis, and open space to problems of intellectual history and of the history of political thought, related to

the Manifesto as a singular event; to the force fields that were created around it – and against it – and that influenced the agents in action in the press and in the public opinion, in the Legislative, in civil organizations and in education institutions.

Based on the study by J. P. F. Carvalho (2008), I suggested that, although there is consensus that the 1940-1960 generation of Laerte Ramos de Carvalho, Roque Spencer, Darcy Ribeiro and Florestan Fernandes led the Campaign in Defense of the Public School, the pioneers of 1932 were the protagonists of the 1959 Manifesto. I pointed out, however, that the strategy of presenting it as “a second manifesto” in order to give it more legitimacy before the public opinion ended up reinforcing in the eyes of historians of education its dependent character, which is complemented by its reduction to an antecedent to the 1960 Campaign and to what was going to happen in the country after 1964. I expounded, also, the hypothesis that the discursive devices used in the manifesto and the news-propaganda apparatus that accompanied its irruption have entranced later historians who, having assumed its agenda as “progressive” or “socialist”, took upon themselves the task of, affectively and retrospectively, distributing subjects and values in the opposing fields, and of seeing it as the bearer of a timeless message, instead of conferring it a historicity that refers the event and its agents to their own time, vis-à-vis their effective antagonists.

I evaluated the impact of texts and events, both on the historiographical production and on the political culture of later times, in order to indicate that the years that lie between the appearance of the 1959 Manifesto and the university reform of 1968 display a remarkable wealth of significant events for the political sensibility of intellectuals involved in them or that were affected by them. To unshrink this brief period of time, fragmenting the scale and the explicative coverage of the historical time usually employed to explain that political culture and the historiography onto which it is projected, allows the emergence of the immediate resonance between the subjects of events, who relatively quickly reconfigured the Brazilian intellectual field, and particularly those that were more closely involved with education and its history.

References

- Alves, C. (2012). Jean-François Sirinelli e o político como terreno da história cultural. In E. M. T. Lopes, & L. M. Faria Filho (Org.), *Pensadores sociais e a história da educação II* (pp. 111-134). Autêntica.
- Anais da Câmara dos Deputados* (1959, julho 1). O sr. Luiz Vianna (para uma comunicação). 68a Sessão da Câmara dos Deputados, de 30 de junho de 1959, pp. 496-512. https://imagem.camara.leg.br/dc_20b.asp#/
- Azevedo, F. (1959). Mais uma vez convocados (Manifesto ao povo e ao Governo). *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 31(74), 8-24.
- Azevedo, F. (1971). *A cultura brasileira* (5a. ed.). Melhoramentos.
- Barros, R. S. M. (Org.). (1960). *Diretrizes e bases da educação*. Pioneira.
- Bomeny, H. Manifesto “Mais uma vez convocados”. <https://cpdoc.fgv.br/producao/dossies/JK/artigos/Educao/ManifestoMaisUmaVez>.
- Bontempi Jr., B. (2005). A presença visível e invisível de Durkheim na historiografia da educação brasileira. In L. M. Faria Filho (Org.), *Pensadores sociais e história da educação* (pp. 47-62). Autêntica.
- Bontempi Jr., B. (2015). *Laerte Ramos de Carvalho e a constituição da História e Filosofia da Educação como disciplina acadêmica*. Edufu.
- Bontempi Jr., B. (2018). Laerte Ramos de Carvalho (1922-1972). A educação pela presença. In T. C. Rego. *Educadores brasileiros: Ideias e ações de nomes que marcaram a educação nacional* (pp. 197-208). CRV.
- Brandão, Z. (1999). *A inteligência educacional: Um percurso com Paschoal Lemme por entre as memórias e as histórias da escola nova no Brasil*. Edusf.
- Buffa, E. (1979). *Ideologias em conflito: Escola pública e escola privada*. Cortez & Moraes.

- Carta de Jaime Junqueira Ayres a Anísio Teixeira (1956, agosto 13). Correspondência entre Jaime Junqueira Aires e Anísio Teixeira sobre assuntos diversos. Arquivo do CPDOC. Classificação: AT c 1927.09.26/2. Série: c – Correspondência. Data de produção: 26/09/1927 a 19/06/1970. Quantidade de documentos: 23 (67 folhas).
- Carvalho, J. P. F. (2008, maio). *A origem do Manifesto dos educadores mais uma vez convocados, de 1959, na correspondência de alguns de seus signatários*. [Apresentação de comunicação]. Congresso Brasileiro de História da Educação. Aracaju, Brasil. Unit/Ufes, pp. 1-15.
- Carvalho, M. M. C. (1989). O novo, o velho, o perigoso: relendo a cultura brasileira. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 71, 29-35.
- Catani, A. M. (2009). *A Revista de Cultura Anhembi (1950-62): Um projeto elitista para elevar o nível cultural no Brasil*. Eduem.
- Charle, C. (1990). *Naissance des "intellectuels" (1880-1900)*. Minuit.
- Cunha, L. A. (1983). *A universidade crítica: O ensino superior na República Populista*. Francisco Alves.
- Cunha, L. A. (1988). *A universidade reformanda*. Francisco Alves.
- Diário do Congresso Nacional* (1959, julho 1). 68a Sessão da Câmara dos Deputados, do dia 30 de junho de 1959, pp. 3691-3695.
- Dias, J. A. Carlos Pasquale. (2002). In M. L. A. Fávero, & J. M. Britto (Org.), *Dicionário de educadores no Brasil: Da colônia aos dias atuais* (2a. ed., pp. 225-229). Editora UFRJ/MEC-Inep-Comped.
- Drummond, A. A. José Carlos de Mello e Souza. (2002). In M. L. A. Fávero, & J. M. Britto (Org.), *Dicionário de educadores no Brasil: Da colônia aos dias atuais* (2a. ed., pp. 587-594). Editora UFRJ/MEC-Inep-Comped.
- Duarte, R. A. (2019). Carolina Ribeiro: o lugar da mulher na educação em São Paulo. In D. G. Vidal, & P. P. Vicentini (Org.), *Mulheres inovadoras no ensino (São Paulo, séculos XIX e XX)* (pp. 83-96). Fino Traço.
- Escola pública é o único patrimônio para nossa consolidação democrática. (1959, junho 23). *Correio Paulistano*, p. 9. Arquivo IEB-USP. Fundo Fernando de Azevedo/ Cx. 085/Coleção Atividades Profissionais/FA-D9/1, 33.
- Fernandes, F. (1960a). A posição dos escritores. In R. S. M. Barros (Org.), *Diretrizes e bases da educação nacional* (pp. 85-92). Pioneira.
- Fernandes, F. (1960b). A democratização do ensino. In R. S. M. Barros (Org.), *Diretrizes e bases da educação nacional* (pp. 154-165). Pioneira.
- Fernandes, F. (1966). *Educação e sociedade no Brasil*. Dominus/Edusp.
- Ghiraldelli Jr., P. (1999). Posso conversar sobre “história das idéias” e “história da educação” a partir do neopragmatismo de Richard Rorty? In C. Monarcha (Org.), *História da educação brasileira: A formação do campo* (pp. 65-94). Unijuí.
- Lambert, J. (1969). *Os dois Brasil* (5a. ed.). Companhia Editora Nacional.
- Lemme, P. (1988). *Memórias* (Vol. 4). Inep.
- Lima, V. L. S. (2017). Os manifestos de 1932 e 1959 e suas contribuições para as diretrizes e bases da educação. *Revista Communitas*, 1(1), 247-267.
- Mais uma vez convocados. Manifesto ao povo e ao governo. (1959, julho 1). *O Estado de S. Paulo*, p. 8.
- Manifesto dos educadores em princípio de julho. (1959, junho 20). *O Estado de S. Paulo*, p. 11 (recorte). Arquivo IEB-USP. Fundo Fernando de Azevedo/Cx. 085/Coleção Atividades Profissionais/FA-D9/1, 31.
- Manifesto dos educadores mais uma vez convocados. (1959, julho 2). *Diário de Notícias*, p. 6, segunda seção.

- Manifesto público dos educadores para reafirmação de princípios diante dos problemas educacionais. (1959, junho 18). *Folha da Manhã*, s.p. (recorte). Arquivo IEB-USP. Fundo Fernando de Azevedo/Cx. 085/ Coleção Atividades Profissionais/FA-D9/1, 30.
- Manifesto sobre as bases da educação. (1959, julho 26). *O Estado de S. Paulo*, p. 21.
- Manifestos dos pioneiros da educação nova (1932) e dos educadores (1959). (2010). Fernando de Azevedo et al. Recife, PE: Fundação Joaquim Nabuco; Massangana.
- Manuscrito de Fernando de Azevedo: “Manifesto dos educadores mais uma vez convocados”, publicado em vários jornais e revistas em 1959 (primeiro exemplar). 24 p. (datilografado). Arquivo IEB-USP. Fundo Fernando de Azevedo/Cx. 085/Coleção Atividades Profissionais/FA-D9/1, 14a.
- Mea culpa perante o povo e a mocidade. (1959, julho 2). *Jornal do Commercio*, p. 1.
- Pasinato, D. (2011). Importância do manifesto de 1959 para a educação brasileira. *Revista Semina*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Por um ensino público obrigatório e gratuito. (1959, julho 5). *Jornal do Commercio*, p. 8-9.
- Rabello, R. S. (2019). Noemy da Silveira Rudolfer e a vanguarda da psicologia educacional. In D. G. Vidal, & P. P. Vicentini (Org.), *Mulheres inovadoras no ensino (São Paulo, séculos XIX e XX)* (pp. 219-240). Fino Traço.
- Ribeiro, M. L. S. (1992). *História da educação brasileira: Organização escolar* (12a. ed.). Cortez.
- Ribeiro, M. L. S. (1999). A reconstrução do texto histórico em educação no contexto da sociedade brasileira: minha experiência nesse processo. In C. Monarcha (Org.), *História da educação brasileira: A formação do campo* (pp. 121-146). Unijuí.
- Ridenti, M. (2003). Cultura e política brasileira: enterrar os anos 60? In E. R. Bastos, M. Ridenti, & D. Rolland (Org.), *Intelectuais: Sociedade e política, Brasil-França* (pp. 197-212). Cortez.
- Ridenti, M. (1998). Um romantismo revolucionário em Florestan Fernandes? In P. H. Martinez (Org.), *Florestan ou o sentido das coisas* (pp. 169-176). Boitempo.
- Romanelli, O. O. (1986). *História da educação no Brasil (1930-1977)* (8a. ed.). Vozes.
- Sanfelice, J. L. (2007). O Manifesto dos educadores (1959) à luz da história. *Revista Educação e Sociedade*, 28(99), 542-557.
- Saviani, D. (1996). Florestan Fernandes e a educação. *Estudos Avançados*, 10(26), 71-87.
- Sirinelli, J.-F. (1986). Le hasard ou la nécessité? Une histoire enchantier: l’histoire des intellectuels. *Vingtième Siècle, Revue d’Histoire*, 9, 97-108.
- Sirinelli, J.-F. (2003). Os intelectuais. In R. Rémond. *Por uma história política* (pp. 231-269). FGV.
- Skinner, Q. (2005). *Visões da política: Sobre os métodos históricos*. Difel.
- Vidal D. G. (Org.). (2000). *Na batalha da educação: Correspondência entre Anísio Teixeira e Fernando de Azevedo (1929-1971)*. Edusf.
- Vieira, C. E. (2017). Contextualismo linguístico: contexto histórico, pressupostos teóricos e contribuições para a escrita da história da educação. *Revista Brasileira de História da Educação*, 17(3) (46), 31-55.
- Warde, M. J. (2002). Noemy da Silveira Rudolfer. In M. L. A. Fávero, & J. M. Britto (Org.), *Dicionário de educadores no Brasil: Da colônia aos dias atuais* (2a. ed., pp. 860-866). Editora UFRJ/MEC-Inep-Comped.
- Warde, M. J. (2004). Legado e legatários: Questões sobre o Manifesto dos pioneiros da educação nova. In M. C. Xavier (Org.), *Manifesto dos pioneiros da educação: Um legado educacional em debate* (pp. 221-240). Editora FGV.
- Xavier, L. N. (2015). O manifesto de 1932 e a democracia como valor universal. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 96 (n. especial), 133-156.

Data availability statement

The data underlying the research text are reported in the article.

How to cite this article

Bontempi Jr., B. (2021). O Manifesto dos Educadores de 1959 revisitado: Evento, narrativas e discursos. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 51, Article, e07278. <https://doi.org/10.1590/198053147278>

Received on: APRIL 6, 2020 | Approved for publication on: OCTOBER 7, 2020



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons license BY-NC.