

Guerreiro Ramos, reader of Eric Voegelin: post-colonial theory and alternatives to liberal modernity.

Christian Edward Cyril Lynch¹

Introduction

The present paper aims to understand how Alberto Guerreiro Ramos (1915-1982), one of the three recognized fathers of Brazilian modern social science alongside Gilberto Freyre and Florestan Fernandes, assimilated Eric Voegelin's critique of modernity during the last ten years of his career in the United States. At first glance, such a purpose may seem strange due to the differences between Ramos and Voegelin, regarding place of birth (Germany and Brazil), ideology (conservative and progressivist), and academic development (in the first half of 20th century social science was giving still its first steps towards institutionalization in Brazil). Nonetheless, when one considers their intellectual backgrounds, it is not difficult to find affinities. Voegelin and Ramos received strong Catholic educations and developed early on a keen interest for philosophy and the history of political ideas. Religion kept playing a relevant role in their work, albeit in a much more subtle manner in Ramos's case than Voegelin's². Religion was for both of them a basic framework in order to establish a humanistic anthropology based in moral values. This Catholic background made them ferocious critics of liberal utilitarianism, positivism and Marxism and turned them into critics of liberal indifference towards civilizational values. Both witnessed the tumultuous process of massification of politics in their countries and wrote against racism and political authoritarianism, trying at the same time to understand what was going on in their societies. After the rise of dictatorial regimes in Nazi Germany (1933) and Military Brazil (1964), Voegelin and Ramos fled to

¹ Professor of the Institute of Social and Political Studies of the State University of Rio de Janeiro (IESP-UERJ) e adjunct researcher of House of Rui Barbosa Federal Foundation (FCRB). Member of the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute (IHGB).

² Speaking of this youth just before his death, Ramos confessed: "For a part of my life it was the religion that sustained me, as it still is today: I am religious. Religion was a very important, very serious moment in my life. And still today I am a deeply religious person. I think this is one of the things that make up my strength, because I have a very intense religious life" (In: OLIVEIRA, Lúcia Lippi (1995). *A sociologia do Guerreiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ, 1995, pp. 165-167).

the United States looking for personal security and liberty of speech and had to adapt themselves to new environment. Having considered these affinities, the comparison seems more than natural.

Nevertheless, the subject is somewhat delicate. In Brazil, Ramos is widely known and celebrated as a left-wing intellectual committed to the ideals of national emancipation and social democracy during the Third Republic (1946-1964). He engaged actively in a public campaign aiming to sustain a State-based process of industrialization in order to reach national self-determination and succeeded in creating the basis of a Brazilian sociology committed to such efforts. As a rising star in intellectual political debate, he got involved in militant politics after 1958 and became federal deputy elected by the Brazilian Labour Party (PTB), founded by Getulio Vargas and presided after his suicide by his political heir, João Goulart. Everything came abruptly to an end when the military regime inaugurated after the coup of April 1st, 1964 deprived him of his political rights and dismissed him of his public duties. The subsequent and last phase of Ramos career, during which he moved formally to the field of Administrative Theory and became a professor in the University of South California, is almost universally ignored by Brazilian social science. Beside the apparent obstacle of disciplinary boundaries (more apparent than real), one of the strongest reasons for this silence lies in the fact that most of Brazilian social scientists feel uncomfortable in associating Ramos with a conservative thinker like Voegelin. Nonetheless, things are always more complicated than ideological approaches may suggest. The apparent paradox of a progressivist social scientist incorporating a conservative critic of liberal modernity must be understood by means of a careful study of how Ramos developed his intellectual sensibility during his youth; the disillusionments he suffered after the political breakdown of 1964 and his reactions as an émigré to his new academic environment of the United States. Nevertheless, it is not possible to understand the deep motivations of Ramos's works without considering his earlier and later works. Although we are not supposed to interpret political ideas of any author as entirely coherent, it is equally reasonable to suppose that even change must follow some logic, especially when the author's credibility depends on the public expectation of such a coherence.

Examining the way Ramos reacted to Voegelin's work in the 1970s may also help to clarify his intellectual activities by that time. Unlike the other two founding fathers of Brazilian social science, Ramos's legacy had a bad critical fortune. Here ideological

differences played once more some role. Gilberto Freyre (1900-1987) belonged to a traditional and wealthy family and developed his vast work according to an ideology of political conservatism that since the very beginning of his career helped him to find academic consecration³. On the other hand, Ramos belonged to a far from wealthy African American family. His progressivist approach, including a pioneering militancy against what he called “the ideology of whiteness” hegemonic in Brazilian society, prevented him from receiving the same sort of official acknowledgment - a fact he regretted bitterly in the end of his life⁴. On the other hand, Ramos was not leftist enough to be revindicated by the Marxist social science hegemonic in Brazil during the 1970's that consecrated as its main iconic figure Florestan Fernandes (1920-1995), professor in the University of São Paulo (USP). Ramos strongly refused Marxism-Leninism and communism altogether and published one of his best books – “Myth and truth about the Brazilian Revolution” (1961) – in order to criticize the Brazilian Communist Party and its attempts to apply Marxism Leninism to Brazilian reality. To make things harder, Ramos died relatively young (67 years) in Los Angeles as a professor of the University of South California, when he was preparing to come back to the Brazilian intellectual scene, after more than ten years of absence. Yet Ramos's works have been strongly revisited during the last twenty years by an increasing number of students due to the complexity and permanent validity of his thought.

1. Ramos before America: Catholic background and his work as a sociologist during the Brazilian first democratic experiment (1951-1964)

Ramos was born in a little town called Santo Amaro da Purificação. He was raised during the end of the 1920's and beginning of the 1930's in a school directed by Marist priests in Salvador, capital of the Brazilian State of Bahia. These were the golden years of Catholicism in 20th century Brazil: liberalism had collapsed after the Great War and there was a sort of religious revival in Brazilian cultural life. Deeply influenced by

³ LYNCH, Christian Edward Cyril; PAGANELLI, Pía. *The culturalist conservatism of Gilberto Freyre: society, decline and social change in Sobrados e Mucambos*. Sociologia e Antropologia. Rio de Janeiro, v. 07, nº 3: 879-903, December 2017.

⁴ In his last interview, Ramos bluntly admitted: "I am a frustrated, socially frustrated, yet existentially complete person. I do not have the recognition I deserve in Brazil" (In: OLIVEIRA. *A sociologia do Guerreiro*, op. cit, pp. 166-167).

the French Catholic thought of Emmanuel Mounier, Arnaud Dandier, Jacques Maritain and Nicholas Berdyaev, influent intellectuals such as Jackson de Figueiredo, Tristão de Athayde, and Hamilton Nogueira played a key role in the national debate, expressing the Catholic Church's views on the reorganization of the State and how it should re-establish links to civil society in matters concerning education, family and labour. They believed human civilization lived a crisis due to the hegemonic materialistic and utilitarian mind and proposed to restore spiritual order in society, replacing it with a philosophy of spirit characterized by an existential and personalistic approach. Deeply experiencing the religious awakening of that time, young Ramos became fond of an author who, albeit somewhat forgotten nowadays, enjoyed large popularity during the beginning of 20th century: Nicholas Berdyaev. In books such as *Spirit and Liberty*, *The metaphysical problem of freedom*, *Freedom and Spirit*, *The problem of man*, *Solitude and society*, *Slavery and freedom*, *The meaning of history* and *The destiny of man*, Berdyaev criticized the Renaissance anthropology for its secularizing presumptions and sustained that only Christianity presented an anthropology capable of giving an answer to the deepest and most fundamental of enigmas: that of man and his fate. A person was a unique and original being, different from others, maintaining a narrow bond of dependence upon God. A philosophy grounded on such basis should help men to express their creativity in a communitarian perspective and to find harmony⁵. Later on, Ramos publicly recognized the strong impact of Berdyaev on his mind: "Really there was no more powerful influence in my life than that of Berdyaev"⁶

Under the influence of his reading of the Catholic thought of Jacques Maritain, Berdyaev and Mounier, the young Ramos started studying Aquinas in a Benedictine monastery and founded a catholic cultural centre in Salvador da Bahia. He also published a book of poems intituled "The drama of being two", where he expressed his anguish as a fractured being; a person who lived between two worlds he could not define, earth and heaven, body and soul. Afterwards Ramos moved to Rio de Janeiro in order to study law and the social sciences. Living in a convent, he kept flirting with philosophy, poetry and literary critique and fell in love with the existentialist philosophy of Karl Jaspers and Martin Heidegger. In 1939 Ramos published *Introduction to culture*, a book where he claimed for a new culture, a new man and a new civilization based on the notion of human

⁵ AZEVEDO, Ariston. *A sociologia antropocêntrica de Alberto Guerreiro Ramos*. Florianópolis, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Sociologia e Política, 2006, pp. 80-100.

⁶ In LIPPI, op. cit., p.135.

person and community. Personal accomplishment could not be attained without the participation of God. In this book, he opposed culture to civilization, person to individual, organic to mechanical, the tragic sentiment of life to the bourgeois sentiment of existence: "The real revolution", Ramos wrote, "is one that teaches man to be a man before all, giving him the sense of the beautiful, making him responsible for his actions, making him capable of being a person opposing others, seeking to accomplish himself in his own way, because original and unique"⁷. Soon after his graduation, Ramos was hired by the Public Service Administrative Department created by Getulio Vargas to reshape the Brazilian State. From there on he kept his catholic beliefs in private, embraced the nationalist ideology and developed a deep interest in German sociology of knowledge and its culturalist scholars, such as Alfred and Max Weber, Karl Mannheim and Hans Freyer. Inasmuch as positivist social science treated social facts as stable and isolated in time and space, Ramos rejected its universalist assumptions. The true social science should be capable of recognizing the historical and culturally conditioned character of all social phenomena and thus grasping the dynamic and situated character of reality.

In fact, after 1951 Ramos started defending an engaged Brazilian sociology committed to social change and the emancipation of national culture from its former cultural restraints. Coherently with his former ideas, he considered Nations as collective persons who also needed developing and gaining self-consciousness. In an underdeveloped country as Brazil, social science could not afford to stay indifferent to the efforts of national development through industrialization in order to turn Brazil into a developed society. Objectivity was something that "one does not conquer once and for all in the domain of historical-social reality, and always reaches within limits"⁸. Since social facts were just moments of a totality to be transformed, their meanings could only be apprehended through a process of interaction that related thought and reality, theory and practice. Although sociology was everywhere the same as a method of correctly thinking the facts, younger countries should face the challenge of consciously adapting European theory to make its own, adapted to their specific circumstances. It was something that happened whenever a society began to become aware of itself: "Collective self-consciousness and critical consciousness are historical products," he wrote. "They emerge

⁷ Apud Azevedo, op. cit., pp. 118-121.

⁸ RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira*. 2ª. Edição. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ, 1995, p. 36.

when a social group places one another and the things that surround it with a project of existence"⁹.

But the task of building their own sociologies imposed additional difficulties on countries emerging from colonization. Because they possessed the consciousness of freedom and personalization, developed societies had a self-determinative aptitude and critical consciousness which allowed them to have historical existence. Since their culture reflected its structural dependence on their metropolis, colonial or semi colonial societies were deprived of such an element. Dependent societies did not exist for themselves: their self-image was as an extension and an instrument of metropolitan societies. They did not have a history of their own, being just "versions of the history of the colonizers, or ethnographic material of these peoples"¹⁰. Understood as "a totality that imposes a certain type of evolution and collective psychology to colonized populations", colonialism deprived undeveloped nations of "the possibility of an identification of the personality of the colonized with his immediate historical-social circumstance"¹¹. Subjected to a kind of cultural imperialism assured by the very fascination the institutions of the colonizers' countries exerted on the colonized, the cultural elites of the dependent nations tended to repeat attitudes, doctrines and formulas strange to their cultural context. In the field of social sciences, the sociologist's ideal of universality in a semi colonial society was definitely "a compensatory mechanism for the inferiority complex of certain elements of the elite"¹². Aiming at the example of autochthonous economic thought developed by the Economic Commission for Latin America of the United Nations (ECLAC), Ramos thought Brazilian science should cease at once to be "a stillborn by-product of European and American Sociological thought"¹³.

The outcrop of a critical consciousness was the signal that nation was about to acquire cultural autonomy and integrate universal history. Since Brazil was experiencing a strong process of industrialization destined to create a national market, the elaboration of an authentic Brazilian sociology was now a real possibility. Considered an agent par excellence of the "civilizational process", industrialization led the country to live for itself and not for others¹⁴. Brazilian self-determination depended on the continuity of this

⁹ Idem. *A redução sociológica*. 2ª. Edição. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ, 1996, p. 46.

¹⁰ Idem. *O processo da sociologia no Brasil*. Rio, 1953, p. 11.

¹¹ Idem. *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira*, op. cit., p. 37.

¹² Idem. *O processo da sociologia no Brasil*, op. cit., p. 9.

¹³ Idem. *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira*, op. cit., p. 107.

¹⁴ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 145.

process of national industrialization: the formation of a internal market impacted the political field, leading to the decadence of the former aristocratic political society and to the rise of a new social, urban and democratic one. There was no need to reinvent the wheel to build up a national sociology: it was enough to repeat the procedures adopted in the developed countries. Each of them had created a sociology universal in their "general principles of logical reasoning"¹⁵ but also particular as an "instrument of self-knowledge and development of national structures and regional authorities"¹⁶. Aiming to stimulate "the realization of a sociological work endowed with pragmatic value, as to the role it can exert in the process of national development", Ramos developed in *The sociological reduction* (1958) a method to adapt foreign theories to the needs of the specific development stage of each national collectivity¹⁷.

If European sociology provided the general framework necessary for the warp of a post-colonial theory, its national content had to come from the previous contributions of Brazilian social scientists. Hence the interest developed by Ramos in history of social and political ideas: like Germany, France, the United States and France, Brazilian social science should be a result of the cumulative process of intellectual elaboration of previous generations. In "*The process of Sociology in Brazil*" (1953), he wrote there was a tension between two currents of sociological ideas in peripheral countries of Latin America. Of cosmopolitan character, Ramos called the first "consular" because it was nothing but a "repetition of the doctrinarian orientations prevailing in the centers of foreign culture"¹⁸. In turn, because of his efforts towards self-determination, the second current was "authentic" since their representatives belonged to a "sociological tradition really committed to the problematic of Brazilian society"¹⁹. His second essay on Brazilian history of sociological ideas was "*The problem of the negro in Brazilian Sociology*" (1954). According to Ramos, the negro population was something natural in Brazilian context and therefore such a "problem" had no ethnic or biological nature. Racism and ethnic discrimination were above all prejudice residues of colonial mentality and he expected they should cease in near future, since national self-consciousness was about to come: "The negro in Brazil is not an anecdote, it is a parameter of the national reality"²⁰.

¹⁵ Idem. *A redução sociológica*, op. cit., p. 80.

¹⁶ Idem. *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira*, op. cit., p. 107.

¹⁷ Idem. *A redução sociológica*, op. cit., p. 41.

¹⁸ Idem. *O processo da sociologia no Brasil*, op. cit., p. 12.

¹⁹ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 21.

²⁰ Idem. *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira*, op. cit., p. 200.

The situation of the negro should henceforward be studied from his authentic situation in Brazilian life, that is, that of ordinary citizens equal to whites. On the other hand, in “*The theme of institutional transplantation in Brazilian sociology*” (1954), Ramos sustained that the transplantation of theories or institutions into the periphery constituted a means of accelerating modernization by which several stages of development could be jumped over: it was “a normal and inevitable fact resulting from the interaction of objective factors, in which they emphasize the economic ones”²¹.

At the end of 1954 Ramos already had elements to a first synthesis of Brazilian sociological thinking in order to denounce its five main vices. The first was that of *symmetry*, which resulted from the inclination of the Brazilian scientist to literally adopt foreign theories presented as the most advanced in Europe and North America. The second was that of *dogmatism*, described as the “extensive adoption of arguments of authority in the sociological discussion, or in a certain tendency to discuss or evaluate facts through the mere juxtaposition of texts of prestigious authors”²². The third vice was *deductivism*: since foreign systems were seen as possessing universal and absolute validity, they were adopted as starting points for the explanation of Brazilian national life. Its main characteristic would be “the abstraction of the contingency and the identification of the present of our country with the present of other countries in the higher stage of development or, in any event, of historical formation different from ours”²³. The fourth defect of Brazilian social science was *alienation*. Instead of mobilizing it for the country's self-determination, Brazilians would prefer to see national reality in abstract as if they were foreigners and tended to see their own reality as exotic. The fifth and final problem was *inauthenticity*: Brazilian science was not produced from genuine cognitive experiences, but from a large scale of categories and processes pre-fabricated elsewhere.

At the turn of 1954 to 1955, Ramos began to believe that traditional Brazil was about to disappear. Industrialization, urbanization and the emergence of an internal market integrating the national territory had triggered a real revolution (the “Brazilian Revolution”), creating the objective conditions of overcoming the colonial condition. A consequent theory of Brazilian society should therefore go beyond describing the past to contribute to design an “ideology” capable of sustaining the State developmentalist

²¹ Idem, *ibidem*, p 242.

²² Idem, *ibidem*, p. 39.

²³ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 40.

project based on industrialization. Much closer now to political science, Ramos defined such an “ideology” as prescriptive and normative at the same time; it should be a “theory of Brazilian society capable of supporting the trends of self-determination prevailing today in our country”²⁴. The creation of the Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies (ISEB) by the Education Federal Bureau in Rio de Janeiro and his nomination as chief of the sociology department provided an ideal space for the deployment of his theoretical project. Looking for subsidies for the formulation of a “national-developmental ideology”, Ramos turned to the history of Brazilian political thought in order to distinguish the progressive ideologies from those of a conservative nature. By this time Ramos wrote some of his best articles on the history of political ideas: *Efforts politically oriented to theorize the national reality from 1870 to our days*; *The ideology of the Jeunesse dorée*; and finally, *The sociological unconscious: a study on the political crisis in Brazil in decade of 1930*.

In 1958 Ramos decided to embrace militant politics. Since his hero Max Weber and other German social scientists had done the same, he considered it a natural path. As one of the most prominent intellectuals of the Brazilian Labor Party (PTB), Ramos sustained a non-Marxist socialist perspective in books and articles as *The national problem of Brazil*, *The Crises of power in Brazil*, *Principles of the Brazilian People*, *Five principles of the Brazilian People* and *Panorama of contemporary Brazil*. *Myth and truth about the Brazilian Revolution* [1963] was the last book he published during this time of great political instability and social effervescence and contained acute criticism against the Marxism-Leninism ideology that spread everywhere after the Cuban Revolution. He argued that, alienated from national reality and overconfident, Brazilian communists were arousing a panic that would elicit a reaction in the form of a coup d'état in the opposite direction. Ramos reached his climax as a politician in 1963, when he became a federal deputy for the Brazilian Labor Party (PTB). Alarmed by the crescent disarray of political life due to radical polarization of Brazilian society, Ramos criticized left and right altogether. According to him, many leftists were intellectually servile to Soviet models and incapable of thinking the specificities of Brazilian process of modernization. As a result, having lost all sense of objectivity, nationalist movement had become a faith rather than a true theory²⁵. Meanwhile, incapable of thinking the country out of the North

²⁴ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 60.

²⁵ Idem. *Typology of nationalism in Brazil (a case of political breakdown)*. Los Angeles, February 1968.

American model, the right-wing politicians decided to resist once and for all to all sorts of social reform. Democracy's days were numbered.

2. Ramos in North America: Ramos's later career as a professional scholar after the Brazilian military coup (1964-1982).

After the coup d'état of April 1st, 1964 Ramos public career came to a traumatic end. On charges of subversion and corruption, the Supreme Command of the Revolution decided to deprive the main actors of the ruling class of their political rights for ten years, Guerreiro Ramos included²⁶. He stopped appearing in public and decided to dedicate himself to professional social science in the American style. Thanks to a grant by the Ford Foundation, he locked himself for two years in his office at the Public Administration School of Getulio Vargas Foundation (EBAPE) in order to write an extensive treaty, *Public administration and strategies of development* (1966). In this book, Ramos consolidated many of his former reflections on the social sciences concerning State planning, the role of bureaucracy and the problem of modernization in periphery countries. On the other hand, since the military adopted a technocratic view of development as a key principle in order to reassure national security, Ramos expressed growing doubts about the role of the rational bureaucracy to national development. The crises had underlined instead the importance of human agency (including personal beliefs and idiosyncrasies of the main actors) over bureaucracy and economic relations: "Bureaucracy has no nature, it has history. To confer on it fixed and unchanging attributes is to focus on an error of historical perspective"²⁷. The bureaucracy should be limited to rationality and routine business of the State and cut off from the sphere of politics: "The direct execution of every management strategy modernization is always an elite task

²⁶ The reasons for the loss of Ramos' political rights determined by the military regime are not easily ascertained. Although he belonged to the Brazilian Labor Party, there were dozens of other party colleagues who were not revoked. Moreover, although he advocated a social democratic development project for Brazil, Ramos was a staunch critic of Marxism Leninism and the Communist Party. Senator Orestes Quercia, for instance, believed the military thought Ramos he was a subversive just because there was a sickle and a hammer in the front page of his last book "Myth and truth about the Brazilian Revolution" – ironically, a book acidly critic of Marxism Leninism and the Communist Party. President Castelo Branco would have recognized the mistake but made nothing to amend it (See the Brazilian newspaper "Jornal do Brasil", edition of August 21th 1978, p. 3).

²⁷ Idem. *Administração pública e estratégia de desenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro, FGV, 1966, p. 264.

under the current conditions of our time”²⁸. The validity of progressivism or conservatism as ideologic choices depended always on the context of a definite action and in a certain perspective, never in abstract.

After finishing *Public Administration and Strategy of Development*, Ramos decided to emigrate believing his and his family’s personal security was threatened under the military regime. He moved in 1966 to Los Angeles and became visiting professor of the School of Public Administration of Southern California University. During his first years in the United States, he kept writing about development, but as a cosmopolitan sociologist up to date with the bibliography current in American social sciences. Since it became increasingly identified to positivistic theories of modernization produced by scholars as Walt Whitman Rostow and Seymour Martin Lipset, Guerreiro Ramos abandoned for once his ancient belief in industrialization as the key to social and political development. In *Modernization: Toward a Possibility Model* (1967), Ramos directed his weapons against modernization theory, criticizing its automatisms and ideological commitments to a teleological and cumulative philosophy of history of deistic origins. He argued that modernization was not driven by a historical necessity that would propel all societies to seek the stage of the so-called developed societies: “Modernity is not a kind of metaphysical entity or a complex of prescriptive elements to be adopted by peripheral nations as the only best way to proceed”²⁹. According to his new theory based on a “possibility model”, any nation always had its own possibilities of modernization, whatever its contemporary configuration. Modernization always demanded a strategic behavior of the ruling class according to each society’s circumstances of culture and time. This modernization process guided by the judgements of value about right and wrong concerning real people should not be disturbed by the superimposition of “a frozen, normative model, extrinsic to those possibilities”³⁰.

In 1968, Ramos decided to give a concrete illustration of this “possibility model” in a paper he never published: *Typology of Nationalism in Brazil (a case of political breakdown)*. For Ramos, nationalism was no longer a heuristically fruitful perspective and had become a dead issue for Brazilian social science. Such a declaration cannot be considered a surprise since he had been criticizing the denaturation of the nationalism

²⁸ Idem, ibidem, p. 266.

²⁹ Idem. *A modernização em nova perspectiva: em busca de um modelo de possibilidade*. Rio de Janeiro, Revista de Administração Pública nº 2, 1968, p. 42.

³⁰ Idem, ibidem, p. 44.

movement at least since 1961. Moreover, he had never considered the nation as a definitive or eternal form of organization of a people in history. Ramos stressed he had always envisaged nationalism as a circumstantial or provisory means of mass mobilization in order to liberate periphery countries from colonial dependence. Besides, the successful 'modernization' brought by the military dictatorship challenged a generation of intellectuals who used to think of capitalist development as the most visible face of democracy, citizenship and sovereignty. As stated by Edison Bariani, since reason and modernization were no longer convergent, Ramos decided to keep his distance from politics and started criticizing instrumental reason, historical serialization and the idea of rational and democratic planning, thinking of transformation no longer in terms of modernization, but of humanization³¹. The task for the new era in Brazil was to establish the theoretical and methodological foundations of a true social science. Here Ramos underlined the importance of understanding the motivations of actors and their idiosyncrasies, far beyond explanations such as class conflict or historical determinism:

The historical and social process is not a blind sequence of events in which the human actor always plays a passive role. History and society are manufactured by human decisions, although within limitations imposed by the circumstances. In any social process, particularly the political process, it is possible to argue the responsibility of human agents. Success and failure, achievement and breakdown, can be visualized from a voluntarist standpoint which does not deny the impingement of objective factors. In other words, the so-called 'objective conditions', 'social and historical forces' are not the whole story in any course of events. In fact, very often they are alleged as excuses for irresponsibility, for occasional or systematic miscalculation. There is no achievement without merit, no breakdown without demerit. Both are results of intentional acts of willing, in a certain measure, large or small, according to the circumstances. Determinism understood as fatalism is unacceptable by social Science. Society is an open system³².

After 1968, although keeping his previous humanistic beliefs contracted in Brazil, Ramos became a scholar adapted to the cosmopolitan environment of American academy of Administration. As stated by Mario Bick, the articles and books written and published by Ramos in North America demonstrate "his impressive ability to adapt to changing intellectual possibilities. In these articles, he shifted from an erudite focus on Brazil and Latin America to a full engagement with the American literature in Sociology and

³¹ BARIANI, Edison. *O longo caminho: Guerreiro Ramos e a sociologia da administração antes de a nova ciência das organizações*. Organizações & Sociedade. Escola de Administração da Universidade Federal da Bahia, v. 17, n. 52, p. 17-28, 2010.

³² RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. *Typology of Nationalism in Brazil*, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

especially in Public Administration, while sustaining his role as a creative critic”³³. Increasingly attracted by global issues after the events of 1968 in the United States (including a sympathetic regard towards the hippie movement), Ramos felt once more attracted to the issue of civilizational crises and turned back to his old concerns about the destiny of man in a time of change. Although keeping distance from expressing openly religious views, Ramos started to think of a general theory of interdisciplinary character. Once more characterized by a descriptive/ normative approach, such theory should be anchored in a human-centered anthropology, capable of overcoming the social constraints imposed by the market-oriented paradigm and favoring personal self-perfection of men in a civic context. This new perspective came to light for the first time in a paper published in 1970, “*The new ignorance and the future of public administration in Latin America*”. Originally presented for a conference in the University of Texas, this paper he expressed his belief that traditional normative paradigm of administration based on scarcity had come to a dead end. A new administration model of essentially non-prescriptive character should be aware of its own ignorance in order to surmount, as a “learned ignorance”, the gap between what men knew and what they should know to fulfill their duties as administrators and citizens.

Reaffirming his previous commitments with the humanist perspective acquired during his Catholic education, Ramos proposed in 1970 a new model of social organization based in three assumptions as value premises of professional behavior. The first was a *commitment to the world*. There were now world problems of development that could not be solved unless an effort of institutional building were undertaken in planetary scale. Such a development could be conceived according to the “possibilistic approach” previously presented in his own modernization theory. Although social scientists and administrators were not above politics, they should try to influence public policy making regarding world development. The second was a *commitment to human growth*. Bureaucracies were becoming incapable to respond to new demands for well-being and for this reason new generations tended increasingly to feel social systems as true prisons. The situation was even worse in Latin America, where “middle class bureaucrats, abiding by impersonal rules, aggravate the powerless and alienation of the underprivileged before governmental services”. At this time, Ramos repeated his mantra:

³³ BICK, Mario. *Guerreiro Ramos's Intellectual Trajectory in the U.S. as Seen Through his Writing*. Revista ILHA v. 18, n. 1, p. 229-253, junho de 2016, p. 1.

“Without a humanistic value commitment, social science is meaningless”³⁴. The third and last was a *commitment to legitimacy*. Legitimacy was more than a matter of pure principle; it was a condition of development to the extent that it made the political and administrative system more responsive and responsible towards citizen’s needs. Here he was already supposing that the Western world was entering a post-industrial age whose previous paradigms of social organization based on mere legalism were doomed: “Within the framework of legality, economic injustice can be institutionalized, whereas the essential duty of the State now is to implement inequality-reduction public policies”³⁵. In Latin America, Ramos recommended more attention to the theory and practice of institutional building, for institutionalization was ultimately a corrective of illegitimacy as well as a social indicator of administrative effectiveness.

4. The impact of Eric Voegelin’s work on later Guerreiro Ramos works (1972-1981).

According to Mario Bick, despite very active giving lectures and participating in conferences, between 1966 and 1969 Ramos lectured only at California colleges and universities and published papers in books edited by his colleagues and in journals published by his university. Soon he moved beyond this local venue, however. During the period 1969-1973, his activities were mostly on the East Coast, including his sabbatical year at Wesleyan and Yale. He had clearly moved beyond the orbit of University of South California to become a nationally respected figure in the field of public administration. Ramos’s ideas were making a national impact, especially on Public Administration theory, and his north American trajectory contrasted “with the erudite and cosmopolitan display of references in his early articles and in his Brazilian publications, which are redolent with references to French, German, Latin American and Brazilian literature in his footnotes and bibliographies. Instead, his references in his U.S. writing were unerringly to the American social science and Public Administration literatures, and the articles were published in Public Administration journals”³⁶.

³⁴ RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. *A nova ignorância e o futuro da administração pública na América Latina*. Rio de Janeiro, Revista de Administração Pública nº 17 (1), jan./mar. 1983, p. 63.

³⁵ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 64.

³⁶ BICK, Mario. *Guerreiro Ramos’s Intellectual Trajectory in the U.S. as Seen Through his Writing*, op. cit., p. 242.

It was precisely in this very beginning of the 1970s that Ramos seems to have been acquainted with the sort of political science produced by German émigrés as Hannah Arendt, Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin in the United States and that contrasted sharply to the hegemonic behaviorist approach of Gabriel Almond, Karl Deutsch and Seymour Lipset. Once again, there is no reason to be surprised with the positive impact of such readings on Guerreiro Ramos's thought. In spite of living in a distant Latin American country, he had learned sociology and philosophy in German books produced during the spiritual crises of the Weimar Republic in his youth and remained closely attached to German philosophy and sociology for the rest of his life, especially those critics of positivism and Marxism and liberal modernity. From a spiritual point of view, it is no exaggeration to claim that, as matter of fact, Ramos was a German émigré himself in the US. Because of his critique of modern rationality based on economic calculations and his belief in the possibility of replacing it with another kind, more suitable to human nature, Ramos felt especially attracted by Voegelin's works, and there were several reasons for such an especial attachment: Voegelin had always been a severe critic of utopian and ideological thought. Because of the lasting influence of his Catholic education, he believed in the possibility of a true knowledge that could help people reconnect to God and correlate values as soul, love, nation, or community. Although deeply influenced by Weber's sociology, Voegelin too was not satisfied with a science limited to describing facts regardless of values. He also rejected the underlying assumptions of positivism or Marxism, whose anthropology considered men as exclusively moved by selfish purposes and whose philosophy denied the role played by human agency and beliefs in historical events. According to this perspective, for Ramos and Voegelin science could not be but a knowledge of salvation. That is the reason why both bet their chips on the history of social and political ideas to find out true scientific knowledge, fought against racism and political authoritarianism, and paid the heavy price of fleeing their home country.

The first time Ramos quoted Voegelin was in an article intitled "*Models of man and administrative theory*" (1972). Aiming to attack the anthropology based on theories of rational or economic choice, he argued that the basic problem of society from the 18th century on was to overcome the scarcity of material goods and elementary services. For this reason, traditional social theory based on social Darwinism created two models of man: the *operational man* and the *reactive man*. The operational man was coequal to the *homo economicus* of classic economics and required four elements: 1) an authoritarian

method of allocating resources and a training as a technic to adjust individuals to the needs of maximizing production; 2) an anthropology based in rational choice, according to which man was a calculating being moved exclusively by material rewards; 3) a belief in the neutrality of social theory, as well as a systematic indifference towards ethical and value premises of the environment; 4) the belief that aspects of personal freedom were strange to organizational model and that labor should be something opposed to satisfaction. Reactional man, in turn, was a model developed from 19th century on by progressivists to minimize the discomfort of individuals by merely adjusting them to their labor context, still disregarding their needs of individual growth. Despite their dissimilarities, both shared similar presumptions about human nature. Yet the problem of scarcity had been solved for the last decades in developed countries, and people were now looking for the satisfaction of needs far beyond the level of simple survival. Meanwhile traditional organizational theory seemed incapable of designing a new model of man for societies about to enter a post-industrial age, according to an alternative rationality. Here he quoted Eric Voegelin for the first time: it should be no longer an “instrumental” rationality, but a “noetic” one. The quotation was extracted from “Industrial society in search of reason”, a text Voegelin had published in 1963. According to Ramos, “noetic rationality” derived from “immanent imperatives of only reason, understood as a specifically human attribute, that excludes blind obedience to the demands of efficiency”³⁷. He suggested a new model of man to replace the operational and the reactional - *the parenthetical man*, whose critical attitude would follow parameters of noetic rationality similar to that existent in society before the Industrial Revolution:

Parenthetic man can grade the flow of daily life to examine and evaluate him as a bystander. It can move away from the family environment. He deliberately tries to break his roots. He is a stranger in his own social environment in order to maximize his understanding of life. The parenthetic attitude is defined by the psychological capacity of the individual to separate himself from his internal and external environment. Parenthetic men thrive when the period of social ingenuity ends³⁸.

Thanks to the sabbatical year spent at Wesleyan University and Yale University, around 1972-1973 Ramos began writing his last book, intitled “*The New Science of Organization: The Reconceptualization of the Wealth of Nations*”. His ambition was to make a general critique of the market-centered paradigm of civilization associated with

³⁷ RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. *Modelos de homem e teoria administrativa*. Rio de Janeiro, Revista de Administração Pública, nº 18 (2):3-12, abr./jun. 1984, p. 7.

³⁸ Idem, ibidem, p. 8.

positivism, behaviorism and rational choice in order to rebuild administrative theory. A paradigm based on the instrumental rationality violated human nature insofar as it prevented individuals from developing their potentialities as persons. The paradigm of social systems based only in market rationality should be replaced by a multi-layered vision of rationality. The alternative civilizational paradigm proposed by Ramos would be characterized by the "delimitation of social systems", which would circumscribe the role of market to regulating just one of the social systems and let the others to be guided by natural rationality. The reestablishment of paramount social values such as solidarity, creativity, love, or friendship would make room to rebalance human life and to build a new, ecologically assured global order. Published in 1981, Ramos's last book had ten chapters, the first five comprehending a full critique of modern reason: "Critique of Modern Reason and Its Bearing upon Organization Theory" (1); "Towards a Substantive Theory of Human Associated Life" (2); "The Behavioral Syndrome" (3); "Misplacement of Concepts and Organization Theory" (4); and "Cognitive Politics: The Psychology of the Market-Centered Society" (5). The second half of the book had other five chapters and proposed a new organizational theory based on substantive rationality: "A Substantive Approach to Organizations" (6); "Theory of Social Systems Delimitation: A Paradigmatic Statement" (7); "The Law of Requirement Adequacy and Social Systems Design" (8); "Para-economy: Paradigm and Multicentric Allocative Model" (9); and finally "Overview and Prospects of the New Science" (10). In other words, Ramos was offering a new model of social development based on substantive rationality:

Social science should be freed from its obsession with development and begin to understand that each contemporary society is potentially ready to become a good one if it chooses to rid itself of the linearist vision of history. This book suggests that there are many possibilities for the nations of the so-called underdeveloped world to recover immediately from their peripheral condition, if only they would find their own political will and thus free themselves from the syndrome of relative deprivation which they have internalized by taking the advanced market society as the scenario of their future. Delimitation of the market system, as predicated by the New Science, implies the formulation and implementation of new allocative criteria and policies within and between nations. The novelty of these criteria mainly results from their sensitivity to the detrimental ecological and psychological externalities produced by the unregulated activities of the market system. The administration of constraints to the functioning of the market

system aims at the preservation both of the ecological soundness of the planet and of the psychological health of mankind³⁹.

Is it possible to measure the extent of Voegelin's influence on Ramos's last book? This is no simple question. Ramos was a proud man who enjoyed presenting himself as a man without living masters; moreover, he quoted Voegelin alongside other authors who were critics of modernity such as Weber, Mannheim, Horkheimer and Habermas. Nevertheless, a more careful study suggests Voegelin's influence on Ramos should not be underestimated. To start with, there are records of letters exchanged that reveal a deep impact. Ramos's first letter to Voegelin dates of April 3, 1973 and it was written on letterhead from Wesleyan University, where Ramos was during his sabbatical year. After introducing himself, the Brazilian sociologist communicated he was writing a book to “assess current approaches to organizational design and policy making”⁴⁰. Once they had distorted the true meaning of rationality, he had decided to focus his work “according to the restorative standpoint you (Voegelin) have been articulating in your writings”. He meant to have already read all Voegelin's works in English because they were “of paramount significance for my work”. In his second letter, of April 23th, Ramos told Voegelin that he had been studying his works since 1971 and intended to explore some lines of his thought in his own academic activities. The epistolary correspondence suggests in addition that both met in January 1974 and Ramos invited Voegelin for a lecture he called: “From History to Humanity”⁴¹. Ramos felt comfortable to tell Voegelin about his Catholic intellectual background, something he had been avoiding for many years in public for considering it inappropriate to his scholarly condition. This common spiritual background had led him to a better understanding of Voegelin's intentions:

Since I was a young student in Brazil I have been exposed to German idealism, Marxism, phenomenology, existential philosophy, and especially to the teachings of Karl Jaspers and N. Berdyaev. In spite of the uneven quality of Berdyaev's books, I see in them much of what seems to me a correct understanding of the Christian legacy. His interpretation of Jacob Boehme has had a tremendous significance for me and helped me to better understand the implications of your approach to human existence as ‘In between’, your updating of symbols like metaxy and apeiron, as well as the thrust of your thought about Gnosticism, doxic views and the phenomenon of contracted psyche (second realities).

³⁹ Idem. *The new science of organizations (a reconceptualization of the Wealth of Nations)*. Toronto, Toronto University Press, 1984, p. 168.

⁴⁰ I thank professor Eric Schmidt Passos who kindly sent me photocopies of this epistolary correspondence collected from Eric Voegelin's private archives.

⁴¹ This meeting with Voegelin surely took place since Ramos himself alludes to lectures and conversations they had in his “The new science of organizations”, p. 21.

Besides the epistolary correspondence, one could measure the influence of Eric Voegelin in Ramos's last book by other means. The first and most obvious lies in the title itself ("The new science of organization"), which is undoubtedly a direct reference to Voegelin's "The new science of politics" and suggests the same intention of rebuilding a different area of knowledge according to the same principles. Comparing Voegelin's quotations to those of the other authors mentioned by Ramos as critics of modern reason is another fruitful way to measure such influence. First, he dedicated more attention to Voegelin's critique on modernity than to any other social scientist, as the length of text written on them suggests. He wrote six paragraphs on Max Weber's critical theory; four paragraphs on Karl Mannheim's; ten paragraphs on Horkheimer's; nine on Habermas's and thirteen on Eric Voegelin's. Voegelin was also by far the most quoted author of all those mentioned by Ramos alongside the book, being mentioned in six out of ten chapters. The second place belonged to Mannheim, the others being mentioned only in just one or two chapters.

Table 1: Quotations of German authors in Ramos's "The new science of organization"

	Weber	Mannheim	Horkheimer	Habermas	Arendt	Strauss	Voegelin
Ch.1	X	X	X	X			X
Ch.2	X				X	X	X
Ch.3							X
Ch.4				X			X
Ch.5		X					X
Ch.6		X			X	X	X
Ch.7							
Ch.8							
Ch.9							
Ch.10							

Table 2: List of Voegelin's works quoted by Ramos in "The new science of organizations"

Ch.1	<p>1952. <i>The New Science of Politics</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 175 Chapter 2.</p> <p>1960. 'El Concepto de la "Buena Sociedad,"' <i>Cadernos del Congreso por la Libertad</i>. Suplemento del no. 40.</p> <p>1961. 'On Readiness to Rational Debate,' in A. Hynold ed, <i>Freedom and Serfdom</i>. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing –</p> <p>1963. 'Industrial Society in Search of Reason,' in R. Aron ed, <i>World Technology and Human Destiny</i>. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.</p> <p>1967. 'On Debate and Existence,' <i>The Intercollegiate Review</i>, Marchi April</p> <p>1974. 'Reason: The Classic Experience,' <i>The Southern Review</i>, spring.</p>
Ch.2	<p>1952. <i>The New Science of Politics</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p> <p>1968. 'Configurations of History,' in P.G. Kuntzed, <i>The Concept of Order</i>, Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press.</p>
Ch.3	1952. <i>The New Science of Politics</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ch.4	1956. 'Necessary Moral Bases for Communication in a Democracy,' in R. C. Seitz ed, <i>Problems of Communication in Pluralistic Society</i> . Milwaukee, Wis.: Marquette University Press.
Ch.5	1963. 'Industrial Society in Search of Reason,' in R. Aron ed, <i>World Technology and Human Destiny</i> . Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Ch.6	<p>1964. <i>Order and History</i>, Vol. I: <i>The World of the Polis</i>. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press</p> <p>1969. <i>The New Science of Politics</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press</p> <p>1970. 'Equivalences of Experiences and Symbolization in History,' In: Eternita E Storia. Florence: Vallecchi Editore.</p> <p>1974. 'Reason: The Classical Experience,' <i>The Southern Review</i>, spring Weisskopf, W. A.</p> <p>1957. <i>The Psychology of Economics</i>. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.</p> <p>1971. <i>Alienation and Economics</i>. New York: E.P. Dutton</p>

Although Ramos gave considerable room to Voegelin's critique of modernity, his endorsement was far from being complete. While endorsing his critique of instrumental rationality and the idea that classic political philosophers as Plato and Aristotle were useful to help rescuing substantive rationality mankind, Ramos had serious restrictions on the propositional part of Voegelin's work for his exceedingly reactionary or restorative character, which explains why Voegelin's quotations almost disappear in the second part of his book. The prescriptive content of Voegelin's work was too broad and void of immediate pragmatic concerns. Classical philosophy was too generalist and insufficient to meet the challenges of contemporary society. Voegelin's critique of modern scientific knowledge was exaggerated: there were other social scientists who also refused positivism and marxism altogether and whose work should be valued in order to

replace the market as the only paradigm of social organization, such as Wright Mills, Karl Polanyi, or Whitehead. According to Ramos, Karl Polanyi's *The Great Transformation* had masterfully showed the ideological limits of liberal economic theories in the organization of real societies in 20th century Europe, and for this reason he had become the pioneer of a substantive economic theory in USA. Although Polanyi also believed that a market centered society was a deformation of collective human life, he did not intend (unlike Voegelin) "to justify a return to the past, but to suggest that it would be possible a industrialism different from the one we know, more consonant to the permanent requirements of human existence"⁴². In other words, Voegelin's works served to demolish but not to rebuild social theory:

No return to any historical mode of human existence can be implied in the idea of a true creative restoration of the classical teachings. This restoration consists in making the classical thinkers, through the appropriation of their insights, active partners in the contemporary scholars' pursuit of knowledge. Restoration of the classical conceptual legacy in this case is meant only to overcome its oblivion. The classical thinkers are not to be considered infallible canonic authorities. After all one does not have much to learn from the Aristotle who justified slavery, only from the Aristotle consistent with the definition of the human being as *zoon politikon*⁴³.

Whatever his criticisms, Voegelin's influence on Ramos persisted until his death. Most of the newspaper articles he published between 1978 and 1981 were based on the critique of modern industrialism and often highlighted the importance of revaluing the classic tradition to replace the ideological views provided by positivistic and Marxist philosophies of history. One can easy to detect Voegelin's touch in articles such as "Limits of modernization"⁴⁴; "Aristotle, Whitehead and the bifurcation of nature"⁴⁵; "Plato and the talk of generations"⁴⁶ and "Political economy reconsidered"⁴⁷. Ramos also quoted Voegelin in his last interview (1981), demonstrating how far he had absorbed categories such as "derailment" and "order" to explain his own sociological ideas. About the influence of Durkheim and Weber on his scholarly education, for example, Ramos said: "These men have made mistakes. They are creatures of what I call 'derailment', using

⁴² RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. *Notícias sobre a nova teoria econômica*. Jornal do Brasil, edition of July 26th, 1981.

⁴³ Idem. *The new science of organizations*, op. cit., p. 22.

⁴⁴ Idem. *Limites da Modernização*. Jornal do Brasil, edition of June 22nd 1979.

⁴⁵ Idem. *Aristóteles, Whitehead e a bifurcação da natureza*. Jornal do Brasil, edition of May 5th, 1981.

⁴⁶ Idem. *Platão e a conversa das gerações*. Jornal do Brasil, edition of March 8th, 1981.

⁴⁷ Idem. *Economia política reconsiderada*. Jornal do Brasil, edition of October 11th, 1981.

a Voegelin's word. Social science is a bluff to me, a fallacy - except for Max Weber"⁴⁸. Later, when referring to Brazilian history, Ramos resorted once again to Voegelin's derailment thesis of Western thought after the Industrial Revolution: "The existence of Brazil has passed so far in the cycle of decay. All accept the theory of phases, that the industrial revolution was a positive process, that Brazil should make itself independent to become an industrialized nation. This is all wrong"⁴⁹. After being reminded by the interviewer how far he had changed his thought on the subject of industrialization as a means to achieve modernity since he had left to the USA, Ramos continued with his analysis according to Voegelin's philosophical framework: "There is a theoretical legacy that never reached Brazil. We read Plato and Aristotle as if they were a relic. These works are of no importance to Brazil's intellectual history, but without it you are not in universal history. We are modern, we are born into modern history, which is a deviation. Modern history is a derailment"⁵⁰. Ramos finally resorted to Voegelin's category of "order" to criticize the new Brazilian industrial society forged by State modernization during the military regime: "People internalize the disorder, do not see the disorder. The subject is socialized within the disorder. In Brazil, people eat wrong, live wrong, love wrong. Everything is wrong, because there is no order. The problem is the order, which begins within you. This country is the disorder"⁵¹.

Conclusion

It is not easy to measure the impact of Voegelin's reading on Ramos's late social and political thought. It was a long way since the beginning of his career as a sociologist in Brazil. Although an unrepentant critic of positivism and Marxism since his youth, Ramos had initially perceived national developmentalism as a progressive and humanist alternative in the peripheral context. He believed that a national project of development grounded on industrialization was the key precondition to raise the economic and cultural standard of Brazilian people to a level analogous of that of USA and West Europe. Nevertheless, the authoritarian process of economic modernization imposed by the

⁴⁸ In: OLIVEIRA. *A sociologia do Guerreiro*, op. cit., pp. 146-147.

⁴⁹ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 177.

⁵⁰ Idem, *ibidem*, p. 177-178.

⁵¹ Idem, *ibidem*, pp. 177-179.

military regime the 1964 coup d'état revealed the limits of a purely market-centered development project. His later move to the United States also helped to change the point of view from which he saw the world: he was no longer in a society that perceived itself as peripheral and backward, desperately looking for modernization, but a centric society in which the modernization process had already been completed, and which had become the main engine of the world's economy. Despite the undeniable advances provided by industrial society, Ramos realized in his new American home the limitations, illusions, and harms generated by modernization in industrial society, given the excessive centrality of the market as a mechanism of social regulation (consumerism, environmental destruction, cultural mediocrity, etc).

Ramos concluded that the ideological character of modernizing theories was more extensive than he had believed and ended up considering economic structuralism and developmentalism only as further instances of application of modernizing ideologies, alongside positivism and Marxism. The industrializing ideal had already become a crumbling project in developed countries and would lead undeveloped countries to the same dead end, aggravated by the dependent character of their economies and cultures; a fabric of social inequality, environment destruction and urban violence. Ramos wished henceforward to criticize the instrumental rationality behind the modernization process and articulate a theoretical alternative to a post-industrial society. But he had not yet formulated the broader notion that modernization should have been impossible without a teleological and accumulative philosophy of history as continuous progress as its ideological basis. In this sense, the reading of the German emigrants and the discovery of classic tradition helped him to consolidate a different idea of history and knowledge. Bringing classical knowledge back to the present allowed him to think of modern problems regarding collective life, such as community life and the allocation of resources, in a different key from that provided by positivism and Marxism. Science could be something else than indifference to values or just an ideology of modernization destined to denature men from their real vocations. In sum, Ramos endorsed Voegelin's views as his critique of the instrumental rationality of modernizing theories grounded on the market, his explanatory categories such as *derailment* and *disorder*, as well as the belief of classical tradition as an alternative source of a substantive knowledge committed to the permanent values of men.

Yet Ramos did not accompany Voegelin's restorative standpoint without criticisms. He believed that the German philosopher was too radical in rejecting four centuries of knowledge in block. While recognizing the inevitability of ideological, perishable, or simply wrong elements in scientific knowledge throughout history, Ramos also discerned elements of truth in it. After all, even though in a partial manner, men had been always able to interpret reality and modernity was no different. Despite the behavioral and serialist syndrome of men like Seymour Lipset and Gabriel Almond, one could always count on true scientists as Wright Mills and Karl Polanyi, who succeeded in escaping from the realm of ideology. Voegelin also seemed too naive when believing that the challenges of a contemporary society could be solved by the mere restoration of the classical authority of Plato or Aquinas. Ancient philosophy was a permanent source of inspiration in the search of a substantive rationality for modern society. But if Ramos really wanted to constitute an alternative social science to Marxism and positivism up to contemporary challenges of a post-industrial world, he had to go further. The more general critique of theoretical modernity provided by Voegelin's *The New Science of Politics* should be complemented by the new economic theory of Polanyi's *The Great Transformation* to be fully operational. Although past wisdom was crucial, men could not abdicate the task of interrogating their contemporary problems to reach salvation. Here one may see clearly the differences that, despite all affinities, kept Ramos from being a proper Voegelin's disciple. On the other hand, when one understands Ramos's disappointments with modernization theory after the Brazilian military coup of 1964, his new American professional environment and how he rescued his old concerns regarding a new social organization favorable to personal development after May 1968, the apparent ideological paradox of a progressive sociologist appropriating a conservative criticism of liberal modernity seems dispelled. Paraphrasing Shakespeare, there are far more things between heaven and earth than are dreamt of our ideology.