



CHICAGO JOURNALS

Facundo by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento

Facundo by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento; Kathleen Ross

Review by: Barbara Celarent

American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 117, No. 2 (September 2011), pp. 716-723

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/662169>

Accessed: 19/12/2011 12:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Sociology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

chapters to package new wine in old skins, especially when it comes to inferences about the interpersonal dynamics that govern housework in couples. Several discussions of what might be going on at the microlevel (which in these studies tends to be poorly measured) fall back on one of three “classic” but arguably shopworn explanations that emphasize partners’ relative resources, demand/time availability, and gender ideology. An exception to this is the expanded rubric presented in chapter 10 on pair relationships and housework that identifies six structuring mechanisms: gender ideologies, competences, preferences, interests, transaction costs, and identity construction (p. 203). But even this contribution is beset by another tension that surfaces throughout the book. The project of developing theories that have clear empirical implications and retain enough parsimony to be applicable over a range of contexts seems to get lost amid the welter of detail and complexity required to account for cross-national differences. Some of these differences, although they exist, do not in fact appear to be very pronounced.

In short, this volume provides incontrovertible evidence that scholars are getting better at documenting housework inequalities, identifying their correlates, and coming up with nuanced accounts for cross-national differences. But it also suggests that, on balance, it might be time to invest more effort in developing analytic frameworks that capitalize on the advances in data collection and modeling that have enriched our substantive knowledge base, but have been less successful at stimulating new directions for theory. Strategic country comparisons like the one featured in the chapter by Lynn Prince Cooke offer a research-design tool for taking this important next step in a new and promising field.

Facundo. By Domingo Faustino Sarmiento. Translated by Kathleen Ross. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003. Pp. 284.

Barbara Celarent*
University of Atlantis

In 1845 appeared *Civilization and Barbarism: The Life of Juan Facundo Quiroga, and the Physical Aspects, Customs, and Habits of the Argentine Republic*. Posterity has reduced all that to one word: *Facundo*. First issued in pamphlet form, the book made its author so dangerous to the Chileans hosting his exile that they at once sent him to Europe on a fact-finding tour. Indeed, no one can read *Facundo* unmoved. Nor can one speak of it without revealing one’s politics and passions. For if its analysis of Argentine life and politics is perceptive and impassioned, its literary qualities are monumental.

*Another review from 2050 to share with *AJS* readers.—*Ed.*

The child of a declining family, Faustino Sarmiento was born in 1811 in San Juan, Argentina, a small settled area surrounded by arid wastes and shaded by the Andean Cordillera. Educated haphazardly in local schools and by a priest uncle, Sarmiento was willy-nilly swept up in the anarchic local politics that opposed “federalists” and “unitarists” in newly independent Argentina. A militia commission was forced on him by the local federalist leader, but Sarmiento refused it, was jailed, and emerged committed to the unitarist party. He served in various (and largely unsuccessful) military capacities against the region’s emergent federalist strongman (*caudillo*), Juan Facundo Quiroga. When Quiroga finally defeated Lamadrid, the last remaining unitarist general, Sarmiento fled into exile in Chile beyond the looming Andes. Quiroga made it clear to Sarmiento’s family that return would mean death.

In Chile, the young Sarmiento held various jobs—miner, store clerk, teacher. Meanwhile, the Buenos Aires caudillo Juan Manuel Rosas maneuvered himself to absolute power, aided by the assassination of Quiroga in 1835, in which the role of Rosas remains unclear. The new federalist governor of San Juan was the somewhat more easygoing Nazario Benavidez, however, so Sarmiento returned, opened a school, and began a unitarist newspaper. Renewed unitarist revolts and local federalist protests soon forced Benavidez to send Sarmiento off to Chile again. He was now almost 30, and he began serious work on education: a text on reading methods, a scheme for simplified spelling, and in 1842 a normal school to train Chilean teachers.

But Sarmiento also continued his anti-Rosas polemics, and the arrival in February 1845 of an Argentine ambassador instructed to request his extradition pushed him past his limit. He rushed forward his plan for a biography of his old nemesis Quiroga. In five hectic months *Facundo* was written and published. Three months later the worried Chilean authorities put Sarmiento on a boat to Europe.

Sarmiento spent three years studying education and society abroad, in Europe and then America. In Europe he met such figures as François Guizot, Adolphe Thiers, Richard Cobden, and Pius IX, as well as the aging Liberation hero José de San Martín. An accidental meeting on the packet to America gave him an introduction to the educational reformer Horace Mann, whose work decisively influenced his own approach to education. On his return home, Sarmiento published a report on the United States, like so many other 19th-century travelers. But more important, the many contacts the gregarious Argentinian made abroad would facilitate *Facundo*’s French translation and publication in 1853, and then its English translation and publication in 1868.

In the early 1850s, Justo José de Urquiza expelled Rosas from power; Sarmiento provided press reports and occasionally joined the fighting. In the late 1850s, Sarmiento worked on education, but he also moved into political life, becoming in 1862 the governor of his home province of San Juan. Governor Sarmiento undertook many reforms—including the in-

roduction of compulsory education—but like so many before him, he reacted violently to a lingering caudillo challenge. The murder of the defeated El Chacho by Sarmiento's forces did not improve things, so President Mitre sent Sarmiento abroad in 1864 as ambassador to the United States. There Sarmiento ran an embassy more intellectual than political, making and renewing acquaintances throughout the American intelligentsia: Mrs. Horace Mann (now a widow), Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and many others. He returned to Argentina in 1868 to find himself president. Sarmiento's presidency was marred by the usual complexities: a lingering war with Paraguay, the revolt of Entre Rios and nearby provinces, Argentina's disastrous financial position, and so on. After his presidency, Sarmiento held various regional and national positions in education, finally establishing a truly national education system. He died in 1888 while vacationing in Paraguay.

Although Sarmiento is still revered as an educational reformer, it is through *Facundo* that he touches us directly. The book has three main parts. The first is a national character study of the Argentinians, in the style of Montesquieu and Herder, tracing the national character to two sources: on the one hand the physical experience of the plains and their climate, on the other the social effects of the great distances and solitude attendant on the grazing mode of production. In glowing, romantic terms these passages make the frontier argument later associated with the American historian Frederick Jackson Turner. They draw directly on the romantic novelist James Fenimore Cooper, whom Sarmiento greatly admired. This section comprises chapters 1–3 (later, chapter 7 adds an analysis of the political structure of Argentina in the 1820s).

After chapter 4, which makes the transition from climate/structure to human history by discussing the events of the early independence years, the second part of the book takes up the life of its protagonist, Juan Facundo Quiroga. Chapters 5 and 6 give Quiroga's beginnings and first essays as a caudillo. Chapter 8 discusses his emergence as a major force, and chapters 9–12 take up the crucial years of his life, from the battle of La Tablada (a loss) through Oncativo (another loss) to Chacón (an unexpected victory) and finally Ciudadela (final victory). Chapter 13 considers the federalist problem of dividing the spoils of victory, ending with Quiroga's trip to his doom at Barranca Yaco. Embellished with dozens of colorful stories and minor characters, the Quiroga narrative is more a character study than a narrative biography per se.

The third part of the book is a polemical analysis of Argentina under the dictatorship of the triumphant Rosas, a tale told in the two final chapters as well as in the many proleptic fulminations pervading the earlier chapters. Ironically, because Sarmiento portrays Rosas as a cold-blooded, bureaucratic killer, the latter becomes a foil to Quiroga, who for Sarmiento always remains—although brutal and violent—at least an authentic and honest expression of his emotions and of the limitless wastes from which he sprang.

Sarmiento intended this three-part book to make a sociopolitical analysis that would not be out of place in academic political sociology. It can be summarized as follows. Argentina is divided into two types of places, and consequently two types of ideologies, and two types of politics. The cities are Europeanized, middle class, educated, forward-looking, organized, industrious. The countryside, epitomized by the great plain (*pampa*), is American, brutal, violent, short-sighted, disorganized, and lazy. These two forms of character derive from the physical surroundings (city and pampa) and the ways of life (urban production vs. cattle ranching) characteristic of the two places. (Sarmiento gives a particularly nice account of the gender differences in life courses in the countryside, portraying brilliantly [but whether correctly one is not sure] the aimless culture of self-assertion and bravado that grows out of the male world of the *pulpería*.)

Argentine politics takes the form of a battle between these two life zones, the first of which favors a united republic responsibly advancing its people and relying on European models, the second of which favors caudillos governing through extortionate violence and in their own interests. The first is closely linked to liberal European ideas and the Enlightenment, the second more loosely tied to a conservative church and the past. But there is an irony (or is it simply a mistake in Sarmiento's analysis?). The emergence of Rosas as caudillo in Buenos Aires province and his consequent domination of the small, liberal city itself mean that the second conception—the gaucho/caudillo localist model with the loose attachment to conservative ideology and the church—came to control Argentina's relation to the rest of the world as well as, to a considerable extent, Argentina as a whole nation. Thus, although in the literal meaning of the word, Rosas was a unitarist, *de jure* his party was still named "federalist." By contrast, the old liberal unitarism of the cities was destroyed in Buenos Aires and isolated in the smaller inland cities (e.g., Sarmiento's San Juan). It was thus a federation of dispersed groups, not appearing "unitary" at all.

Much clever sociological insight sustains this argument, as does a powerful if one-sided reading of the political situation and a very sharp recognition of the disconnections between the names and the contents of the political parties and their ideologies. And Sarmiento's second chapter, with its list of gaucho types, is a triumph not only of ideal typical analysis, but also of romantic character portrayal. If there are many faults of detail—and 200 years of critics have found their name to be legion—the analysis is nonetheless broad and compelling. (Its great weakness, to a post-Marx reader, is of course its ignoring of the economic foundations of "federalism" in the emergence of a dominating meat export industry organized around giant holdings. It took more than gauchos to sustain the Rosas dictatorship.)

But Sarmiento decided to realize his sociological argument only in part through this straightforward analysis. He also used the figure of Quiroga

to bring the reader close to the repulsive, murderous world of the gauchoturned-caudillo. In the style of Sir Walter Scott, whom Sarmiento had read *in extenso* during his time as a Chilean miner, Quiroga would embody a whole way of life, as his foils Rosas, Lamadrid, and others would embody other ways of life. Like the gaucho he represents, Quiroga is at once a figure of fun for his uncouth clothes and his frontier values as well as a figure of horror for his endless violence to both friend and foe. His brutality is told and retold, whether it is his murder of gambling opponents or his beguiling of the beauties of Tucumán up to the moment they hear the shots that are executing their husbands and lovers. He is the embodiment of arbitrariness and violence.

The rhetorical problem is that Sarmiento cannot avoid admiring Quiroga's occasional capricious kindnesses nor—more ominous—the man's imperious, charismatic, and ferocious will, which evokes enervating terror in all who face him. In the text, even Quiroga's endless betrayals of friends and brutalizations of enemies are softened by his thoughtless bravery. He comes to seem simply an emanation of the soil, as brutal and capricious as nature itself. And the more Rosas emerges as a character, the more admirable Sarmiento's Quiroga becomes. For Rosas has others do his murdering for him. "Rosas never goes into a fury; he calculates in the quiet and seclusion of his study, and from there, the orders go out to his hired assassins" (p. 176). By contrast, "Facundo wasn't cruel, wasn't bloodthirsty; he was just a barbarian who didn't know how to contain his passions, which, once irritated, knew neither measure nor limit" (p. 175). Better a hot-headed killer than a bureaucratic murderer, Sarmiento implies.

In Buenos Aires, after the federalists have won, Sarmiento's Facundo is clearly a man without a reason for living. He even starts appearing to be a reformer (pp. 196, 220). (Revisionist histories of Argentina have taken up this theme quite strongly, but it appears even in *Facundo* itself.) Given the structure of the narrative to this point, Facundo is an obvious threat to Rosas, and there seems little doubt that Sarmiento believes that Rosas connived at his murder. (The French translator of *Facundo* made this quite explicit.) Indeed, Rosas appears all the more cold-blooded for foreseeing that the daring Quiroga will trust his terrifying charisma even in the face of a carefully planned assassination. And so at the end, reader and writer admire Quiroga, whose brutality and vileness all vanish in the pride that refuses the military aid and the hints to take alternate routes. "He counted on making the knives held over his head drop with the terror of his name" (p. 201). Facundo ascends to tragedy, accepting without demur the death he meted out to so many others.

And that is the book's problem. In the end, Sarmiento actually admires Quiroga, because in the last analysis the man of terror is also a man of honest and authentic action, unlike the cold bureaucrat who is the author of his murder. By contrast, Sarmiento's occasional admiring recitations of middle-class reforms (e.g., pp. 168, 185) fall completely flat, even though

these are the core of the unitarist, liberal culture that Sarmiento's sociological analysis so vaunts. And Sarmineto can't bear actually to tell us that the unitarist cause failed because its great commander, the able and successful General José María Paz, committed the astounding blunder of mistaking his own lines and thereby being easily captured by the federalists. Sarmiento can only tell us Paz was "yanked away from the head of his army by a throw of the bolas" (p. 174). It was an unpardonable mistake for any gaucho. (Astonishingly, Paz survived to endure 20 more years of wars and exiles, eventually triumphing with Urquiza in the early 1850s.)

To some extent, Sarmiento here falls prey to the power of biography as a genre rooted in the classical canon of drama. Readers trained on that canon cannot avoid the seductions of the tragic trajectory. (Shakespeare's Macbeth, after all, is a scheming caudillo not so different from Quiroga, redeemed somewhat in the end by his courage before the nothingness of life.) Academic sociology evades these biographical seductions with its deadening prose and endless statistics. For example, the rise and fall of Quiroga takes one or two bland pages in a standard study of Argentina's history. Such a book spends its time recapturing the experience of common men and women, lives shaped by but not determined by the elite heroics that oppose Sarmiento and Rosas. Sociology is in that sense a thoroughly middle-class discipline. Democratic, sober, and restrained, it focuses on the good life for all of the people. Of the two social ideals Tocqueville offers in his celebrated opposition of aristocracy and democracy in *Democracy in America* (vol. 1, pt. 2, chap. 6), sociology has chosen the latter. But, as the example of Sarmiento shows, it never makes that choice without profound regret.

If we get past this initial—and quite familiar—opposition of the aristocratic, daring, and ambitious versus the democratic, thoughtful, and calculating, we come to less familiar ground. Laminated together in Sarmiento's version of Quiroga are a number of themes, some disturbing, some noble. There is, first, a morbid fascination with violence. The text is full of gory and horrifying stories, told with a relish that tries to gainsay their horror. There is, second, a fascination with perfidy, disloyalty, and betrayal, themes that are always strong in middle-class writing about honor societies. Betrayal is here evident in the pervasive lies, the switching of sides, and the taking of unfair advantage. This theme culminates in the enigma of whether Rosas has actually ordained the events of Barranca Yaco. There is, third, a more morally neutral meditation on the role of the arbitrary in human life. Sarmiento's Quiroga is admirable in part because he accepts—indeed delights in—the human necessity arbitrarily to make a world, to enact a life for oneself and possibly others. Moreover, the near-complete absence of women from the book inevitably associates this celebration of the arbitrary with the phenomenon of masculinity. (One could, indeed, read the book principally as a study in ideologies of masculinity. No doubt this has been done many times.)

Fourth, there is the theme of authenticity. The contrast of Quiroga and Rosas is always one between the authentic and the forced, between the natural and the unnatural. It is here that we miss the economic analysis most, for the logical opposite of Quiroga as emanation of the land should be Rosas as emanation of the evils of civilization, in particular of the organized cattle export that requires control not only of the *pampa* but also of the port city with its processing and transportation industries. Yet in Sarmiento's original system of oppositions, cities are good because they are middle class, educated, and organized. He doesn't see what would later be called the export-dependency complex, although he does understand that there is something about Rosas that is disturbing in a way that Facundo, for all his violence, is not.

There is finally the theme of charisma and performativity. One of the many things Sarmiento cannot help admiring about Quiroga is his success. Setting aside the content of Quiroga's life—fighting, murder, extortion—what marks him is that he makes (indeed defines) the world around him. What matters is not so much that this made world is arbitrary, but that it is made at all. Quiroga, for all his destructiveness, is Promethean, a maker of a world. If we transposed the whole story to the arts, we could imagine Quiroga as one of those revolutionarily destructive artists whom the 19th and 20th centuries so much admired. Because he is a man who *makes*, he has the charisma of the artist. Sarmiento cannot help but admire him.

But Quiroga makes his world by destroying the worlds of others. He is an evil man. It is by a similarly dangerous logic that the Carlylean heroes of the early 19th century took shape in the tawdry but merciless dictators of the 20th. What we see in *Facundo* is the initial set of confusions through which that shaping began. The book shows us the strangely familiar set of associations according to which we can come to find an evil man to be admirable.

Inevitably, a book so powerful yet so ambivalent became a canonical and controversial text. Within months of its appearance, Valentín Alsina criticized the book for misreading the facts about Rosas and misunderstanding the inner realities of unitarist/federalist relations. Juan Batista Alberdi attacked the book for overstatement, attributing the parts he liked to a larger tradition of analysis and the parts he did not like to Sarmiento in particular. In the 1880s, with the temporary triumph of liberalism, the book and its author were canonized, although the new context of a high-immigration Argentina led to a more Spencerian reading of *Facundo*, one with stronger race overtones, an interpretation given to some extent by Sarmiento himself in old age. The emergence of José Hernández's *Martin Fierro*—the *gauchesca* epic—led to new interpretations of *Facundo* emphasizing Sarmiento's admiration of Quiroga, rather than his disgust with him, and indeed, there were eventually arguments that Quiroga had been a sort of "rural man with a broader vision."

In the metropolis, *Facundo* has had an equally long and interesting

history, particularly in the United States with Mary Mann's framing it (in her translation and her writing about Sarmiento) as a foundational text of progressivism-in-the-making. In the mid-20th century, national character studies found the book an ideal text, and by the end of the 20th century the work was providing a field day for humanists, academic gauchos daring each other to ever-stranger feats of interpretive horse-manship.

Whatever else *Facundo* is, some piece of it is great social science. The work is centrally important for us precisely because that social science is inextricably bound up with fiction, history, travelogue, polemic, and sheer egomania. It is best to end with Sarmiento's beginning.

Terrible specter of Facundo, I will evoke you, so that you may rise, shaking off the bloody dust covering your ashes and explain the hidden life and the inner convulsions that tear at the bowels of a noble people! You possess the secret: reveal it to us! (P. 31)

Social analysis does not get better than this.