Introduction

In his *Contribuição à história das lutas operárias no Brasil* (Contribution to the History of Labor Struggles in Brazil), originally published in 1955, Hermínio Linhares reveals himself to be one of those authors who considers the typesetters' strike, which took place in 1858, to be "Rio de Janeiro's first strike, maybe Brazil's."[1] This strike, which has been an object of academic studies for some time now,[2] is significant indeed. After months demanding a wage increase from the owners of the three major court dailies (*Correio Mercantil, Diário do Rio de Janeiro,* and *Jornal do Comercio*) and at a moment when the cost of living was soaring, the typesetters decided to stop work beginning on January 9, 1858. What is most interesting about this strike is the existence of a relatively vast volume of records, because the strikers, supported by the *Imperial Associação Tipográfica Fluminense* (Imperial Fluminense Typographic Association),[3] founded the *Jornal dos Tipógrafos* (Typographers' Journal), a daily newspaper that was to present the workers' arguments in the weeks that followed. In the newspaper's pages we find a relatively small professional group (the biggest of the diaries, *Jornal do Comércio* [Commerce's Journal], employed about thirty-two typesetters only) that presented itself being composed of "artists," specialized artisans, impoverished by the greed of the newspaper proprietors and their refusal to pay them a decent wage. The strike is all the more remarkable because of the active role played by the typographers' association, whose main goal was actually mutual assistance, but which eventually assumed the function of representing *its members'* interests, interceding with the authorities on behalf of the workers and financing machinery acquisition for the printing of the strikers' newspaper.

In the *Jornal dos Tipógrafos* we can find evidence of a class identity under construction, for there are clear statements of specificity when the typesetters define themselves as *artistas* (artisans/artists) or declare that they "gathered" as a consequence of being "a low-paid class." Nevertheless, they also state that "laborers from many classes" were in a similar situation to the typesetters who recognized themselves in their deeds.[4]

In some articles they went even further, affirming the need to put an end to the "oppression of the entire caste" and to fight the "exploitation of men by men," identifying the "stupid selfishness of the industrial entrepreneurs and capitalists"[5] as a target.

Regarding the *Imperial Associação Tipográfica*, it was founded in 1853 with goals of mutuality (to create a fund for sickness, widow assistance, and funeral costs). However, it also made provision in its Statutes whereby one of the association's aims would be to "contribute to the progress and development of the typographic art in whatever way it can," and that provision opened the way to the possibility of defending the interests of the associated "artists," as they considered themselves to be.[6] Examining the 1858 typesetters' movement, its characteristics as a representative of a branch of free and wage-earning workers who gathered together to defend their dignity as artists but fought those who they consciously considered to be their class enemies (the bosses), we could call it an example of the working-class formation process, presenting clear similarities to the classic cases. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the Brazilian case as it was during the second half of the nineteenth century and, particularly as it was in Rio de Janeiro, then focusing on this particular aspect of "free labor" alone in order to reflect on the process of class formation as a whole would impose great limitations on the analysis. After all, that society needed to differentiate some workers defining them as "free" precisely because they lived among other workers who were not "free."

It is hard to determine whether the typesetters' strike was or was not the first free workers' or wage-earning workers' strike in Brazil. However, it is noteworthy that Hermínio Linhares, before making the statement quoted above, commented in the same text on another episode that had occurred the year before. This work stoppage by slave workers at the *Ponta d'Areia* establishment, the property of the Baron of Mauá,[7] was reported as follows in the November 26 issue of the Niterói daily newspaper *A Pátria* (The Nation):

> Yesterday, between eleven and twelve noon, according to information received, the slaves from the Ponta da Areia establishment rose and refused to continue working unless three of their colleagues, who had been arrested for disobeying the establishment's orders, were released. Fortunately, the uprising did not gain ground, for the honorable Dr. Paranaguá [the chief of police of the province] came as soon as he had been alerted, arrested thirty-odd mutineers and took them off to jail.[8]

It is known that the *Ponta d'Areia* establishment, which consisted of a foundry and a shipyard and was made up of many smaller workshops, was the largest private enterprise of its kind at that time, employing about six

hundred laborers, of which approximately a quarter were enslaved.[9] We also know that many other arsenals and factories employed a large number of enslaved workers, which allowed Geraldo Beauclair to state that there was "a functional integration … within most 'factories' between 'free men and slaves', with no suggestion at any time that the latter could not alternate with the former in the most complex tasks (excluding those assigned only to the more highly qualified masters of a craft)."[10]

Thus, it seems appropriate to ask whether it would be possible to dissociate episodes of workers' strikes/uprisings that occurred in factories like this one from the process of working-class formation in Rio de Janeiro. It is not hard to imagine a more generalized level of contact among the trajectories of enslaved, ex-enslaved and free workers within the class-formation process, not only in factories but all over a town in which, for many decades, many areas of work and employment were shared by enslaved and free workers alike.

This degree of contact between the urban workers of different legal conditions—slaves and free—also allows another question. The experience of freedom should, in the context addressed here but not only in it, be problematized. After all, for enslaved workers, freedom was something to achieve by overcoming the legal situation of slavery. For the so-called "free workers," many of them former slaves, in various situations, it became evident that their freedom was very limited by the constraints of their lived experiences of proletarianization. Therefore, in many cases discussed in this book, they evaluated their situation as akin to slavery.

The hypothesis that, in the formation of the working class in Brazil during the period between the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, the experiences undergone by slaves and former slaves who shared working areas and labor processes were just as important as those of the artisans and other free men who first experienced the process of proletarianization is now being embraced as much by scholars specialized in slavery as by labor researchers, although such convergence is not always acknowledged.[11] Some guidelines that inspired the analysis developed in this work will now be briefly mentioned. They will be brought up again at different moments further on in the text.

Very rich examples of recent research come from Maria Cecilia Velasco e Cruz, who, in her studies of Rio de Janeiro's dock workers, has found a strong link between the organization of enslaved loaders working in times of slavery and the practices of the sector's trade union formed at the turn of the century, which engaged itself in struggles for controlling the workforce hiring process. The way her thesis, defended in a sociology graduate program, embraces the multiple dimensions of class is outstanding, and she manages to combine the two classic areas of the sociology of

labor, namely labor process and labor movement, demonstrating how sociability, solidarity, and labor market control networks, built when slavery was still in force, played a decisive role in the formation of a unionism in which ex-slaves and their descendants had great participation and whose main objective, in its early years, would be to ensure at least a minimum degree of workers' control over the process of hiring in the casual labor context.[12]

In an article in which Velasco e Cruz summarizes part of her PhD thesis, she finds that in the port there was a strong "line of continuity between slaves and freedmen from the former imperial times and the proletarians of the First Republic." To sustain that conclusion, the author marshals many factors and calls particular attention to the combination of "the mutual solidarity of dock workers and loaders and the speed with which the workers managed to impose their union on the employers." That is evidence that the "change of historical actors, with the entry of white immigrants and decline of blacks and mulattoes did not occur in the city's port system in the manner proposed by existing analysis of the Brazilian working-class formation process."[13]

João José Reis started from research on mid-nineteenth-century slave laborers—in their vast majority Africans from the "*cantos*" of Salvador (the corners where slaves waited for work) and most of them *ganhadores* (money-earning slaves) who provided services, mostly, but not exclusively, as loaders—and advanced his time frame up until the eve of abolition, a moment when very few of the street workers organized in the *cantos* were still enslaved and only half of most free and freedmen were actually Africans. From his pioneering study of the "black strike" of 1857 in Salvador to the analysis of the same groups in the 1880s—basing his work on a discussion of the *livro de matrículas,* a registration book instituted under police orders—the author found that if at first African ethnic identity was the fundamental tie explaining their capacity for collective organization and collective action, at a later moment it then became possible to perceive that "class, race and ethnicity were mixed in a complex game, as they have always been, but, at least in the sheets of this *livro de matrículas,* and supposing these things can be separated, the class side appeared to be making headway in the game."[14] That would in no way remove the stigma of slavery, nor the ethnic aspect, but it would attribute new dimensions to them in the light of the new class experience:

> That means, that under the pressure of class experience, the *ganhadores* would be moving towards a racial identity in which mestizos [half-breeds], Brazilian blacks and African blacks would recognize themselves as being, socially, passengers on board the same Negro slave ship in Bahi[15]

Researching two cities in Rio Grande do Sul (Pelotas and Rio Grande), Beatriz Loner also found important relations between slaves' and free workers' experiences in the class-formation processes. From her study emerges not only the emphasis on the importance of the urban black labor force in those towns but also the encounter between the struggle for affirming a positive racial identity of ex-slaves and their descendants and the first steps being taken by an active labor movement. From her analysis, we can find leaders who combined trade-union activism with anti-racist struggles and markedly ethnic social spaces (such as clubs, libraries, and musical societies). According to Loner,

> Black militants are found in every moment of struggle and organization of the various labor associations.… Their dual militancy in associations of race and of class probably contributed, in a significant way, to the engagement of new workers.… In Pelotas, in particular, the organization of the labor movement mainly reflected this group's actions.[16]

Sidney Chalhoub studied the organization of black workers' associations during the 1860s and 1870s in Rio de Janeiro, a process that he called "a crucial chapter of working-class history in Brazil," because strong associative models among free workers, mutual associations that were forbidden for enslaved workers, were operated by sectors of Rio de Janeiro's African-Brazilian population (slaves included) and directed mainly at the fight for freedom. Studying those associations based on the documentation addressed by them to the *Conselho de Estado* (State Council, highest consultative body to the Emperor) whereby the associations sought a recognition that would eventually be denied them, Chalhoub found a

> similarity between those black societies and the nineteenth century labor associations.… Here and there we find internal democracy, a great emphasis on member assembly in associative life, an equality of rights and duties, low monthly fees, the objective of attracting new members—"unlimited number of members"—an attempt to dignify labor, to assure a good moral conduct from the members, and to provide various means of assistance.[17]

International references can also be called into play. The perspective that relates slavery to working-class formation was adopted by Herbert Gutman in his studies on the American case. Author of many essays on the labor movement and on post-abolition African Americans, he discussed, for example, the black workers' presence in miners' union movements based on the letters of one Richard Davis.[18] In an interview given after the publication of that study, Gutman explains that he hit upon a matter little studied by labor historians when he discovered the "marvelous" letters of Davis, an ex-slave and one of the main miners' union leaders during the

1890s, and found that "in the first years of the UMW [miners' union, founded in 1890], black unionists were proportionally more important than the white ones."[19]

In this work, I have attempted to link some of the more or less recent areas of historiographic research that have been generally regarded as circumscribed specialties, and we have also sought to analyze underexplored sources that allow us to address other matters. Taking into account that enslaved and free workers shared common urban work environments; that collective protests from both groups coexisted in time and space, each group's demands sometimes being closer, sometimes farther from the others in form and content; that associative forms were often shared; and that identity discourses arose from comparisons between enslaved and free work, we have worked with the hypothesis that in the process of working-class formation in Rio de Janeiro—a period that stems from the second half of the nineteenth century to the first decades of the twentieth century—the existence of slavery and of slave struggles for freedom and the means by which the local ruling classes attempted to control their slaves and conduct the process of "un-slaving" without further disturbances to their domination were decisive factors in shaping the new class of wage-earning workers.

After all, if we consider class as "process and relation," and not as a structural position, there is no escaping from the fact that, even if one does not want to demonstrate a single direct evolution from urban slavery to the making of the wage-earning workers' class, it is not possible to explain the class-formation process by setting an initial mark at 1888 or by merely going back in time to search for free workers' experiences.

For that reason, this work embraces a period that starts in the 1850s, apogee and beginning of the decline of slave presence in the city, when the first strikes occurred and the publication of workers' newspapers began to mention some of the examples that will be analyzed in the text, and ends in the first years of the 1910s, when strikes were already a widespread experience, labor/socialist parties had sprung up, and the class's trade union institutions were already constituted with relative stability, as witness the participation in the *2º Congresso Operário Brasileiro* (Second Brazilian Labor Congress) of 1913.

The historiographic hypotheses and approaches presented here are not detached from theory. The theoretical references that guided this research are situated in an area of study that takes the concepts of social class and class struggle as fundamental for analyzing the dynamics of workers' social movements. On the other hand, it is a matter here of focusing on a certain moment—the one of formation—in the trajectory of the working class in Brazil, taking strongly into account the coexistence of slaves and

free workers in Rio de Janeiro's labor market. For that reason the works that have analyzed class formation based on the European case were read as references, not as models.

The contemporary use of the word "class" tends to indicate a new analytic category of social reality capable of embracing the socioeconomic inequalities in capitalist society.[20] It also indicates a moment of workers' conscious self-representation concerning their social situation, common interests, and opposite interests in relation to other classes. Such a process, whose political nature is undeniable, is related to the expansion of socialist ideas. It is especially connected to the proposals for interpreting social reality defended by Marx and Engels from the 1840s on. Although it is possible to observe other matrices used to apply the concept of social class, it is from Marx and Engels's proposals that the social sciences have incorporated "class" into their analytical arsenal, and, even when diverging from Marxism, in it they have had their main reference and interlocutor in the debate on the concept's use.[21]

Given the limitations of an introduction, it would be pretentious, to say the least, to attempt a synthesis that showed even a minimum of respect for the contributions of Marx and Engels (and later of the other "Marxisms"), to history in general, or to the concept of social classes in particular. It is worthwhile, though, to briefly situate in which Marxist perspective on social classes, class struggles, and class formation this text's guidelines were built. After all, to simply affirm that we are theoretically grounded on Marxism does not grant us a stamped passport to go along without any further care, for it is not difficult to acknowledge that the paths taken by Marxism throughout the twentieth century were various and often even antagonistic.

This seems to have been the concern of English historian Edward Palmer Thompson, who in a 1978 book—*The Poverty of Theory*—summarized the problem. At the beginning of the 1970s, in a polemic article titled "An Open letter to Leszek Kolakowski," he had referred to the different paths taken by a single Marxist "tradition" during the twentieth century. Though they were opposing paths in many senses, he felt they had something in common, even though it might only be their use of a vocabulary derived from Marx and Engels's ideas.[22] In 1978, however, he self-corrected, for he believed he had been wrong and that actually there were indeed two irreconcilable Marxist traditions:

> For the gulf that has opened has not been between different accentuations to the vocabulary of concepts, between this analogy and that category, but between idealist and materialist modes of thought, between Marxism as closure and a tradition, derived from Marx, of open investigation and critique. The first is a tradition of theology. The second is a tradition of active reason. Both

> can derive some license from Marx, although the second has immeasurably the better credentials as to its lineage.[23]

Thompson affirmed that distinction after following a pathway well-trodden by British social history, of presenting a singular Marxism's reading; a trend that became stronger from 1956 on, when Thompson and others who shared similar concerns ruptured with the Communist Party to build a political movement known as the New Left.[24]

It was within that context that Thompson, addressing the question of class formation in a specific and minutely studied historical context, attempted to articulate the cultural elements, that is, the systems of values, beliefs, morals, and attitudes involved in the process of articulating class interests and identities stemming from common experiences. According to Thompson himself, the constant concern in his work with the silences of the Marxist approach led him to reflections of a cultural and moral type, understood not as autonomous spheres of reflection but as important parts of the study on "the ways in which human beings are enmeshed in particular, determined production relations, the way those material experiences mold themselves into cultural forms and the ways in which certain value-systems are consonant with certain modes of production and certain modes of production relations are inconceivable without there being consonant value-systems." For that reason, according to the British historian, "there is not a moral ideology that belongs to a 'superstructure', there are these two things which are different sides of the same coin."[25]

Such moral and cultural references emerge from the sedimentation and reinterpretation of older values and customs. The interest in these issues led Thompson to the study of the preindustrial period, particularly that of England in the eighteenth century. From the many important analytical suggestions derived from this backward time leap in the analysis, Thompson's anxiety to explain social conflict in class terms, even at a time when its agents did not identify themselves in such a way, emerges as something decisive for the kind of reflection that this book intends to dwell upon. With those aims in mind, Thompson works with two dimensions of the class concept: "a) with reference to real, empirically observable correspondent historical content; b) as a heuristic or analytic category to organize historical evidence which has a very much less direct correspondence."[26] Concerning this second dimension of the concept, Thompson highlights the indissolubility of the relation between class and class struggle, even indicating the primacy of the second term of the pair over the first. It is worthwhile reproducing a longer fragment of his reflection, where he stresses the fact that

> class, in its heuristic usage, is inseparable from the notion of 'class-struggle'. In my view, far too much theoretical attention (much of it plainly a-historical) has been paid to 'class', and far too little to 'class-struggle'. Indeed, class-struggle is the prior, as well as the more universal, concept. To put it bluntly: classes do not exist as separate entities, look around, find an enemy class, and then start to struggle. On the contrary, people find themselves in a society structured in determined ways (crucially, but not exclusively, in productive relations), they experience exploitation (or the need to maintain power over those whom they exploit), they identify points of antagonistic interest, they commence to struggle around these issues and in the process of struggling they discover themselves as classes, they come to know this discovery as class-consciousness. Class and class-consciousness are always the last, not the first, stage in the real historical process.[27]

This is how Thompson systematizes his contributions to the study of pre-capitalist societies departing from a perspective centered on the class concept, or better, on the class-struggle concept. Such considerations assume a fundamental importance for the study of class-making processes, in which the new class's consciousness is molded from the articulation of values and traditions inherited from the preceding social setting, a setting that was itself marked by class struggles as well, even though not necessarily explicitly understood in terms of class by its contemporaries. Ellen Wood summarizes Thompson's intention in his studies of eighteenth-century England as an attempt to "demonstrate the determinative effects of class 'situations' even where 'mature' classes do not yet exist."[28] In the same author one finds a precise synthesis of the relevance of the English historian's elaborations:

> His historical project presupposes that relations of production distribute people into class situations, that these situations entail essential antagonisms and conflicts of interest, and that they therefore create conditions of struggle. Class *formations* and the discovery of class consciousness grow out of the process of struggle, as people 'experience' and 'handle' their class situation. It is in this sense that class struggle precedes class.[29]

This type of argument made it possible to construct an analytical framework for the relations between "material life," "social struggle," and "social consciousness" on new grounds. Although Thompson has not dedicated much attention in his studies to matters related to the so-called "social-economic structure" (according to him, in order to leave this task to more competent members of a collective historiographic project), one can infer a very rich theoretical and interpretive lode from his work. According to Ellen K. Trinberger, Thompson's theoretical framework,

> when applied to historical material, could produce an argument that is neither idealist nor economist, neither voluntarist nor structurally determinist. Such an argument could integrate an analysis of cultural (including ideological and moral) production with material (especially economic) production.[30]

Taking Thompson's reflections into due account, many consequences can be drawn from materialist theoretical-interpretative guidelines for analyzing social classes in historical situations other than the British one Thompson focuses on in his studies. In a brief summary, the following can be mentioned: the possibility of basing studies on workers in pre-capitalist/pre-industrial periods on the concept of class struggle, relating the approach to the question of a 'mature' working class to the specific historical formation processes and conflicts between classes; the perception of class's heterogeneity and of their collective behavior based on an analysis of the multiplicity of possible responses to the context, as much at the level of consciousness as at the level of organization and collective action; the obligation to view class not only from the perspective of the production *locus* but also from the perspectives of neighborhood and social environments, i.e., in the community; the need for the scholar to combine history's interpretive references with concepts and methods of other social sciences when working with notions such as culture, tradition, customs, and community.

Thompson's perspective is also inspiring in regard to this text's own specific object, insofar as it proposes that any analysis of the process of working-class formation must hark back to the earlier standards and values-forming moments, forged in the class struggle, and which eventually came to guide the "new" class's world vision. It is from the study of preceding class situations that the class and the class-consciousness formation of workers under capitalism will become apparent in a far less simplistic way.

Viewed that way, as process and relation, the working class in formation in Rio de Janeiro could not be dissociated from the experience of coexistence between slaves and free workers in the city in the course of the nineteenth century. If life and labor experience engender fields of struggle in which organizations and class-consciousness manifestations emerge, the field of antagonistic social forces up until the decade of 1880—that is, the class situation—still vigorously opposed masters and slaves. The enslaved workers' struggle for freedom, associated with the abolitionist movement during its last years, was to make that clear.

Based on the discussion delineated at the beginning and orientated by the theoretical guidelines briefly presented earlier, this work has been split into six thematically delimited parts, though in each one of them the chronological dimension has been essential to organizing the presentation.

It is a means of exhibiting the research that should not conceal the fact that the multiple aspects portrayed in each chapter are interrelated within a single historical process, which means that the initial division by themes is a guide not always strictly followed in the course of expounding them.

This introduction started off with a brief reference to sources that have enabled us to acquire knowledge of two movements fairly representative of the overall set of labor issues at the time, followed by a presentation of the conceptual grounds on which this research was developed. In the four following chapters, although we shall still make some theoretical references, the analysis of the sources predominates.

The first chapter, "Labor, Urban Life and the Experience of Exploitation," discusses those working-class dimensions that Katznelson, taking E. P. Thompson's oeuvre as his reference, considers "experience-near,"[31] involving the level of economic structuring, the way of living and working in the city, as well as some references as to how such situations determined a given experience marked by the exploitation condition, as depicted in certain workers' records. In order to do so, it was necessary to have recourse to a vast bibliography. On the one hand, works have been consulted in the field of economic history, dedicated to the first stages of Brazilian industrialization, Rio de Janeiro's industrialization in particular, and often making use of categories such as "proto-industrialization" or "pre-industry" to define the existence and dynamics of the nineteenth-century factories. The combined exploitation of free and enslaved workers in the first industrial plants had already been identified and analyzed as far back as the 1980s by studies addressing such aspects, and the present work has drawn much nourishment from them. Wide use has also been made of various pieces of labor history research investigating urban slavery in Rio de Janeiro. Furthermore, there is a whole series of academic studies on living conditions (housing, health/epidemics, food/food supply, cost of living) during the last decades of the imperial court period and the first decades of the Capital of the Republic that are in the true tradition of urban social history, and this work has made copious use of them.

To a lesser extent than in other chapters, the first chapter also refers to primary sources that could complement the general analysis of the modes of living and working in the city during the period studied, favoring those that could lead us to a perception of how workers (especially free workers in this case) translated this experience, and for that reason attention is dedicated to the newspapers that first define themselves as representatives of the "artists" (artisans), or laborers.

The second chapter, "Forms of Organization," maps and analyzes the kinds of organizations that workers, whether enslaved or free, built

over time. The chapter also discusses other forms of organization so that brotherhoods, mutual assistance associations, trade unions, and parties constitute the main focus at that stage of the text. The objectives, the profile and the number of members, the rules, and various other aspects of those organizations have been studied based on a wide range of sources, such as brotherhood engagements, association and trade union statutes, sentences and processes of the *Conselho de Estado* (State Council), civil records, reports and balances, and surveys from the period.

In the third chapter, "Resistance and Struggle," the focus is on collective action, identifying, in keeping concern with work as a whole, specific and/or common forms of struggle among enslaved and free workers. As in the second chapter, there is an effort to evaluate the amount of continuity (or the force of tradition) of mobilization modes before and after the abolition of slavery. The press, memoirs of militants, and other sources of the period have been used as a means to address everything ranging from urban *quilombos* (communities of fugitive slaves) to strikes, including riots, rebellions, and social movements with broad repercussions, such as the abolitionist movement. The police repression of those movements is also studied in this chapter, in an attempt to address some of the ways the dominant classes fought collective mobilizations in the labor world by activating the state body responsible for maintaining law and order.

The fourth chapter is dedicated to the matter of consciousness. Taking into account that within the process of class formation, the progressive (although not linear) self-identification of workers stemming from their common interests and from the opposition of interests in relation to their exploiters is a fundamental dimension, this part of the book concentrates on analyzing the discourses of organizations and leadership, as well as the evidence of collective manifestations of class consciousness. The main sources for this chapter (although others have been used) are newspapers identified with the workers that began to be published in the 1850s. In them one can notice nuances in the (self-)identification categories such as artist, laborer, worker, slave, African, free, and freedmen, and the changes they suffered as time went by, as well as the projects of social emancipation discussed by laborers, where it is possible to find the moments in which the sense of "class" becomes predominantly one that identifies a collective consciousness.

Finally, the last part of the text takes up, once more, the discussion on processes of class formation and includes the case of Rio de Janeiro, with its specificities and common traits with other experiences, in an analytic perspective of greater scope, (re)combining the various levels of analysis discussed in the preceding chapters.

I could not end this introduction without signalizing that, even in texts written singlehandedly, the marks of collective work and of existing in society make themselves felt. There are formal acknowledgments that, in the current context, gain particular importance. After all, the whole research that fostered this text was done in the period between the final years of the 1990s and the first of the twenty-first century, a time of severe cutbacks in Brazil on public funding for those universities that were still state-run and for scientific and technological research in general. In spite of that, however, the research projects related to this text were supported by the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq) and by the Rio de Janeiro Research Support Foundation (Faperj).

The presentation of papers in scientific events gained a less bureaucratic atmosphere when I joined the National History Association's (Anpuh) working group *Mundos do Trabalho* (Worlds of Labor). To avoid a long list of individual acknowledgments (and possible inadvertent omissions), I shall limit myself to declaring the importance of the academic exchanges with all members of the working group for developing the studies reflected in this text.

I have always profited and shall continue to do so from the various spaces of social contact (and conflict) in which I take part at the Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF), especially the classrooms and the daily interaction with undergraduate and graduate students; and that transpires in every line I write. My acknowledgments also go to friends and colleagues within the interdisciplinary nucleus for research and studies into Marx and Marxism (NIEP-Marx). Nevertheless, I do not only teach and learn within the UFF environment, and I must stress that during the last years I have intensified an experience that has always been rewarding to me: taking part in courses with social militants, from both the rural and urban areas, such as "Brazilian Reality" and "The History of Class Struggle in Brazil," both run by the Florestan Fernandes National School. In them I have sometimes had the opportunity to discuss themes related to this work, and those discussions have proved to be highly valuable; and even more valuable, perhaps, was the lesson about sharing that I learned through those classes.

Over a period of years Rafael Maul de Carvalho, Marcela Goldmacher, Francisco Josué Medeiros de Freitas, Igor Soares Netto de Oliveira, Branno Hocherman Costa, and Maya Valeriano have received initiation scholarships enabling them to help me with the research that has led to this text. Without their work and the ideas we exchanged, none of this would ever have been possible. Equally fundamental have been the contributions stemming from the discussions of a study group dedicated to class-formation studies made up of the aforementioned colleagues and

longstanding friends and colleagues Luciana Lombardo Costa Pereira and Júlia Monnerat Barbosa and more recent partners Tiago Bernardon, Érica Arantes, Igor Gomes, Victor Emrich, and Rômulo Mattos, whom I must thank for their comments on the work's first version, as well as Paulo Terra, Felipe Demier, Gabriel Aladen, Elisa Monteiro, Desirée Azevedo, André Berenger, Tatiane Vasconcelos, Otávia Cláudia Pequeno, Priscilla Gomes, Marco Marques, Demian Melo, Juliana Vieira, Clarice Chacon, Adriano Zão, and my teacher Mirna Aragão. As the study group is also a group of friends, I thank all of them for their friendship, since no work can be expressive of life unless there is affection present.

To me, João is one of human life's greatest expressions, and to him this book is dedicated.

For this English version, Marcel van der Linden's support has been decisive. Over the last few years, the ideas exchanged with him and with others who have dedicated themselves to building a labor history from the Global South have shown me that I am not alone in my thinking and that I have a lot to learn from the studies of my fellow Indian scholars, such as Rana Behal, Prabhu Mohapatra, and Chitra Joshi.

Thanks to Renata Meirelles, Frederico de Barros, and Martin Nicholl for the translation.

Notes

1. Hermínio Linhares, *Contribuição à história das lutas operárias no Brasil,* 2nd ed. (São Paulo: Alfa-Ômega, 1977), 33.
2. For an example, see Artur José Renda Vitorino, *Máquinas e operários: mudança técnica e sindicalismo gráfico (São Paulo e Rio de Janeiro, 1858–1912)* (São Paulo: Annablume/Fapesp, 2000).
3. [Translator's note] The term "Fluminense" refers to somebody or something that comes from or belongs to the province where the city of Rio de Janeiro is located, but Rio de Janeiro itself, as a capital, was a neutral municipality. "Carioca" came to be used to identify somebody or something specifically from the city of Rio de Janeiro.
4. *Jornal dos Tipógrafos,* Rio de Janeiro, 1/14/1858, 1.
5. *Jornal dos Tipógrafos,* Rio de Janeiro, 1/23/1858, 2–3. Also transcribed in *O Povo Soberano,* Rio de Janeiro, 5/3/1858, 3.
6. *Estatutos da Imperial Associação Tipográfica Fluminense,* Rio de Janeiro, 1866. Biblioteca Nacional (BN), V-253, 2, 8, n. 44.
7. Mauá was a pioneering industrialist and one of the wealthiest men of the period.
8. Quoted in Linhares, *Contribuição à história,* 32.
9. For further information on Mauá's enterprise, see Geraldo de Beauclair, *Raízes da indústria no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro: Studio F&S, 1992). For another analysis that shows how common the employment of a slave labor force in industrial establishments was, see Luiz Carlos Soares, *A manufatura na formação econômica e social escravista do Sudeste, um estudo das atividades manufatureiras na região fluminense* (master's diss., Niterói: UFF, 1980).

10. Beauclair, *Raízes da indústria no Brasil,* 181.
11. There are suggestions of this in an article by labor historian Antonio Luigi Negro, "Imperfeita ou rarefeita? O debate sobre o fazer-se da classe trabalhadora inglesa," *Revista Brasileira de História* 16, nos. 31–32 (1996): 40–61, in which the main concern is to associate class-making studies in Brazil with Thompson's perspective, according to which the analysis of the formation processes should go back to previous historical moments that formed patterns and values forged in the class struggle and that guide the "new" class's worldview. On the other hand, departing from the slavery issue, we can find Silvia Hunold Lara's perspective in "Escravidão, cidadania e história do trabalho no Brasil." *Projeto História* 16 (1998): 26–38, which attempts to situate the importance of the slave experience in social labor history. John French defends the importance of studies of that kind in the article "A história latino-americana do trabalho hoje: uma reflexão autocrítica." *Revista História Unisinos* 6, no. 6 (2002): 11–28.
12. Maria Cecília Velasco e Cruz, *Virando o jogo: estivadores e carregadores no Rio de Janeiro da Primeira República* (PhD thesis, São Paulo, USP, 1998).
13. Maria Cecília Velasco e Cruz, "Tradições negras na formação de um sindicato: sociedade de resistência dos trabalhadores em trapiche e café, Rio de Janeiro, 1905–1930." *Afro-Ásia* 24 (2000): 274.
14. João José Reis, "De olho no canto: trabalho de rua na Bahia na véspera da abolição," *Afro-Ásia* 24 (2000): 199–242. And João José Reis, "A greve negra de 1857 na Bahia." *Revista USP* 18 (1993): 7–29.
15. Reis, "De olho no canto," 241.
16. Beatriz Ana Loner, *Construção de classe: operários de Pelotas e Rio Grande (1888–1930)* (Pelotas: Unitrabalho/EdUFPel, 2001).
17. Sidney Chalhoub, *Machado de Assis: historiador* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2003), 248.
18. Herbert G. Gutman, "The Negro and the United Mine Workers of America," in *Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America* (New York: Vintage, 1977), article's first edition in 1968.
19. "Interview with Herbert Gutman," in *Power and Culture: Essays on the American Working Class,* ed. Ira Berlin and Herbert Gutman (New York: Pantheon, 1987), 331.
20. The discussion on the concept of social class has been limited here to the elements most directly related to the issue of class formation. For further theoretical analysis of the concept by the author, see Marcelo Badaró Mattos, *E. P. Thompson e a tradição de crítica ativa do materialismo histórico* (Rio de Janeiro: Edufrj, 2012), especially chapter 2; and Marcelo Badaró Mattos, "The Working Class: A Contemporary Approach in the Light of Historical Materialism," *Workers of the World: International Journal on Strikes and Social Conflicts* 1, no. 2 (2013): 77– 104.
21. It is the case of Max Weber, who analyzes social inequalities out of three dimensions: wealth, prestige, and power. For Weber, class is a category that concerns only the first of these dimensions—strictly economical—defining a group of individuals who share the same situation in relation to market. Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).
22. "An Open Letter to Laszeck Kolakowski" was originally published in the 1973 edition of *Socialist Register* and reproduced in E. P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays* (London: The Merlin Press, 1978).
23. Thompson, *Poverty of Theory,* 380.
24. Bill Schwartz, "'The People' in History: The Communist Party Historians Group, 1946–1956," in *Making Histories: Studies in History-Writing and Politics,* ed. the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (London: Hutchinson, 1982).
25. E. P. Thompson, "An Interview with E. P. Thompson," *Radical History Review* 3, no. 4 (1976): 4–25.

26. E. P. Thompson, "Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class?" *Social History* 3, no. 2 (1978): 148.
27. Ibid, 149. On the uses of this notion in historical studies of eighteenth-century England, see E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common*: *Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (New York: The New Press, 1993).
28. Ellen Meiksins Wood, "Falling through the Cracks: E. P. Thompson and the Debate on Base and Superstructure," in *E. P. Thompson: Critical Perspective,* ed. Harvey J. Kaye and Keith McClelland (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 146.
29. Ellen Meiksins Wood, *Democracy against Capitalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 80.
30. Ellen K. Trinberger, "E. P. Thompson: Understanding the Process of History," in *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology,* ed. Theda Skocpol (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 221.
31. Ira Katznelson, "Working-Class Formation: Constructing Cases and Comparisons," in *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States,* ed. Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 16.