

o artigo acaba por beneficiar do cotejo entre filme e documentário, notabilizando os ciclos intermináveis de reprodução de uma identidade estabelecida mas subjetivamente alterada.

Por fim, centremos o nosso olhar num ensaio arguto de Marcelo Carvalho que rastreou a presença de elementos das culturas negras na cinematografia de Glauber Rocha. Levando em conta o superlativo artístico (formal e temático) deste realizador, o mesmo será dizer que foram contempladas as suas películas nas quais a “africanidade” como modo de existência é considerada sob a ótica revolucionária: *Barravento* (1962), *O Leão de Sete Cabeças* (1971) e, se bem que de forma indireta, *A Idade da Terra* (1980). Destarte, o artigo “África em transe: propostas glauberianas para a diáspora africana” investiga o posicionamento do cineasta face à problemática das culturas africanas nos contextos de exploração capitalista, religiosidade e praxis revolucionária. Marcelo Carvalho discerne que o devir revolucionário e metafórico africano em Glauber Rocha encontra resolução num projeto de redenção pelo sincretismo, concretizado de formas diversas, englobando a identificação das potencialidades das forças sociais autóctones. De maneira sagaz, o ensaísta conclui que esse recurso ao sincretismo não isenta as transformações redentoras que operam pela miscigenação de forças heteróclitas, culturalmente distantes e mesmo contraditórias entre si.

Em suma, estes e outros textos incluídos em *Portugal – Brasil – Afri-*

ca: Relações Históricas, Literárias e Cinematográficas manifestam-se como um contributo de enorme utilidade e alicerce teórico para a valorização das culturas de Língua Portuguesa nos três continentes evocados. Neste propósito, o livro é capaz de articular uma panóplia de pensadores de variadas instituições, imprimindo novas possibilidades de relacionamento entre áreas científicas e artísticas que, até aqui, não tinham sido entrelaçadas.

Paulo Branco Lima

**THE LUSOPHONE WORLD:
THE EVOLUTION OF PORTUGUESE
NATIONAL NARRATIVES.**

SARAH ASHBY

Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2017

When in the 1981 the Portuguese rock band GNR (short for Guarda Nacional Republicana — the military police established during the 1st Republic — but also for “Grupo Novo Rock”) released the hit “Portugal na CEE” (Portugal in the EEC), the voice of Alexandre Soares shouted those that were perhaps the deepest aspirations of most Portuguese: “Quero ver Portugal na CEE / E agora, que já lá estamos / vamos ter tudo aquilo que desejamos / um PA p’ras vozes e uma Fender / Oh boy, é tão bom estar na CEE” (I wanna see Portugal in the EEC / And now that we’re there / we’re gonna have all we desired / An amplifier for the voices and a Fender

/ Oh boy, it feels so good to be in the EEC). This very same atmosphere of euphoria could be seen in the 1986 posters featuring Mário Soares and a map of Europe with Portugal highlighted in green, with the words “CONSEGUI-MOS! Portugal na CEE” (WE MADE IT! Portugal in the EEC), and the Socialist Party logo. The collective optimism that followed the adherence of Portugal to the European Economic Community and the urge to redirect the national narratives are at the core of Sarah Ashby’s *The Lusophone World: The Evolution of Portuguese National Narratives* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2017).

Following a thoroughly informed Introduction (“After the Honeymoon”) where the issues of national identity, postcolonial challenges, and transnational shared memories are addressed, Ashby moves on to analyse the implications of Portuguese economic status in the realm of the European project. Here, she deals with the problems of living in the periphery of the European economy, and aptly links that to the complexities of multiculturalism in a country that faced a late decolonization process, to analyze how immigrants from the former colonies transformed the social dynamics in Portugal after the 80’s, and how this impacted the narratives of national identity in Portugal — but also in the former colonies.

Chapter Two foregrounds the central agent at stake in this book: the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries

(in the original, CPLP, or Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa), and how this transnational community was brought into being based upon a principle of language, and ended up being shaped by various economic interests, but also how historical factors interfered in this process. Chapter Three deals with what came to be commonly known as “politics of language”, questioning the criteria on the basis of CPLP and underlying the convergent interests that justified the creation of the organization. The next chapter serves as a counterpoint, dissecting the not so subtle contradictions undermining the project of a language-based community. This is followed, in chapter Five (“Portuguese Discourses of Modernity”), by a reinterpretation of how the urge to “return to Europe” can be seen as both a symptom and a solution in times of national existential or economic crisis, and isolation, using a broad understanding of “modernization” to frame the claims of this “becoming European.” The conclusion—“New Lusophone Horizons”—points to different ways in which the relationship between Portugal and the CPLP can be enhanced in the future, drawing from the experiences of past failures and successes of the community.

Among the main achievements of this book I would like to stress the sound combination of disparate genres, such as the philosophical essays of Eduardo Lourenço and Germano de Almeida’s novels, and the — quite uncommon

— articulation of these texts with sets of statistical data (economic and social indicators) as well as political issues. By bringing these threads together, Sara Ashby was able to come up with a broad picture of what she describes in her book as “the Lusophone world”, drawing both from the domains of cultural interpretation — welcoming the contributions of authors such as Isabela Figueiredo, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Ana Paula Ferreira, Miguel Vale de Almeida, Onésimo Teotónio Almeida — and from the field of political sciences, by taking into account recent migratory movements, but also political and diplomatic developments in the Portuguese-speaking countries. This cross pollinated approach positions Ashby’s book in a special place among today’s scholarship on issues of culture, politics, and society in the Lusophone spaces. Not only is the author able to develop a firmly grounded interpretation of historical and contemporary relations among these spaces, but she does so while avoiding oversimplifications that tend to emerge in some of the works framed by postcolonial theory.

The multilayered method proves particularly apt when Ashby discusses the “extreme anachronism that characterizes the Portuguese colonial Empire” both in terms of its development and late disintegration (Ashby, 2017: 90), and how that can relate to the political insufficiencies of the CPLP, as long as the organization vaguely evokes, to the eyes of the Portuguese stakeholders,

a symbolic replacement for the colonial space. Almost paradoxically, this rhetoric was reinforced by the “new ideal of multiculturalism” emerging in Portugal during the 1990’s, inasmuch as at a certain (popular) level that implied “the creation of an “us/them” binary, which generated new formal and informal concepts of belonging and exclusion.” (Ashby, 2017: 14) These changes impacted the perceptions of “citizenship” in Portugal. According to Ashby, citizenship came to be seen as a “consolation prize to the darker skinned formerly colonized individuals who suddenly found their presence unwelcome on the continent.” (*idem*) Though absent from the book, Pedro Costa’s film *Cavalo Dinheiro* (“Horse Money”, 2014) is a haunting journey through this entanglement, revisiting the stories of suffering and disillusionment of a Cape-Verdean — Ventura, the staple-character in Costa’s films — after the Revolution of 1974 and the following years.

All the while, this increased awareness of the cultural significance of citizenship brought about a collective sense of urgency to tackle racial issues, resulting in the creation of several anti-racist organizations during the 90’s. Here, again, Ashby pointedly shows the built-in contradictions in such discourses: “But the most compelling aspect of the campaign against racism is the way that it was generally viewed as a tell-tale sign of modernization: an indication that Portugal now had the “privilege” to

grapple with issues that other, advanced European democracies such as Germany, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands had been grappling with for years. In an odd manner, even policies dealing with disenfranchised African youth signaled Portugal's entrance into the elite European club." (Ashby, 2017: 16)

Also noteworthy is the analysis of what Ashby labels as the "mismatched relationship" between Portugal and Europe. After carefully scrutinizing Portugal's relationship with Europe as crafted through stories of inclusion and exclusion, the author examines how that impacts the whole of CPLP, extending to the community a political sense of periphery.

The cornerstone of Ashby's fine analysis — the persistence of subtle (and not so subtle) hierarchies within the structure of the Community — demonstrates how the project of a community bound together by a history of imperialism is irreconcilable with an organization that seems to be holding on to a selective historical memory. By not addressing straightforwardly the wound of imperialism and, more recently, colonialism, the official discourse of the CPLP and its leaders fail to create an open conversation among the member countries. Ashby's central argument can be summarized in the following paragraph: "Theoretically, the collapse of the Portuguese Empire should have occasioned a subsequent collapse — or leveling — of the hierarchy traditionally associated with *Lusofonia*. Rather

than signifying any and all culture that emanated from Portugal, *Lusofonia* could signify the linguistic and cultural variations, manifestations, and transformations observed in all locales that were once formerly connected by imperial rule to Portugal. This proposal contains a subtle, but crucial, distinction. Failure to recognize this leveling of the hierarchy of cultural influence and failure to recognize a post-colonial two-way street in which Portugal can be a receptor as well as an emanatory of *Lusofonia* is indeed exactly what perpetuates the notion of the CPLP as a neocolonial institution." (Ashby, 2017: 76)

The public debate surrounding the visit of the President of the Republic of Portugal, Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa, to the island of Goree in Senegal, and the outrage caused by his seemingly lackadaisical remarks on the practice of enslavement by Portuguese only reinforces the validity of Ashby's argument. The same could be said about the recent controversy about a statue of Padre António Vieira in Lisbon, standing by indigenous Brazilians depicted in a clearly subaltern posture. The mere existence of these discussions, however, tells us that something is changing in the public perception of the lusophone space, and that there is an increasingly critical community highly vigilant of the uses and appropriations of the past and how the idea of *lusofonia* is being co-opted. Ashby's use of Michel-Rolph Trouillot's study on the formation of collective memory in Haiti is illuminat-

ing, and it also signals that there's still a long way to go in the scholarly field of memories of the colonial past in Portuguese-speaking spaces.

But *The Lusophone World* goes beyond this: it is especially effective at showing that dealing with the past is today inextricably interwoven with contemporary economic networks. Sarah Ashby's interpretation of the relationships in the Atlantic triangle Angola — Brazil — Portugal is notably well achieved. Brazil's ambivalent relation to the community of Portuguese-speaking countries can be summarized as a mismatch between cultural importance and political influence: Angola and Portugal represent valuable markets for exportation of music, telenovelas, and other cultural products, but to bring these spaces upward in the hierarchy of political priorities would take more than that — chiefly, it would require the consolidation of a position of hegemony of the Brazilian influence. The main impediment to that being, Ashby contends, that “in matters related to Lusophone Africa, Brazil has traditionally seen Portugal more as a competitor than an ally” (Ashby, 2017: 33), blocking, to a certain extent, the efforts of multilateral cooperation, given that “such a dynamic is inherently antagonistic to the ideals of the CPLP.” Furthermore, as the book points out, this stance tends to reproduce problematic and historically charged arguments, such as Gilberto Freyre's *lusotropicalismo* — one that is never too far from certain discourses

surrounding the CPLP (Ashby, 2017: 44). Meanwhile, Portugal has been able to leverage the CPLP “in order to garner recognition, agency, and/or economic gain, principally within the European milieu” (Ashby, 2017: 48), as explained in detail in Chapter Three. But such political exploitation has not been matched by measures to embrace the circulation of people across these political spaces, and the idea of a lusophone citizenship has been postponed time after time.

Angola, on the other hand, holds clear interests in fostering cooperation within the Lusophone space, as long as it allows the government and economic elites to move money around, gain direct access to EU countries, while “at the same time lessening the pressure that the ultra-wealthy Angolans receive from the international media for amassing fortunes in a country where two-thirds of the citizenry lives on less than \$2 per day” (Ashby, 2017: 60). The Angolan investment in Portugal is especially telling in this respect (spiking from 1.6 million euros in 2002 to 130 million euros in the first half of 2012 alone), as are the ties of the Dos Santos family to finance and transnational companies operating in Portugal. Ashby's analysis stresses the links between the policy of friendship based on common language, and the flow of capital that is enabled by those “special friendships.” In this sense, her book explores connections between culture and economy that are often underestimated

or left unaddressed when discussing the idea of “Lusofonia.”

Moreover, *The Lusophone World* is able to demonstrate how the current insufficiencies of the CPLP in regard to the other multinational communities (most notably, EU, Commonwealth, and the Francophonie) repeats, to a certain extent, the economic shortcomings of the imperial and colonial formations headquartered in Lisbon. Ashby, therefore, concludes by asking: “Are belatedness and underdevelopment forever destined to be concomitant of Lusophone relations?” (Ashby, 2017: 98). By the end of the book, the author’s initial claims about *Lusofonia* — that is itself “a vague concept rooted in the murky realm of sentimentality and nostalgia” (Ashby, 2017: 63) — are largely justified.

Being a lucid unraveling of the overarching national discourses of the Portuguese-speaking spaces, *The Lusophone World* hardly ever takes into consideration subjective experiences, personal trajectories or testimonies, even if fictional (the analysis of Germano de Almeida’s *Eva* being the exception to this rule). The absence of organic narratives and micro-analysis, and the focus on structural changes and elite diplomacy makes this a top-down approach to the topic of transnational identities. This work would have benefited, however, from a grass roots component that would lend a human scale to the analysis. The inexistence of people throughout the book generates

a tone of disincarnated conjectures, at times risking to venture into territories largely disconnected from lived experiences, into the realm of political speculation. In a time when the stories of displacement, multiple identities, exiles, transnational belongings, contested citizenships, and political subversion in the Lusophone spaces are more documented than ever — be it through the emerging genres of world literature in Portuguese, cosmopolitan narratives as seen in contemporary film and music, public interventions on the web or the social media, to name but a few ways of collecting subjective stories — this choice does not seem like the natural thing to do.

At the same time, some of the insightful intuitions put forward by the author leave the reader hanging onto the end of the chapters, willing to read more on the topic. Such might be the case with the experiences of migrants across the lusophone spaces nowadays, the contested status of Guinea Equatorial as a Portuguese-speaking country, or the treatment of David Livingstone’s accounts of the Portuguese in Angola as an example of competing models of colonization in imperial spaces.

Overall, Sarah Ashby’s book brings a breath of fresh air to the discussion around the postcolonial narratives across the lines of *Lusofonia*. Her contribution is able to connect economic trends, political transnational projects, and discourses on identity, enriching a scholarly field that is finding its own

space outside of the narrow and limited realm of the “area studies,” and becoming a topic of interest in the wider arena of critical theory. *The Lusophone World* aptly broadens the horizon of this conversation, opening up some alleyways that will certainly be explored by others in future works.

Pedro Lopes de Almeida

**CLARIDOSIDADE – EDIÇÃO CRÍTICA
FILINTO ELÍSIO E MÁRCIA SOUTO
(ORGANIZAÇÃO)**

Rosa de Porcelana, Lisboa, 2017

568 páginas. ISBN 978-989-99746-8-5

O volume *Claridosidade – Edição Crítica*, organizado por Filinto Elísio e Márcia Souto, oferece-nos a terceira edição fac-similada da mais importante revista literária de Cabo Verde, com nove números (esparsamente) publicados entre 1936 e 1960. A primeira delas, de 1986, sob a chancela da ALAC, incluía um prefácio de Manuel Ferreira e um depoimento de Baltasar Lopes da Silva; o segundo fac-símile, que dispensou quaisquer paratextos críticos, foi publicado, em 2016, pelo jornal (cabo-verdiano) *Expresso das Ilhas* e a editora (portuguesa) A Bela e o Monstro. O presente volume recupera e acentua a preocupação crítica de Manuel Ferreira, apresentando sete ensaios inéditos que testemunham o estado da arte da crítica de *Claridade*. Os seus autores são Alberto Carvalho, João Lopes Filho, José

Luís Hopffer C. Almada, Manuel Brito-Semedo, Maria de Fátima Fernandes, Simone Caputo Gomes e Urbano Bettencourt. Suplementarmente, reedita-se também o polémico “Consciencialização na Literatura Cabo-Verdiana”, de 1963, assinado (apenas) por Onésimo Silveira.

Como explicam os organizadores do proemial “*Claridosidade – Instigações sobre o fenómeno da Claridade*”, é este conjunto de ensaios que justifica o subtítulo “Edição Crítica”, que não pode confundir-se, portanto, com o sentido académico corrente desta locução. Não se discutem quaisquer problemas de atribuição autoral ou de fixação textual. O único caso que mereceria uma investigação (ou uma anotação) desta natureza tem que ver, justamente, com o ensaio de 1963, recentemente reeditado pela UCCLA, cuja autoria partilhada com Manuel Duarte foi já assumida por Onésimo Silveira (cf. José Vicente Lopes, *Onésimo Silveira – Uma Vida, Um Mar de Histórias*, Praia, Spleen Edições, 2016, p. 79-82). É significativa, portanto, a referência de Filinto Elísio e Márcia Souto às figuras de Manuel Duarte e de Gabriel Fernandes a propósito deste texto – o primeiro pela razão já apontada, o segundo porque, em benefício da coerência do volume, talvez devesse ocupar o espaço do Onésimo Silveira (e do Manuel Duarte) de 1963, criticando-o(s) e atualizando-o(s).

Outra atribuição autoral que caberia também assinalar diz respeito ao próprio título do volume – *Claridosidade* –,