

**Interview with Phillippe Schmitter, San Francisco, tape December 18, 2002.**

When I was a graduate student in Switzerland I had prepared my exams and that year Brazil was the featured country at the Bienal, got interested in Brazilian art and music. This would have been earlier than the coup. I went to Brazil while it was still democratic. I didn't know what I wanted to do and so I went back to the United States, I was in political science and I end up in what we call comparative politics and I decided that I was going to do Brazil. I have lived in Mexico, spoke French and Spanish.

Were your parents Swiss Quakers.. Members of the meeting in Geneva...

I had decided to work on Brazil. At the time at Berkeley there was no one working on Latin America, much less Brazil in political science, but I didn't care about that because I really wasn't a Latin Americanist, but a comparativist that decided to go to Brazil which was my basic problem and was the beginning of some of my difficulties that may get reflected later, namely at that time the main source for doctoral research on Latin America was the Ford Foundation and in that program they were very concerned in developing area specialist, I didn't want to be an area specialist. What's more, I didn't bother to learn Portuguese because I thought I would learn Portuguese when I was there because I knew Spanish very well and French. I just assumed, and I was right because I picked it up when I was there. But when it came to getting fellowships I didn't get one although I had very good background and grades and they turned me down on the grounds that I was not sufficiently informed, but they really meant that I hadn't done area studies, which I couldn't have done because Berkeley didn't have it. But the odd thing was that the Ford Foundation decided that the candidates that it gave grants that year did not have sufficient area background and send them to Berkeley, which I don't understand because there was no one there in area studies, and who did they pick to run the program for these area specialists but me, so I had just been turned down by them on the ground that I didn't have area studies and then they decided to give money to Berkeley to train people for the summer and they ended up hiring me. It was so crazy. It made no sense for me from the beginning to the end. . My job was to put people together from different disciplines but especially people who had experience in Latin America in the summer school That meant that my cohorts, (this was in 1965). This was all closely tied to the Alliance for Progress.

I didn't have any money to go to Brazil and then my mentor, one of the people on my committee since Berkeley had been given money by Rockefeller to improve area studies at Berkeley and several other universities. And so some one came up with the idea that I was an acting assistant professor in Brazil, since they had no one at Berkeley who wanted to do this. So they appointed me as if I were an incoming assistant professor and then sent me to Brazil with the obligation to teach in Brazil. So I went to Brazil under entirely different circumstances. The only Brazilian that I knew was Glaucio Dillon Ares Soares and Glaucio was helping with Portuguese, he was a visiting professor at Berkeley and it was my first live Brazilian, and Glaucio arranged for me to be appointed as an assistant professor at the Instituto de Ciencias Sociais da Universidade do Brasil and I didn't know anything about it. It sounded good. It was Botafogo. The only problem was

that I didn't know how to teach and I didn't know Portuguese, so I thought I would start teaching in Spanish and French and learn Portuguese as I went along. So I taught the first course in Political Science, *introdução a ciencia política* in Brazil. No one had ever taught it before.

Jim: Sociology.

PS: Gláucio was a sociologist of politics, electoral kinds of stuff and had been trained at Florida, and so Gláucio put me in contact with the Instituto and asked them if they would like someone who would like to teach the introduction to political science.

So I arrived there. It was complicated because my daughter was born in Oakland. My wife was German. So I had to spend six months in Germany where I learned German before going to Brazil. We took the ship from Europe to Rio and it was during Carnival, 400, in 1965. It was 38 39, 40 degrees for three weeks. A long story. We got installed and then I started teaching this seminar and I had an office in the Instituto, it was near Sears.... Three months after I left they closed it down as an subversive organization.

People were nice. They must have thought it was strange.

JG: Was there any reaction to the fact that you were north American.

PS: I confused them because I arrived from Europe, with European wife and I was French and I had a Swiss name, so there was a very strong, no one had any doubts about the U.S. participation in the coup, so I think basically what happened were two things. One of two people who eventually became very famous Luciano Martins, became a friend. Had an apartment in Paris and because I was half French, I have the feeling that he spoke out for me and then I taught this course. My students seemed to like this course.

JG: I would assume that sociology was very Marxist inflected at the time.

PS: Of course it was. Luciano like almost all Brazilian intellectuals had been a member of the Brazilian Communist Party, but so here I was, Marxism was the general approach, dependency theory was the rage. I didn't met Celso Furtado until much later. Later I met a lot of the Brazilians in Paris, including Fernando Henrique. Luciano was still in the country. The director was a marvelous lawyer Tencio? Brandão Calvacando, but it was also the students. Among the students I had the daughter of Getúlio's daughter, Celina, to this day she claims that I am the one who made her into a political scientist, so I had I think of that class, 15 to 18 students, five or six went on to be political scientists, they were a founding group. Several of them ended up getting PhD in Berkeley, at MIT, Alexandro at Chicago. For some reason when you are giving a course, and these students are all part of a Marxist intellectual current. There were these shadowy Ford people who didn't have any connection with the university and ironically they had more trouble than I did. The only one that I remember was Joe Love. Peter Smith was off to Argentina, John Wirth was a part of that group.

I don't know to this day whether this was an intellectual or a political judgment but a lot of the historians were going regional, in Brazil that is an obvious thing. Levine was in Pernambuco, Wirth in Sao Paulo and Love in Rio Grande do Sul. These guys were in Rio.

I was teaching and then I began to do research which was on the role of interest associations. I also had the daughter of Evaristo de Moraes Filho. All of these daughters.

JG: The universities were for the daughters of the elite, or the middle class.

PS: In this case it was kind of the left, but Evaristo was a famous labor lawyer. They offered to help me in my research. I started working my research into the course. The first think that I did was a mailed survey to a list of associations as a kind of first contact. I begin to suspect that something was wrong, and I would get them back and they had been opened. One of them was not only opened, but it had a stamp on it "aberto pelo PP". I asked someone and they said it was the policia politica. Someone had denounced this and they were obviously controlling my incoming mail. I don't know if they were controlling my phone conversations because it was so difficult to get a phone line period. If they were it was a nightmare.

I did surprising well with the survey. I did get a lot of returned questionnaires. There were a lot of phony associations that didn't really exist. The other thing that was happening to me intellectually was that I was getting into this issue of corporativism. I had assumed that in the period of democracy this corporativist arrangement had changed significantly or that I would see roots of pluralism. That's why I went to Brazil, to find roots of pluralism, and I argued the case that you are going to find urbanization, industrialization, developmentism and changes in infrastructure and if there was no pluralism then there was something really wrong with the theory. Brazil had all of these ethnic and regional cleavages so there was every reason to believe tha Brzil would have a pluralist infrastructure. I arrived to discover that this fascistoid structures were alive and very well. And that during democracy, instead of being eliminated, they had been strengthened. One of the few things that the military was doing was not only to reassert the political police control over the associations, but they had expanded the sindicatos rurais, and the previdencia to the rural sector,

JG: Something that Vargas had been reluctant to do.

PS: I immediately had the theme of a book staring me in the face, but when I was doing these extensive interviews, two to three hours. What I would try to do was to discover who was really running , and particularly on the business side that was usually some semi-civil servant. I also got to meet some of the younger people working with them. I started out focusing on labor, but the more that I worked the more I found that business was the most interesting peculiarities. The corporativst controls over labor was fairly obvious, authoritarian rule. But the extent that business interests profited with some important incentives for the businesses. They were running a dual show so they had the FIESP for example and the Centro Industrial do Estado.

So they had a parallel structure, much of which was paid for by the imposto sindical, but organized in such a way that it could do things independent. So the Centro Industriais, in every state, most of their expenses were charged to the Federação but they were independent. This was of course denied to the labor.

I got my students involved in designing the questions and as I began the interviews, I took my students with me. Ostensively as translators, but my Portuguese was fine, since none of them would have dreamed to interview trade union leaders, much less business leaders. I wanted to let them get a sense of how people did this. I took one or two of them along which was a good idea, especially since many of them were very attractive women.

JG: It opens a lot of doors.

PS: I was afraid in the case of Celina, coming from such a well-known family, but . . .

I did this with this course for about six months, although I was in Rio for nine. I then was asked if I would teach in São Paulo. What I thought was a liability, teaching. I went to the Escola de Sociologia e Política. I quickly realized that it was a mediocre place, French oriented, legal, public administration . . . I thought it had disappeared. I wasn't by near as successful in teaching. It had been founded by Simonsen in the 1930s. He was someone that I wanted to study. He was a major figure as an industrialist but also as a founder of associations, and that whole key period of the civil war, Simonsen was everywhere.

And then, one of my students in this course . . . I can't remember how, I met José Mindlin, I don't know why but José really liked me. He was enormously helpful, opened archives, I could sit in on meeting, that I would understand it and that I would write something. In part it was because his daughter was married to Celso Lafer who I only met once later and they were students and Celso was a student of political science, and Bete in sociology at Cornell. Maybe because he had a daughter and son-in-law in the U.S. . . .

I always thought that he wanted to be a professor and was frustrated. . .

[discussion about Midlin]

I was discovering this whole intellectual live oriented toward fascism, Brazilian style fascism, but of course it was the intellectual inspiration of the CLT, but there was a whole intellectual tradition, and the central figure was a Romanian. I later wrote about this Romanian and learned Romanian . . .

He was the major figure in the 30s on this intellectual tradition; and he is the inventor of dependency theory. I was the one who got Joe Love turned on to this. I didn't realize until much later when Celso Furtado told me all about it that Cepal was founded by Eastern European refugees, Jewish, mostly, in the case of ?, not Jewish, Romanians, Poles, so they bought this view of the periphery and they were the main intellectual lights and they the main influence on Raul Previsch, who had actually studied in Germany and had known ? . I didn't know any of this at the time; I just found his books in used book

stores with fascistoid corporatist, and Italian. I have a huge collection. 200 volumes of Italian, Spanish, French and Portuguese on this idea, so. This interested Jose I remember leaving two or three books with him.

So José helped me there and that made all of the difference in the world and he also gave me letters of introduction for Bahia. I spent about four months in São Paulo interviewed Sociedade Rural Brasileiro, FIESP and the specialist trade unions, and this is another point where I might have gotten in trouble. At that time the Alliance for Progress through the AFL-CIO were running some kind of training program...ah, Leoncio is one of my best friends.

I don't know how I stumbled on this, I guess it was when I was interviewing trade union leaders, I stumbled on someone who was in this program and so I went and met those people, I essentially agreed that I would give a talk about comparison of the Brazilian system and others and in exchange I would give them questionnaires. When I would do an interview the interview would be basically about the person, why they were interested in associations, personal stuff, then the middle part would be about the association, who they most frequently met with, who their contacts were, etc., and then in the end, I would hand them this attitudinal survey and I had done this for, I finished with 70 business and 40 or 50 trade union leaders, some refused to take the test, because they were long. What I did with AIFLD I applied the questionnaire to their students and then discuss it with them. So I had a control group. I never had a control group with business leaders. And that turned out to be good because I had a controlled structure, a sociological component about how they got involved, and I had an attitudinal information. I took items out of the authoritarian scale from Adorno, other things as well. That's all in the book. They were a control group, because I was particularly interested about how this system got transferred from generation to generation. My whole understanding of this system was based on the idea of authoritarian regimes and legacies of authoritarian regimes don't go away, especially in the case of Brazil, when the transition to democracy was pretty rigged anyway. So this enclave remained and there I could understand it in the formation of Vargas and the PSD. This continued with Janio, a new generation, a sort of rotation. I was interested in the younger people to see their basic values, as it was expected that the trade union would be funded by the state and here was a course in which just the opposite. The focus of the course was to turn them into American trade unionists and it wasn't very successful. My experience was that it was a complete failure. On my scale it was a complete failure. It will give an example of a representative study.

Then I went to Bahia for two weeks or so, and then I went to Berkeley, six months writing up and then I went to Chicago.

I was much more concerned about being denounced as a CIA agent, that was the normal cerotic (?) that you would have felt. As it turned out I thought I was being disadvantaged because I was giving a course and was part of an intellectual life, and that was my best protection because people knew who I was and what I stood for, but the problem was that you were much more exposed to being denounced. I think it was a period within two weeks in which I was denounced as a CIA agent, I think I know who did it, it was a

mineiro, I can't remember how I met him, it was a leaflet which was handed out, my students thought it was kind of amusing,

JG: So this was a leaflet in Rio.

PS: I think I had been there three or four months, because I had made a trip up to Minas Gerais and Belo Horizonte to do some interviewing and at that time the only other place, there was a sort of political science faculty, who subsequently became important figures, I felt uneasy about them, I don't have a copy of the flier, one of the students gave me one.

Two weeks later in a social occasion, someone from the embassy took me aside and told me that I had been denounced inside the Embassy, that some had said, and I remember the phrase, "an enemy of the pan-American system" I just remember within two weeks I was denounced as a CIA agent and as an enemy of the pan-American system. Somehow that comforted me. As far as I know, neither one had any real effect on my access. I know that they were opening my mail, that I do know. I assume that they were opening everyone's mail, the place was identified with Marxism and leftwing subversion.

I was blissfully unaware, I was innocent of the police activity around me. I assumed that there was someone in the institute or someone who had informed the American embassy, since there were no Americans in my class, but somehow this got to the American embassy and it was a circular within the embassy.

JG: I can't find this internal control in the State Department Documents.

PS: I was not formally in their files, I was not on a Ford and I had an indirect Rockefeller, to tell the truth I don't even think that I registered.

JG: When you went back to the U.S. did you maintain contacts with these scholars. You go back in 1969 and you write the article. ...

Question about support:

PS: Peter is the best guy that you can interview. I don't think that he was the head but he was running the Ford Foundation in Rio. It may have been Peter who told me about this denuncia. He is the President of CARE. I could never figure him out. Peter comes from a very old wealthy New England Protestant part. Only person that I knew who wore a three piece suit in Brazil, looking very stiff and wearing a tie, and yet somewhere behind this guy was an openness politically which was astonishing for me because I thought he must have been a CIA agent, but I think I am wrong....He had also had connections with the Peace Corps, I think that he had been a volunteer. Gloucester MA.

JG: Why did you go back to Brazil in 1969, follow up research?

PS: Yes, I think I was filling in holes, I think what I was doing was that article that really pissed them off.

After I came back at Harvard I was a visiting professor at Harvard.

JG: I had assumed that you had gotten this contact individually from your friends.

PS: No, I had been in contact with some of them, I knew what was going on, and I was trying to follow things in Brazil, and I had stopped off on my way of going down to Argentina, but my basic source. When I came to Chicago, the Ford Foundation had started a program for doctoral students in the U.S. It was MIT, Chicago, and UCLA,

JG: Bringing Latin Americanists

PS: Bringing Bolivar Lamonier, for example. Those guys. I had three Brazilians working with me. One was Cesar Guimaraes, who went back to be head of Candido Mendes, Alexandre de Brito, he had been a student of mine in my course. Murillo de Carvalho. When I was giving lectures.

Another place that we met putting that book together on authoritarian Brazil at Yale.

JG: Did someone ask you to write the article or did you come up with the idea yourself? Why did you write it?

PS: Because I was pissed.

Jim:

PS: I thought it was, First it's two forces. I was very upset about what I considered to be conformist postures of American political scientists in general and so in a sense I'm sending two messages. I'm sending a message about Brazil and these were some of the people who I knew, and if I didn't know them I admired them, and I knew what they were up to. I think I knew Paulo Singer. I can't remember when I met FHC. I think it was in Paris. There was a group in Paris that I must have met in 1968. Luciana would put me in contact. We all went to a little restaurant. There was a little place in the back to hang out. That's where I met Celso Furtado, and others. It couldn't have been before. It would have to have been out.

It was a dual resentment. I thought that American political scientists were taking much to much of a conformist attitude.

JG: Even in the midst of the anti-war movement.

PS: But that is not the Political Science Association.

JG: But isn't that bubbling up within the APSA?

PS: Of course it was; that was part of what I was interested in. But then of course it was a connection with Brazil. Some of this information I am sure that I got from Brazil. I have a terrible memory for all these things. Frank Bonilla was also important.

He had the Stanford group with Murillo. There were three or four places where they would send students. Frank had a closer connection through the Ford Foundation.

I am assuming...

JG: Impact, contact. Did it have any impact.

PS: I don't think I am position to know that. I felt and I still feel until this very day a very strong connection, but I never went back to do research on Brazil. That is a principle of mine. I never go back to do more research. I did the same thing in Portugal; it took me longer. They had this damn Portuguese revolution. I knew some people who become important and became ministers. I don't want to be a Brazilianist or an Argentinist. I had also realized that I wouldn't be allowed back into Brazil. I never tried. But I was told.

JG: The Brazilian government knows about the report. They also have copies about LASA.

Did you have contact with Ralph della Cava. I am fuzzy on this. I think that I got help on this. You mentioned Ralph and Bill Wipfler. I don't remember him as more than Ralph. I certainly got on to Wipfler through Brady.

JG: Brady really helped you when he was there in 1965? How did you meet him?

PS: Someone must have told me about him. He had a garage that he didn't use and it was jammed through Estadoo and pamphlets. He was a pack rat. I remember spending days and evening clipping things. I had this treasure trove. I used the morque at Estadoo. We would sit there and drink and talk about things. This is a long time ago. It is only coming back in bits and pieces.

JG: When you go back and write the article did you help people come up to the United States?

PS: Mainly, the credit should go where it is due to the Ford Foundation. I could assure that they could get admitted or get admitted to another graduate program. But the actual choice was theirs. How they did it and with whom you have to talk to Peter.

JG: This was for graduate students. What about professors.

PS: I had nothing to do with these professors. This is Ford Foundation. If I couldn't get them into Chicago I would get on the phone and help them get into other schools.



We did have an informal network. It is obvious when I re-read this, that I was very, overly alarmed. I really did see it as a long-term commitment to authoritarian regimes and this fit into that.

JG: If the oil crisis of 1974 hadn't happened and the economic situation hadn't gone sour...

PS: They certainly weren't forced out of power.

JG: Well it was a combination of them remove themselves and ...

PS: We separate liberalization from democratization. In the case of Brazil, *direitas* ja certainly had some consequences but it didn't have the intended consequences. It may have changed the probability of eventually really having a competitive civilian election by something, but it didn't happen. The same as the mobilization under Chile; it had an important effect, but it didn't ...

JG: Campaign for amnestia... are indirect forces, the strikes of 1978-80...

PS: When we write that book I am the expert for southern Spain and Portugal and the emphasis in the book is internal fragmentation. Now what contributes to making that fragmentation significant, especially when the military is very sensitive to this issue. Obviously part of it is simply the mechanics of succession and that was the Brazilian regimes most difficult problem and they never solved it. They managed to negotiate it but almost every President was not succeeded by the one that he would have preferred to be succeeded by, so clearly there was an element of uncertainty in that process that was a reflection of these internal fragmentations, factions or whatever. Now what contributed and whether popular movements make those contradictions within the regime much more sequential, or ...

JG: One last question. At the end of the article you hypothesize that the Brazilian government is going to implement or does implement with 477 a more rigorous control of foreigners doing research in Brazil and you alert north Americans to not fall into the trap of collaborating with that. I am not aware of that happening.

PS: That is in part a personal reflection of the rumor that I couldn't go back. Now I didn't intend to go back so I didn't ... go back, reside, do research. I was told that... I had just assumed...again the Ford Foundation is crucial. We all tried to work through Ford. Ford had these mechanisms of gathering this information and Peter was at the center of this. It is also that I am reflecting a judgement of the Ford Foundation. That the Ford Foundation also interpreted it that independent scholar's work would be controlled. It wasn't too long after that that Ford pulled out. I can't remember. . .

With the funding of CEPRAP, who was fundamental. I can imagine that I was talking about myself but also getting this message from Ford now whether this meant that the Brazilian government was putting pressure on Ford, I have no idea.

PS: Sheppard Forman is a professor of human rights at NYU, and his wife is Brazilian and . . .

He did a book on the fisherman in the Northeast then went into Ford.

Two questions: Someone

PS: I had heard that I couldn't come back. I think that the word went around that a list was elaborated.

JG: Explains Skidmore.

PS: I never tested it. I had a good friend in Tom and somewhere he is in this story. It could have been Tom. All I know is that this word went around. I don't know if I was told that I was on this list. I was aware that Tom was denied a visa...

JG: Final question. Tom and others were thought of as CIA.

PS: I think that Brazilians with good reason that the American Embassy and the CIA were surveying and weighing what was going on. I know my students they all felt that the CIA was deeply involved with the Brazilian police and monitoring who could go, fearful of what they could and could not do. I remember that I didn't disclose the information of where I got this information because I didn't want to harm them. Ford insisted that they go back. They signed some kind of deal that they had to go back and teach in Brazil.

JG: Sergio Micelli's book and argument

PS: He's right. I think that you have to see it on two levels. There is no question in my mind that Ford did more to protect continuous social science profession, research, etc., but there is also no question that they also helped to reset the agenda.

JG: How did they do that.

JG: The most subversive thing that they did was to send so many people to do doctorates in the United States. They came back, and I can speak for my own students, they came back with a much greater commitment to do empirical research which also meant that the relatively vacuous Marxism . . . I have a lot of experience with this elsewhere in Latin America. Brazilians, intellectually, I don't think that they are lazy, but they are not jumping to the latest fad in Paris. When you go to Argentina you think that you are having a discussion with people in Paris. We call it in French *logo machie*—machination of words—which is a dangerous disease that can have serious social consequences. And I think that things did change and empirical social science I think what I would call critical and rational but nonetheless empirical was set by the Ford Foundation, and CEBRAP was at the center of that, to a lesser extent Candido Mendes, and in a lesser way the program that they started in Minas but I don't think it has as much influence as the others and they became the points of reference. You could be a Marxist, but you had to do research. . . .  
[talk about Leoncio...]

Leoncio I immediately recognized as a different . .

I assume the book condemns it as a bad thing. I don't think it was a bad thing. I think that it was going to happen anyway and it has happened all over Latin America, but it happened under particularly favorable circumstances if I can talk about unfavorable contexts; it was a good thing that that change in the attitude about how one researched and understood the political and social universe took place in adverse conditions in opposition to the government. I think it would have been very different if it hadn't had that adversarial oppositional element...

PS: They [Alliance for Progress] thought in a linear fashion. That was the mistake of us, political sciences and all this nonsense that political development is an automatic result of economic development and all of that. More Marty Lipsett. Huntington was involved all over the place. I think he has admitted that he had very close relations with army intelligence.

Two of the weirdest experiences that I had when I was in Rio. I was this young graduate student and Candido Mendes, I got to know him. He sort of liked me but not very much, but lots of the students around him liked me and then, Sam Huntington came to visit and the other was Talcott Parsons so I had these two eminent Harvard professors and because there was no one on his staff who knew English that fluently he asked to serve as a guide and that was the first and only time I met them. They are as opposite as you can imagine. I have a life time suspicion. I came to realize that he was there as an agent.

JG: One of the arguments of my book...Opening new ground in LASA.

PS: I don't think. These people had more of a sense to reaching out to these other publics. It's not an accident that I wrote this within an internal professional journal and my public is the political and social science public. This is partly because I have always been an outsider, French in the U.S. France they think I'm an American. I'm now in Florence. I have never felt that either the commitment to or the capability of intervening inside American politics. I do more in Italy today ironically I do a lot at the level of the European union, now in my old age I do a bit more. I think that at this time I saw myself in a different role that is I saw myself as a role circumscribed to the political science community, but also not as someone who was going to protect his own ass. This was not my turf. I was finished. I knew that I wasn't going back to Brazil.

JG: It's more magnanimous.

PS: It was internally driven. I owed a lot to Brazil. It is these other things, LASA and Church that begin to create these links that go outside the academic community. And that is when government's pay attention. I don't think they pay much attention to these internal journals.

JG: How to prove causality. Frank Church. LASA resolution. This article is legitimacy. Was at Harvard, Berkeley, Chicago. Academic gives legitimacy.

PS: Question of causality. Maybe that was sort of the intention, but I always felt that my role. For example, I always try to stay away from administrative roles. The idea that I would be the president of LASA is impossible, partly because I am not a Latin Americanist and I was a vice president of the APSA, but people don't pay much attention. The only thing that I am good about doing is political research. This was an obligation, and ethical obligation, and very much focused on Brazil. I am delighted to hear this, but that wasn't my intention at the time.

JG:

PS: We call this a theory that general name of the theory is constructivism. The basic idea that they have, it starts from the notion that social and political reality is constructed by the actors themselves, but it becomes a movement in political science, especially in the part of political science related to international relations and the idea is the emergence of norms across borders. The leading figure is Katherin Sinkin, she is a Latin Americanist. How epistemic or professional communities set norms that are binding across borders, they set standards. . . .

End of Interview.