



Brazilian Studies in the United States

The Road Ahead

A conference at Yale University
on November 30 and December 1, 2018

Published by the Council on Latin American & Iberian Studies
at the Whitney & Betty MacMillan Center for International
& Area Studies at Yale.

Council on Latin American & Iberian Studies
Whitney & Betty MacMillan Center
for International & Area Studies at Yale
P.O. Box 208206
New Haven, CT 06520-8206
<https://clais.macmillan.yale.edu/>

Yale MACMILLAN CENTER

Council on Latin American and Iberian Studies

INTRODUCTION

The Ministry of Education in Brazil, the Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV), and the Council on Latin American & Iberian Studies at the MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies at Yale University were pleased to co-host an interdisciplinary conference on Brazilian Studies in the United States. This conference had a focused theme around collaborative research. The conference convened at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut on November 30 - December 1, 2018.

This conference gathered an interdisciplinary group of scholars with expertise on Brazilian studies with an emphasis on the sciences and collaborative research, and to further an exchange on the future of Brazilian studies in the United States. In addition to key scholars on Brazilian studies, prominent administrators and representatives from the Brazilian Ministry of Education attended the conference. The following interdisciplinary themes were explored:

Anthropology, Ecology, Environmental Sciences

Art History, Ethnomusicology, Communications, Education

History, Literature

Public Health, Medicine

Law, Political Science

Sociology, Demography, Urban Planning

This collection of essays and papers is a summary of the presentations and ideas shared at the conference.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Brazilian Studies in the United States: The Road Ahead conference and this publication were made possible with the coordinated efforts of the Council on Latin American and Iberian Studies (CLAIS) staff and Blair Nelsen (MAR, Yale Divinity School, 2019).

The Council on Latin American and Iberian Studies seeks to enhance the understanding of Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula through collaborative efforts focused on meaningful partnerships and exchange of ideas and academic research. The Council draws on the strengths of Yale's pioneering departments of History, Political Science, Anthropology, and Spanish and Portuguese, among others, to offer and support a broad array of courses, cultural and scholarly events, and academic publications.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Sérgio Guerra
Keneth David Jackson

15

SUMMARIES OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Anthropology, Ecology, Environmental
Sciences

Law & Political Science

History & Literature

Culture – Art History, Communications
& Education

Sociology, Demography & Urban
Planning

Public Health & Medicine

59

CLOSING REMARKS

Consul-General
Fernando de Mello Barreto

63

CONFERENCE PAPERS

How do studies about Brazil and the exchange of knowledge with Brazilian universities contribute to our thinking about conservation and development in US academies? A University of Florida perspective.

Bette A. Loiselle, Emilio M. Bruna, Robert Buschbacher and Simone Athayde

The Anthropology of Brazil and its Contributions to Conceptualizing Biomes
Suzanne Oakdale

How the United States of America built an intellectual and practical ideology of regulation that Brazil needs to do
Sérgio Guerra

The Study of Brazilian Law and Politics in the United States: A Search for The Open Road
Fabio de Sa e Silva

Teaching and Research on Brazilian Literature and Culture Today: Crossroads, Dead Ends, New Avenues
César Braga-Pinto

97

CONCLUSION

The Burden of Brazilian Studies
Stuart B. Schwartz

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

PREFACE

Sérgio Guerra
Dean, FGV Law School

In April 15, 1876, the Brazilian emperor D. Pedro II landed in New York for a three-month journey across 28 American states (out of 37 that had joined the Union by the time). D. Pedro II was well-known for his intellectual curiosity and passion for sciences. In Boston, he met the Harvard professor Louis Agassiz and the promising inventor Graham Bell. In Philadelphia, he visited the Centennial International Exhibition with the President Grant, where some of the most important inventions of the time were presented. Once asked what he would like to be, should he not be born a “prince”, he answered: a professor.

The expedition of the Brazilian emperor-professor to the United States was a landmark in the relationship between the two countries. The American media celebrated D. Pedro II: he was

more familiar to the US than 2/3rds of American Congressmen. Influential American thinkers visited and engaged with Brazil. William James, a Harvard medical student, spent 8-month in Rio de Janeiro, Belém and Manaus in the second half of the 19th century. John Dewey taught Anísio Teixeira at Columbia University in the beginning of the 20th, and collaborated with him for years. At the same time, D. Pedro II’s tour around the US only called the attention of Brazilian emerging leaders, such as Rui Barbosa and Joaquim Nabuco, largely inspired by the American ideals.

The intellectual collaboration between the Brazil and the United States developed quite significantly since then, though not always in a constant pace. We have witnessed over the recent years the interest of American academia in Brazilian culture, nature, political and social settings. At the same time, an increasing number of Brazilian researchers have come to the US to develop their postgraduate studies in top-tier universities. Some have permanently stayed in the country



The intellectual collaboration between the Brazil and the United States developed quite significantly since then, though not always in a constant pace.

teaching and researching. Some try to keep their roots and connections to Brazil, but the geographic and cultural distances present important obstacles.

The interdisciplinary conference “Brazilian Studies in the United States – the Road Ahead”, convened at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut on November 30 – December 1, 2018, with the support of the Ministry of Education in Brazil, the Council on Latin American & Iberian Studies at the MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies and Getulio Vargas Foundation – FGV, opens an important door to deepen the exchange of ideas between both countries.

Touching on areas as diverse as anthropology, ecology and environmental sciences, history and literature, culture, arts, communication and education, sociology, democracy and urban planning, public health and medicine, law and political science, the event gathered a group of talented and promising American and Brazilian intellectuals genuinely interested in paving new ways for cross-country partnerships.

Some of the most significant contributions of the conference participants are presented in this book. Each participant was invited to address the main challenges and opportunities to cooperation in their own field. The scope and originality of the ideas illustrate the potential for new projects and partnerships between Brazil-

US academic institutions in the coming years.

Part of the genius of D. Pedro II was his ability to combine two different, yet complementary commitments. On the one hand, the ideal of excellence: D. Pedro II was always seeking to engage and learn from the very best of intellectuals, even when they were self-declared anti-monarchists (like the French writer Victor Hugo). On the other, D. Pedro II knew that ideas do not exist in a vacuum; they are context-dependent and tend to flourish in specific conditions that vary from country to country. Like D. Pedro II, Brazil and US academic institutions should also share a commitment to excellence, but never lose light of each other’s unique circumstances.

BRAZILIAN STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES: THE ROAD AHEAD

*Conference Introductory
Remarks Delivered by:*

Kenneth David Jackson
Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies for Portuguese, Yale University

Secretary Sigollo, Ambassador Barreto, President Simonsen Leal, Visiting Scholars, Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen. This conference at Yale, “Brazilian Studies in the United States: The Road Ahead”, marks one of the most comprehensive reviews of studies of Brazil in the United States to be undertaken since the first doctoral degrees were awarded in American universities for studies of Brazil almost 70 years ago, and the first International Colloquium of Luso-Brazilian Studies met in October, 1950 at the Library of Congress with the presence of such figures as Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda, José Honório de Rodrigues, Cecília Meireles, Helen Caldwell, Ralph Dimmick, and Antônio Cândido. Recent research by Darlene Sadlier in her book *Americans All* follows a generation of Brazilian Intellectuals invited to the U.S. in the 1940s and 50s under the Good Neighbor Policy whose presence set the stage for the wave of visiting professors teaching in US universities under the

NDEA Act of 1959. Studies of Brazil in that first phase in our universities belonged primarily to the social sciences, and in 1966 historian Robert Levine published a guide to research titled *Brazil: Field Research Guide in the Social Sciences*. The first comprehensive study of “brazilianists,” as scholars of Brazil came to be called, was José Carlos Sebe Bom Meihy’s 1990 book of interviews, *A colônia brasilianista* (The Brazilianist Colony).

Today’s Yale conference comes almost 20 years after the meetings at the Brazilian Embassy in Washington D.C. in 1999, under Ambassador Paulo Tarso Flecha de Lima, whose objective was to establish interaction with the academic community in the U.S. on an official level and which gave rise to the publication of *O Brasil dos Brasilianistas: Um guia dos estudos sobre o Brasil nos Estados Unidos, 1945-2000* (2002) (Brazil of the Brazilianists: A Guide to Studies on Brazil in the United States, 1945-2000) and its counterpart in English, *Envisioning Brazil: A Guide to Brazilian Studies in the United States* (2005). Those binational studies continued to be limited in scope to the humanities, arts, social sciences, education, and library science. The last general review of studies of Brazil in the U.S. was conducted in 2005 by the Brazilian Studies Association with the aim of assessing and promoting traditional fields of study.

For the first time, and distinct from previous meetings on Brazilian studies, the Yale conference assigns priority to the sciences, particularly public health, medicine, and the environment, alongside the humanities, arts, and social sciences. In addition, our purpose is to provide structural models for the study of Brazil in the U.S. based on active collaborative research tied to institutions in Brazil. Our aim is to establish linkages that will aid future researchers, recognize their work in both countries, and provide a framework for associations among scholars and institutions for the future.

Our work today was prepared by the May 6-7 conference at Yale in which more than a dozen specialists on Brazil presented papers on their own research, covering studies in ethnomusicology, anthropology, history, literature, forestry, biomedical research, and public health. For this November event, scholars will debate central questions affecting their research and discuss models for improving binational cooperation, as well as consider the evolving nature of their fields. Our goal is to produce a book on these discussions that will provide helpful advice and directions for another generation of scholars of Brazil in the U.S.

This conference itself is a collaborative effort between Brazil's Ministry of Education and Yale University. With pleasure I recognize the presence of the National Deputy Executive Secretary, Felipe Sartori Sigollo. I would also like

to thank the personnel of the Ministry for receiving me for a planning session in Brasília in February and for a second meeting in Rio de Janeiro in July.

Supported by UNESCO, this conference is the outcome of many combined efforts. At the Ministry of Education, I would like to recognize Minister Carla Barroso Carneiro, assisted by Maria Auriana Pinto Diniz, and Gustavo Servilha. Thanks also to Dr. Sérgio Guerra, Dean of the Law School of the Getúvio Vargas Foundation (FGV), for our productive meeting in July, which led to participation by the Foundation and the presence of its president, Simonsen Leal. This conference could not have been organized without the truly efficient and perceptive organization of Ms. Asia Neupane, of Yale's Council of Latin American & Iberian Studies, assisted by Blair Nelsen and Daniel Juárez, and in Brasília by Gustavo Servilha. Our work at Yale for Brazil in Connecticut has enjoyed the support of the Brazilian Consulate in Hartford and Ambassador Fernando Melo Barreto, for which we are especially grateful. It has been an honor for me to work with all of you in organizing "The Road Ahead," and I would like to welcome especially the many scholars and specialists on Brazil about whose experience and collaborative research we will soon learn.

Yale has a long and memorable role in Brazilian studies. In 1908 Brazil's first ambassador to the United States, Joaquim Nabuco came to campus for two lectures, "The Place of Camões in Literature," and "The Spirit of Nationality in Brazil."

Nabuco's choice of the Camonian epic is evidence that literature nourished his relationship with political culture, which he understood in esthetic parameters. Carolina Nabuco wrote in her biography, "To reveal Camões to the Americans was to promote the Portuguese language and to treat one of his favorite subjects. The love of Camões that at age 20 had inspired his first book, *Camões e os Lusíadas*, accompanied him his whole life." Nabuco's presentation on nationality shares its content with Machado de Assis, in his famous essay "Instinct of Nationality," seeing in Brazilian life a recapitulation *sui generis* of the great archetypes of Western civilization. He thought that universal values of culture had to be built over a long period of apprenticeship rather than simply located in national identity. For Nabuco's imagination, Brazil is one of the stages of the human drama, and he its spectator. In recognition of Nabuco's lectures at Yale, the seminar "Joaquim Nabuco at Yale: Statesman, Author, Ambassador: a centenary symposium commemorating the lectures at Yale in 1908" brought scholars and many members of the Nabuco family to Yale in April 2008. Today, in recognition of Nabuco's love of Camões, the Beinecke Rare Books & Manuscripts Library exhibited the first edition of *Os Lusíadas and the Rhymas* (1598). Advancement of studies of Brazil and the Portuguese language at Yale date from the late 19th century, with the philologist and medievalist Henry Roseman Lang, and

continued with such scholar-teachers as Malcolm Batchelor, Haroldo de Campos, Richard Morse, and Emília Viotti da Costa. In Music, Aldo Parisot led the world-famous Yale Cellos for six decades.

We owe our accomplishments as scholars of Brazil to several generations of U.S. *brasilianistas* whose work and dedication to Brazilian studies has brought us to this point today. In 1938, for example, American anthropologist Ruth Landes traveled alone to Salvador, Bahia for a year's research and in her book, *City of Women* (1947), commented on the restrictive policies she encountered, at the same time she expressed her admiration for and confidence in the Brazilian people and her admiration for its liberal social attitudes in comparison with those of the U.S. at the time. In the 54 years since I first visited Brazil, I have seen many changes and difficulties, however I continue to be fascinated by Brazilian literature and, like other "brasilianists" who are committed to the study of Brazil, I have confidence in the Road Ahead. On behalf of the Portuguese program and Brazilian studies at Yale, I welcome you here and wish you a successful conference and a memorable visit to Yale.

SUMMARIES OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

SESSION 1: ANTHROPOLOGY, ECOLOGY, AND ENVIRON- MENTAL SCIENCES

Friday, November 30, 2018.
3:00-4:30 p.m.

Moderator: Florencia Montagnini, Senior Research Scientist; Director, Program in Tropical Forestry and Agroforestry, Global Institute in Sustainable Forestry, Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies.

Discussion Question: Thinking about the development and protection of large biomes, how do studies about Brazil and the exchange of knowledge with Brazilian universities contribute to this debate in U.S. academies?

Professor Montagnini led off discussion by drawing participants' attention to the ecological importance of both the Amazon and the Atlantic rainforests for both Brazil and the world. She emphasized how challenging it is to determine whether protected areas are truly protected in practice, or just on paper. She drew

attention to the importance of areas that were once Amazonian forested areas — those which are now grasslands, savannah, or even urban centers. She noticed how complex such post-forest biomes could be, and posited that even these fragmented landscapes might be important for their islands of biodiversity if we help protect them. Environmental protection is challenging as it occurs in both urban and rural landscapes, and deforestation rates are increasing. She pointed out that Brazil has a unique opportunity to continue the conversations from this conference at the XXV IUFRO World Congress in Curitiba, Paraná state, occurring from September 29-October 5, 2019. (More information is available at IUFRO2019.com.)

Bette Loiselle, Professor of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation; Director, Tropical Conservation and Development Program; Director, Center for Latin American Studies, University of Florida.

Professor Loiselle chose an “institutional approach” to the discussion question, beginning by introducing initiatives from her home base, the University of



Environmental protection is challenging as it occurs in both urban and rural landscapes, and deforestation rates are increasing.

Florida. This institution's programs have attracted knowledgeable professionals such as the international climate expert Dr. Carlos Nobre from Brazil's Ministry of Science and Technology, member of the IPCC and the National Academy of Sciences. In 1921, the University of Florida and the government of Minas Gerais collaborated to form the university of Viçosa, one of the most important agricultural centers in the country. UF boasts the oldest Latin American Studies program in the U.S., founded in 1930. The Portuguese language was first taught there in 1914, and has been taught continuously since 1939. She cited numerous collaborations between the University of Florida and Brazilian research institutions in many different disciplines, such as their collaboration with the Federal University of Acre since the 1980s. With the help of a grant from the Ford Foundation, the University of Florida's Tropical Conservation and Development program emerged in the 1980s, building on part research and training efforts focused on the Amazon. Uniting the concepts of conservation and development was revolutionary at the time. This ongoing program is a learning community and does not confer degrees, but it does bring together US and Brazilian scientists, NGOs, students and faculty to work collaboratively.

International collaboration is a moral imperative as well as an effective way to disseminate research findings and

advance academic careers, as Professor Loisel observed in a study done by her colleague, Emilio Bruna. Working with collaborators, Bruna reviewed a number of scientific articles and found that collaborative projects lead to more citations and publication in higher-impact journals. Professor Loisel outlined several strategies and mechanisms for collaboration including formal agreements, two-way exchanges (including South-South exchanges), training courses, collaborative applied research, and joint publications. She emphasized the importance of collaborative partners spending time in the field together in order for such collaborations to be successful. She cited the example of Karen A. Kainer who conducted graduate-level research on the role of the Brazil nut in forest-based development. Her initial work brought her into contact with local stakeholders, including Chico Mendes, and built the kinds of long-term relationship networks that still make research in that area of Acre possible to this day. She cited other examples of collaborative research projects undertaken by members of her institution, such as the Amazon Dams Network/Rede de Barragens da Amazônia (ADN), which began as a field course in 2009. She noted the need to seek funding from multiple sources since each source has its own restrictions— for example, the NSF training grant would only fund researchers from the US, so additional funding from the Moore Foundation was sought for participants from other nations.

She noted the difficulty that exists when trying to scale up successful projects, and pointed out the importance of building local networks to see which strategies work best in different locations. To summarize, her answer to the discussion question is, “Exchange of knowledge and collaboration with Brazilian universities and other partners have **transformed** the way we think about conservation and development, and our approaches to research training and dissemination of results.”

Professor Loisel fielded a question from the audience about whether Brazil’s large dams were more beneficial or detrimental. She admitted that dams are a complicated case, mostly due to the lack of environmental and social planning involved in their implementation. Had environmental impact studies been more thorough and local populations consulted and participated in planning and review, many of the negative impacts might possibly have been mitigated or projects abandoned. Another question was posed about whether social scientists and lawyers were involved in these collaborative projects. Professor Loisel said yes, that the ADN involved academics, engineers, lawyers, representatives of the energy sector, licensing and planning agencies, indigenous peoples. This diversity of actors sometimes led to conflict at meetings, but she highlighted the importance of hearing all of these perspectives.

Jung-Eun Lee, Assistant Professor of Earth, Environmental and Planetary Sciences, Brown University.

Professor Lee examined the role of plant transpiration on rainfall patterns in Amazonia. Her specialty is theoretical modeling of how climate systems and ecosystems evolve. Transpiration from plants decreases precipitation variability over tropical rainforests. She presented a few theoretical models of the earth covered in non-perspiring plants and an earth with no plants at all. Her models showed that plant cover is necessary to produce the moisture that initiates precipitation, and that plant removal leads to more extreme precipitation events – both more days that are drier, and more extreme rain on the fewer rainy days. She then demonstrated how this applies to the Amazon region. Currently, late October marks the onset of the wet season there. The large number of flowering plants in the Amazon leads to higher evapotranspiration and an earlier onset of the wet season, which would start as late as January 10 and last for less time should the flowering plants of the Amazon be removed. Indeed, the onset of the rainy season in the southern Amazon has been delayed in recent years because of deforestation, with consequences for the precipitation cycles in all of Brazil. She correlated these reduced precipitation rates with reduced forest cover using the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI).

Professor Lee demonstrated how she used CloudSat data to compare cloud types and surface processes. Over the Amazon, cloud shapes show a similar pattern to clouds over the ocean, so we could refer to the forest as a “green ocean”, but continental-like deep convection occurs during the brief dry-to-wet transition season with highest temperature and energy, possibly due to plant water stress. Her findings surrounding cloud shapes and precipitation rates confirm the findings above concerning land use change and changing precipitation rates, which are likely to continue to be exacerbated in the future.

Professor Loiselles poised a question to Professor Lee about when a tipping point will happen. Lee replied that this is not easy to determine, but that even a small amount of deforestation results in perceptible change in rainfall patterns. Unfortunately, the expected high level of CO₂ and ensuing temperature patterns over the Pacific might result in Amazonian dieback even without large-scale deforestation. Land surface change is crucial to analyze, since according to her research maintaining precipitation patterns is determined by plants and soil retaining water until the end of the dry season. She affirmed that the conversion from forest to agricultural land is dangerous. Professor Lee fielded another question wherein she admitted that she did not include analysis of secondary forests in her model, although

she pointed out that early successional forests tend to have shallower roots that would likely pose a difference in evapotranspiration.

Suzanne Oakdale, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico.

Professor Oakdale introduced herself as a sociocultural anthropologist who might offer a slightly different perspective from her colleagues. She began by discussing how anthropology has complicated the boundaries between nature and humanity. She asked whether we should be thinking about biomes as exclusively natural. Such a line of thinking dates back to the 1970s, and research in Brazil has played a key role in asking that question and changing our thinking. Archaeologists as well as social anthropologists, particularly ones associated with “perspectivism” originating at the Museu Nacional in Rio de Janeiro, and critiques of perspectivism have been especially influential. Their efforts highlighted the central importance of indigenous Amazonians in the protection of these biomes.

Archaeology is the key to demonstrating how humans and nature are entangled. She described current theories that as early as 4000 years ago, humans were actively shaping the Amazonian landscape to produce today’s Brazil nut and açai “forests”. She highlighted

Hecht's work in this area, as well as Neves and Peterson's work with Amazonian dark earths. Mound-building and other cultivation methods were present in areas of cultivated forest surrounded by "high forest". There were areas of high population density, such as the upper Xingú from 1250-1400 AD. This area displayed roads and houses built around a central plaza, with carefully managed lands between the residency nodes. There is continuity between this archaeological record and contemporary peoples, such as the Kayapó and the Kaapor. Some of these ancient technologies, such as using fire to create dark earths, are increasingly unusable under current climactic conditions (which are drier due to land use change). She noted the collaborative projects between the Kaapor and the Museu do Índio that transmit forest knowledge and speak out against logging, as well as other projects that sell native seeds to deforested areas.

She highlighted the importance of the Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro's work in blurring a rigid human/nature distinction. In contrast to this Western thinking, Amerindian "multinaturalism" treats humans and animals equally as persons with different perspectives due to their different bodies. His work took a major step in decolonizing thought and embracing different ontologies, and his work continues to influence academic thinking worldwide. Professor Oakdale discussed her research with the Kawaiwete people, who were

moved to the Xingú reserve from the Tapajós. She finds "multinaturalism" to be a useful way to characterize shamanism. A number of "true animals" watch over the "everyday" animals of the forest. These "true animals" can take human souls in revenge when needed. Shamans have to navigate the souls of the sick, the diseased, and the unborn in order to bring them back into the world, as well as interact with these "true animals" or non-human subjectivities. Moral codes surrounding dietary taboos and interaction with game are present. The human condition or personhood becomes a generic condition of many different species, so human beings are not special in this regard. The domain of "nature" as separate from "human" effectively disappears.

Perspectivism is not without its shortcomings, as many scholars both Brazilian and international have pointed out. It can lead to a dangerous kind of homogenization or essentialism, treating indigenous worldviews generically instead of specifically (and accurately). However, as Professor Oakdale pointed out, perspectivism can be useful in dialogue with capitalism because it galvanizes support for indigenous peoples and other ways of living. Perspectivism deals in generalities but has an activist appeal. Multinaturalism can be a means of uniting people against harmful development projects. In politics, it can present a utopian, alternative future-oriented project wherein humans do not dominate nature. However, there is no multinaturalist

world isolated from the Western world, since we are all entangled in shared global problems such as climate change. We face a challenge of not discarding indigenous worldviews that are not completely isolated from Western ways of living. Professor Oakdale concluded her talk by giving several examples of indigenous participation in sustainable development projects and some ways that they resonated within their lifeways. In the mid-1940s, a Kawaiwete shaman helped set up an airstrip near his community so that his people could have better access to Western medical supplies, but he did so in a way that took into account appropriate relationships with forest spirits. She also discussed the Instituto Socioambiental's beekeeping projects in the Xingú park. Beekeeping is a Western practice, occurring there with European species. According to a local shaman, there is now a new spirit that watches over the European bees, and the project appears to be going well.



We face a challenge of not discarding indigenous world views that are not completely isolated from Western ways of living.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

After the presentations, the panel opened for discussion and questions. One audience member asked about the political conditions under which multinational collaboration could be improved. Professor Loisel acknowledged that effective collaboration is something they all struggle with, sometimes meeting with resistance from local actors. While the University of Florida cannot enter into projects without partners on the ground, they can sometimes play the role of neutral party between organizations in conflict and thereby improve stakeholder collaboration. Professor Lee emphasized the importance of funding from US and Brazilian sources in making collaborations possible, as was the case with her own research. However, she lamented that American and Brazilian resources for studying the tropics are drying up, and she is often encouraged to study Puerto Rico instead of Brazil.

The audience posed a question about the relationship between forest land use change and chronic or infectious diseases. Professor Lee admitted that she was unfamiliar with this, but knew of a student at Brown who studied disease outbreaks in India. This student found that outbreaks more consistently occurred in deforested areas (as opposed to, for example, cities). Professor Montagnini, the panel moderator, discussed a project on infectious diseases

(malaria, yellow fever, and leptospirosis) carried out in the 1990s by Yale's schools of Public Health and of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Those diseases are present within the forest, including in the birds and small mammals that host the insects bearing the diseases. However, when humans enter forests to extract resources and then return to urban centers, the forest's natural cycle is broken, leading to outbreak. In order to break this cycle of infection, the research team came up with many recommendations about reducing land use change and using forest resources without exposure to disease.

A final question was asked about carbon credits. The audience member posing the question lamented the implementation of carbon credits in the Amazon in a way that prevented local indigenous populations from practicing their traditional agriculture. She lamented a lack of dialogue in the process of their implementation. Professor Oakdale agreed that while carbon credits may be useful, they are not a panacea. Professor Montagnini cited an example of indigenous peoples in Panama who clashed with other stakeholders over carbon credits, claiming that the carbon in the trees and in the soils was theirs and that they should be compensated for it. The laws surrounding ownership of soil vary by country, and there are no simple answers.

SESSION 2: LAW & POLITICAL SCIENCE.

Friday, November 30, 2018.
4:30-6:00 p.m.

Moderator: Daniel Vargas,
Professor of Law, FGV Law School

Discussion Question: How does the foreign view of the American academy contribute to the development of research in Brazilian politics and institutions in both countries?

Sérgio Guerra, Dean, FGV Law School.

Dean Guerra began his presentation by acknowledging that comparative work in this field is acceptable since many Brazilian institutions have been influenced by American ones. American Federalism influenced the 1891 Brazilian Constitution and its subsequent versions as well, making comparisons particularly apt in constitutional law. The Brazilian Supreme Court has been known to rely on precedent set by the American Supreme courts in this area, and in administrative law. Such a comparative undertaking could also help clear up misunderstandings about the Brazilian regulatory standard. His discussion focused on the development of the American regulatory standard, which Brazil needs to do right now.

He pointed out Brazil's current need for practical regulations. He foresees a difficult political transition in the upcoming months due to corruption scandals and a politically fraught climate. Dean Guerra proceeded to outline a history of the interaction between Brazilian and American administrative institutions. The Interstate Commerce Commission marked the beginning of this bureaucratic standard in the regulation of public utilities in the US. He recommended Jerry L. Mashaw's book, *Creating the Administrative Constitution* (2012) for a historical overview of this development. Although administrators were largely allowed to self-regulate, by the 1930s widespread corruption led to the creation of oversight agencies and further regulation. The Administrative Procedure Act (1946) was a crucial step taken during this period. It is the true constitution of administrative law at the federal level. It represents decentralized public administration and effective managerial autonomy. The Brazilian case is a partial reproduction of this standard.

The 1990s saw the restructuring of public administration in Brazil, together with Fernando Henrique Cardoso's economic reforms. There was a large push toward privatization, as well as regularization within agencies. Independent regulatory agencies were created, headed by a collegiate body with tenure for commissioners, administrative autonomy, and quasi-

adjudicatory powers. Many industries underwent these changes, including oil and gas, energy, electricity, health care, telecommunications, and transportation. These new regulatory agencies were intended to reduce some of the party politics influencing public administration. One problem these new structures faced was a lack of the separation of power, having a unitary executive and independent commissioners with permanent terms. Guerra sees massive similarities, both in structure and in difficulties faced, between the US (post-New Deal) and Brazil. The Brazilian Supreme court often looked to the US to determine its rulings, as was the case with tenured positions. However, the Brazilian and American systems remain distinct in terms of governability and government structure.

Laws written under structures created 200 years ago can be difficult to adequately apply when faced with corporations that act like global service providers, such as Uber, Google and Facebook. Guerra suggests that Brazilian and American academics analyze this specifically, taking into account differences in government and socioeconomic realities. He praised this conference for its multidisciplinary nature, and suggested more bilateral cooperation in future research endeavors.

David Trubek, Voss-Bascom
Professor of Law; Dean of
International Studies, University of
Wisconsin - Madison.

Professor Trubek began noting that right now there is no course on Brazilian law in the whole of the United States. It used to be taught at Miami but when Keith Rosenn retired it was discontinued. Few US law professors speak Portuguese or pay attention to Brazil. Trubek was able to include a module on Brazil in a law and development course at his home institution and there may be similar modules in courses on human rights, anticorruption, elsewhere. In those courses Portuguese is not required. This strategy can help break through student unfamiliarity with Brazil and language barriers – it is possible to link Brazil to specific topics such as the environment, climate change, human rights, or development. He cited examples from Pace (law and environment), Harvard (global legal professions), and U. Texas-Austin (human rights in Brazil) as successful examples.

But he noted that maintaining in-depth study of Brazil including Portuguese in US universities is a challenge. The UW Madison had an active Brazil studies program led by Thomas Skidmore. But when Skidmore left UW Madison and was not replaced by another Brazil historian, the program languished. In US universities, the positions are usually in a department and when a departments

decide to focus on a different country, or no country at all, a whole country or regional program can disappear. As Dean of International Studies, he tried hard to get departments to hire people with expertise in Brazil and other needed countries but had little leverage if a department has other ideas.

One area that is encouraging is interdisciplinary US-Brazil research networks on specific topics. Giving an example of an effective collaboration, Trubek discussed a project he is involved with at Harvard. It created interdisciplinary, multinational teams doing collaborative research on the rise of the corporate legal profession in Brazil, India and China. More than fifty people collaborated on this over the course of five years. Harvard partnered with the FGV Law School in São Paulo and created a team of over 20 researchers, mostly Brazilians. The team included Brazilians who could speak English and one American who spoke Portuguese. This led to a volume jointly edited by Brazilian and US scholars and published by Cambridge University Press: *The Brazilian Legal Profession in the*

Age of Globalization.

Trubek described the road ahead for Brazil itself as rocky. He described Brazil as being at a turning point, generating anxiety and concern for some and happiness for others. He sees the current situation in Brazil as paralleling other nations, including the US, with its debates over environmental protection, human rights, the nature of democracy, and the ability of the law to protect the environment and minorities.

In this context, a new version of Brazilian studies might emerge within the field of law. Brazil is at the forefront of many issues important to US law schools such as: how to ensure the legal system support economic development, preserve democracy, maintain the role of the judiciary as a constitutional guarantor, combat corruption, preserve the environment, strengthen electoral systems, reform criminal justice and the protect the rights of defendants, combat all forms of discrimination, and maintain free speech. This new direction would be characterized by interdisciplinary teams led jointly by US and Brazilian



For this deeper meaning of Brazilianist to emerge, a deep-rooted collective experience must be had, and this is the sense in which he uses this term.

institutions on topics like this. These teams would push through language barriers, and address these and other interest areas.

Trubek noted that Yale has a program that sends students to Brazil to explore such issues. That might evolve into a research network with faculty on both sides. Other universities might create similar networks if they could get sufficient support.

While Trubek thought there were ways to promote Brazil studies in law without demanding that all US participants have deep country knowledge or Portuguese competence, it will depend on their being a cadre of US law professors with such skills. Recruiting and supporting such a cadre is essential if there is to be any attention to Brazil in US legal education.

Fabio de Sa e Silva, Assistant Professor of International Studies; Wick Cary Professor of Brazilian Studies, University of Oklahoma.

Professor de Sa e Silva began by defining two meanings of “Brazilianist”: a thin sense, as a strategic label used to communicate about Brazil or research conducted there, or a thicker sense as an identity. For this deeper meaning of Brazilianist to emerge, a deep-rooted collective experience must be had, and this is the sense in which he uses this term. He proceeded to question many of the assumptions embedded in the panel’s discussion prompt. He questioned whether

there is a foreign view of the American academy, suggesting rather that there may be multiple, with some hegemonizing others. When discussing the development of research, he noted that a PhD candidate doing his/her first research trip to Brazil provides a different contribution than those engaged in long-term collaborative projects. He also questioned which political institutions should be focused on – just the ones that have parallels in both countries, or ones specific to Brazil. He cautioned against automatically positioning the US as the more advanced of the two societies.

His area is Law and Society, which developed as a movement in the US in the 1960s and 1970s. This movement has three characteristics: it studies the law in action (how the law gets implemented, rather than written); it is interdisciplinary (pushing back against the status quo of the period in which it took shape); and it is progressive. One of the subareas of Law and Society was Law and Development, which focused on the role of law in promoting economic and political change. He quoted Trubek et al.’s writing as the clearest expression of how Law and Development scholars in the 1960s understood this role (i.e., of what the “foreign view” once was). Those scholars saw economic development as being generated by the organization of markets (private rights) and political development as being a direct consequence of a growing private sphere. They thus pushed for the creation of “better laws”,

for a “better application of the law”, and for changes in legal culture and legal reasoning, always under their normative assumptions of what a “good law” and “good law practice” was. Their research goals included legal changes that could be undertaken or cases that could help justify their intended legal development efforts by showing the positive relationships between particular kinds of law and outcomes in economic and political development. But for many reasons, these projects were later deemed a failure. Law and Development scholars ignored that, in countries like Brazil, the state played a greater role than markets in the economy, changing the role of the law in those systems. They also faced unexpected results, such as in their attempts to promote a more “purposive” thinking in law schools, which legitimized authoritarianism during the military dictatorship. Last but not least, Law and Development scholars experienced a loss of faith in US legal liberalist post-Vietnam, which cast doubt of the desirability of US models of development and the policy motives behind such Law and Development initiatives.

To answer the discussion question, we must learn from these law and development projects, creating infrastructure that would prevent the same mistakes from being repeated. To answer the discussion question in the negative, the foreign view of the American academy does not contribute

to development in Brazil if it is not marked by a commitment to freedom, justice and democracy; if it does not display awareness of the structural contradictions and conflicts in Brazil; or if it is not based on horizontal relationships of solidarity. Professor de Sa e Silva identified some obstacles to doing this work in the US academy, including time, energy, resources, and lack of tangible reward. He argued that in law and political science, collaborative research does not lead to the professional rewards cited in the graph presented by Professor Loisel in the previous panel (the standards for tenure are different). He also pointed out the difficulties in Brazil posed by cutbacks in funding, privatization in higher education, attacks on affirmative action and similar programs, anti-intellectualism and attacks on academic freedom (including Escola Sem Partido, rising fascism, and the recent ENEM essay controversy). Yet, he urged us to keep walking the road ahead. He is a professor at the David L. Boren College of International Studies at the University of Oklahoma, where he is starting a Brazil Studies Program. This program aims to include coursework, events, exchange programs, publications, an institutional research agenda, and study abroad programs.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

An audience member commented on the long-standing influence of the Federalist papers and the US Constitution on

Brazilian constitutional law, remarking with awe that now the US is influencing Brazilian criminal law as well. He cited a recent news report that a new law had been passed, allowing the president to pardon persons involved in corruption scandals. He observed a preference in Brazil for hiring younger lawyers who understood compliance laws after having studied in the US.

Another audience member asked a two-part question about how to improve intellectual property rights in Brazil, particularly for scientific discoveries, and how to embrace responsibility for the state of the law in Brazil without putting all the blame on prior generations of scholars and lawmakers. Professor Trubek fielded this question by explaining more thoroughly what was fueling the projects of the 1960s. At the time, the Ford Foundation and the US government (that were funding these projects) had a simplistic view about what would work and what was needed. There was a romanticized view of the American system, and it was assumed that deliberately reforming one area of Brazilian law would naturally reform the rest. However, the reforms were accepted in a piecemeal fashion and treated with skepticism. He now acknowledges that one cannot transplant a piece of foreign law without recognizing there will be ramifications based on the local environment and the complexity of the system. Americans also have to analyze their own assumptions about how the law works in their own country. He assured

the audience that there is a way for foreign scholars to help (and to get past the assumption that they are just “imperialist pigs”), and he welcomed the audience to grab a drink with him to talk more about how.

Professor de Sa e Silva clarified that he admires Professor Trubek and his collaborators from the 1960s. He does not blame them for the results of their efforts because of their critical takeaways, which allowed his generation to learn from their mistakes. He feels it is now more possible to create infrastructure that allows for deeper engagement, developing a better understanding of place and cultural biases.

Brazil has a habit of importing ideas from abroad, asserted another audience member. They cited Rui Barbosa’s adoption of American Federalism and the social contract copied from the Germans, neither of which were problem-free in Brazilian society. Professor Trubek acknowledged that in order to be an ethical legal exporter, one need be aware of this tendency without contributing to it. One cannot act on advice too soon or too readily, so one has a responsibility to slow the workings down and give time for analysis. He pointed out that this is a narrow, small professional practice, but one that must be handled ethically.

Addressing the subject of intellectual property rights, Guerra described the complexity of the Brazilian case since the nation is currently walking an unstable

path between either a unified acceptance of such laws or a pure administrative state model. He urged Brazil to choose one approach or the other. The Constitution of 1891 copied Federalism and its separation of powers, but Brazilian bureaucracy copied the French (Bonaparte) model that centralized power in the president. Brazil cannot always copy US laws because of this complexity. Professor Trubek called this a good challenge for both Brazilian and American scholars. US law has been reformed so that patents can be obtained even when research was performed with government funding, which has led to many startups associated with American universities. He sees this as something that could be implemented in Brazil as well.

Professor de Sa e Silva noted how Brazilian criminal law is becoming more Americanized, particularly in the case of the Lava Jato scandal. As a scholar, he would like to understand what's driving this, particularly since "corruption" under US law is different from Brazil. He mentioned the modernization reforms being carried out by the ENCLA panel of the Ministry of Justice. Professor Vargas noted the difficulty in reforming the criminal code without streamlining both criminal and civil procedure. The absence of this would still allow for loopholes in which judges can rule. He urged structural reforms to strengthen public institutions over relying on prosecutors and judges to reform the law, which is riskier.

SESSION 3: HISTORY AND LITERATURE

Saturday, December 1, 2018.
9:30-11:00 a.m.

Moderator: Stuart Schwartz,
George Burton Adams Professor of
History, Yale University

Discussion Question: What are the challenges in research on Brazilian history and literature at U.S. universities: elements of attraction and indifference from American students to exchanges with Brazilian universities?

Dain Borges, Associate Professor
of History, Romance Languages
& Literatures, and The College,
University of Chicago.

Collaboration in the field of history primarily means institutional structures such as the “Bolsa Sanduíche”. There are also a few intermediate collaborations such as the Brazilian Association of Historians, but that group will not apply for grants to fund research. Developing functional research centers is crucial. Professor Borges lauded the Biblioteca Nacional’s initiative to digitalize its archives which eliminates prior obstacles to doing research, such as waiting in line in Rio at 7:59 in the morning in order to see a microfilm. Lending materials such as microfilms is difficult, but digitalizing them makes them

conveniently accessible and transforms the possibilities of research. He also praised the expansion of excellent graduate programs in history at USP, the Federal Universities, and the Catholic Universities. The discipline of history is being transformed as the quality of teaching improves. He called the Americanization of the French-style university system in Brazil a success, in general. Having similar degree programs, such as an MA before a PhD, facilitates exchange between the two nations since students will be at comparable stages in their academic careers. He highlighted how growth of the libraries at UNICAMP and USP, as well as their centralization, has revolutionized social science and humanities research at both institutions.

A mourning hush fell over the audience as he reminded the crowd that the Bendigó meteorite is the only part of the Museu Nacional’s collection that still exists after its all-consuming fire in September, 2018. This was a catastrophe for his discipline and many others, and not just for Brazil. This lamentable occurrence demonstrates the critical importance of digitalizing everything. He is undertaking digitalization projects at the University of Chicago with scholars who study the Middle East, whose archives face similar threats due to the ravages of war. He feels committed to doing this with all holdings from all sources. Had the Museu Nacional’s collections been digitalized, biological specimens would still have been destroyed, but many kinds of materials

would still have been preserved. These efforts are as necessary in the US as in Brazil: no collections in Chicago-area museums are fully digitalized, either. He stressed the importance of making multiple copies kept in multiple locations.

Professor Borges discussed the importance of language acquisition in overcoming obstacles to studying Brazilian history in the US. In the field of history, one cannot assume that one's collaborators will speak English, so learning Portuguese is of paramount importance. Since Spanish is the default foreign language of instruction in the US, students will typically not be exposed to Portuguese until college. Many of these language learners come to it via Spanish and tend to enjoy it. There is a high rate of conversion from beginner to intermediate Portuguese in US colleges. There are two bottlenecks: getting students enrolled in beginner Portuguese in the first place, and getting them to study abroad in Brazil since such programs are few and far between. Brazil's reputation for violence keeps many families from sending their children there – many prefer to send their children to Ecuador instead, where 4-10 times the quantity of American students study abroad compared to Brazil. He encouraged the Brazilian government to invest more in promoting tourism to Brazil (which he called mediocre when compared to Mexico or Spain, for example), which would also

attract study abroad students. Once American students have studied abroad there, they tend to “convert” to scholars of Brazil.

Since few undergraduate programs adequately prepare students for a PhD in Brazilian history, programs tend to be more forgiving with language acquisition at the doctoral level. FLAS grants have been particularly useful in helping these students acquire their much-needed language skills. While language learning in history may be slow, this becomes more complicated when one is training for an advanced degree in literature. He encouraged both nations' governments to foment study abroad programs, to encourage higher-level scholarship further down the line. Even a small stimulus could make a big difference, such as a contest with travel or study in Brazil as a prize. He also believes that more MA programs that focus on (and fund) language acquisition would increase the size and quality of the pool of candidates for the advanced study of Brazil, which at this time is very small and self-selected.

César Braga-Pinto, Professor of Brazilian, Lusophone African and Comparative Literature, Northwestern University.

Professor Braga-Pinto described historians as his best friends, even though his field is literature. They share fear over the loss of precious documents

and archives, and concern for the future of Brazilian Studies in the US. There is a crisis in the humanities which affects both American and Brazilian institutions. Language and literature departments are the most vulnerable of these, particularly with less commonly taught languages such as Portuguese. He wants to avoid sounding apocalyptic, but these departments are constantly having to prove their relevance and right to exist. He lamented the decline of tenure-track jobs, which have decreased 50% in the last ten years, particularly in the humanities. Literary scholars need to be interdisciplinary in order to survive professionally. One particular difficulty in the field of literature is that students either need to work with works in translation or need to have a high level of language ability.

The study of Brazilian literature in the US is very different from studying it in Brazil. The focus here has tended to be on popular music, *mestiçagem*, Carnaval and other cultural exceptionalisms. However, now Brazil is beginning to be studied transnationally, in the context of the world. There are only two university departments in the US that study Portuguese exclusively; most departments combine this language with Spanish. When he started his career as a professor, he was told that Luso-Brazilianists were often excluded in these combined departments, but that wasn't what he found in practice. In fact, he only had to teach one language class after grad school, which he could tailor to focus on literature.

He saw high enrollment with more support from the Portuguese government than the Brazilian government. He noted a growing interest in courses taught in English, engaging with comparative literature, Africana studies, and women's and gender studies.

Professor Braga-Pinto lamented the absence of tenure-line faculty at Rutgers after he left that institution. At Northwestern, where he currently teaches, he sees almost no demand for a degree in Portuguese, let alone a course in Portuguese literature, because of the low language level of the students. An interdisciplinary degree was created and courses were carried out in English translation, which was what was possible although not ideal. He praised the translation grants given sometimes by the Biblioteca Nacional. He noted that he is the only Brazilianist in the entire school of Arts and Sciences, and perhaps on the whole campus. This necessitates interdisciplinary work with economics, political science, and other departments. He noted that some student athletes are drawn to courses on Brazil due to soccer and capoeira. He finds that students in these courses are interested in receiving a global education and not just in fulfilling degree requirements. He noted how small, private universities can more easily have such small, "niche" courses on Brazil than larger universities can.

At Northwestern, students are in a situation similar to that at many other

universities, which on the whole don't have a doctoral program in Portuguese, nor the resources to make one currently. Such an endeavor would be unrealistic. However, he finds many people are eager to learn about Brazil and perhaps dedicate a large section of their dissertation to it. Students are generally not encouraged to write exclusively on Brazil unless they plan on moving back there someday.

Professor Braga-Pinto voiced concern over the incoming Brazilian administration, particularly over recent statements about the preservation of family and traditional morality issued by the Secretary of Education. He noted how difficult it can be to make a case for the study of Brazilian literature in a world with many pressing concerns, including deforestation and human rights abuses. He believes the road ahead will be rocky, as Professor Trubek said earlier. However, it remains urgent to study how earlier creative writers have faced the challenges of their times without succumbing to skepticism and despair. In this age of "alternative truth", it remains important to understand the rules of rhetoric, irony, dialogue, and so forth. In these times, literature can be an alternate form of citizenship for some.

Seth W. Garfield, Professor of History, University of Texas - Austin.

Professor Garfield addressed three main topics in his presentation: 1) improved access to primary and secondary sources due to digitalization; 2) shifting trends in Brazilian historiography from comparative to connective history; 3) and challenges to promoting Brazilian Studies in the US and study abroad to Brazil.

Digitalization of Brazilian archives is of inestimable importance. First, it allows researchers to keep up with Brazilian journals, dissertations, and publications, especially via SCIELO. It also enables researchers to break out of the Rio-Sao Paulo academic axis and access intellectual production emerging from other parts of the country. Professor Garfield listed and praised many archival collections that are currently available online, which allows researchers to write entirely new histories. As an example, he cited his current research project:



Without proficiency in Portuguese, applicants face greater difficulty to gain admission to a PhD in Brazilian History.

a history of guaraná, an Amazonian cultivar and namesake of Brazil's "national" soda, which lacks a scholarly monograph, despite being a cultural icon and multibillion dollar industry. Studying guaraná was difficult in the past due to a lack of concentrated archival material. The plant did not leave an extensive paper trail since it was never a leading export, nor the product of the slave-plantation complex. Yet, thanks to digitalization, he has been able to find far-flung sources for his research. This has revealed guaraná's geopolitical importance in sustaining trade linkages with the sparsely populated western frontier in the nineteenth century; its fleeting popularity in the North American pharmaceutical market; and its early packaging as a sign of modernity, comfort, and fantasy in Brazilian magazine ads. In the classroom, he added, digitalization of historical materials allows the teaching of Brazil to be taken to a new level, supplemented by resources such as paintings, videos, telenovelas, and more. Still, greater funds must be dedicated to eliminating inequality in access to digital resources. Moreover, digitalization must supplement rather than replace investment in physical archives, which still need to be adequately preserved, as evinced by the terrible losses at the Museu Nacional in September 2018.

Professor Garfield noted a shifting historiographical trend from studying comparative history to studying connective history. The former was, and is, still robust in the study of slavery and abolition

in the Americas. Yet, one risk inherent in undertaking comparative history is in universalizing experiences or essentializing differences between nations in the interest of sustaining comparisons or contrast. Students should be prodded or intrigued by comparative approaches, but "othering" can also result if the historian's sources or methods do not align well in both countries, and if we end up comparing apples and oranges. Connective histories, on the other hand, trace the exchange of goods, ideas, and peoples between the United States and Brazil, thereby highlighting a dialectic relationship between the two countries' histories.

On his second point, Professor Garfield noted the challenge of promoting study abroad in Brazil, particularly because the pool of students in the US who study abroad has been shrinking, in general. Overall, humanities majors in the US have dropped 45-50% from its 2007 peak, due in great part to the economic recession – students look for STEM skills seen as more marketable. This also means fewer students are in Portuguese classes (as documented by a recent study of the Modern Language Association), and since these classes teach about Brazilian culture as well as language, opportunities for specialization in Brazilian studies are greatly diminished. Without proficiency in Portuguese, applicants face greater difficulty to gain admission to a PhD in Brazilian History. Professor Garfield urged more funding for the study of the Portuguese language.

He noted that there will always be a pool of students, of course, who are proficient in Portuguese, as Americans privileged to have been raised in Brazil or as Brazilian-Americans. However, universities are tasked with broadening students' intellectual horizons. He noted a personal example: when he was a Latin American Studies major at Yale, he was required by the program to take Portuguese, which is how he first became interested in Brazil. As a college student, he subsequently received a grant to conduct research in Brazil for his senior essay, going on to build on this foundation a career focused on Brazilian history. In other words, he became one of the "little Brazilianists" that Professor Borges described in his presentation. These kinds of opportunities must be made available to more students.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

The audience posed a question about how the relationship between Brazilian and American scholars of history and literature can help us understand current issues in Brazil. Professor Borges began by explaining that even though his field is the 19th and 20th century, he begins his courses in the 17th century. He stressed the importance of having a long horizon of at least 500 years in order to accurately understand the world. Issues of identity and the future will likely be dealt with in ignorance if the past is ignored. The moderator, Professor Stuart Schwartz, expressed appreciation

for the emphasis on the sciences that this conference has shown, but stressed the need to retain the humanities in the mix as well. At minimum, if we want greater collaboration between Brazilian and American scientists, those researchers will need to learn the Portuguese language in order to operate. The sciences and humanities are not in conflict, but rather support each other. He described himself as a colonial historian who looks at the role of the state and its relationship to society. Some argue that Brazil had a state before it had a society, and the relationship between the two has been a concern from the colonial period to the present. Questions regarding race, ethnicity, and immigration all benefit from a historical view and an understanding of the way these issues were treated in the past. He gave the example of a project run by a Brazilian entomologist at IBGE, who looked at the role of leaf-cutter ants (*saiúvas*) in shaping colonial society, which continues to have implications to this day. History can inform the development of the sciences as well. Professor Garfield added that history mobilizes people, particularly by the inspiring examples of ancestors who have shown great courage in moments of adversity. Professor Braga-Pinto noted that scholars in the US tend to be more comfortable asking these kinds of questions of literature (which is more affective) than of history (which tends to be more objective or removed). Yet, to understand how Brazil sees itself today—

such as how its society came to be divided, or how the image of Brazil as cordial and harmonious emerged – an archival approach drawing on literature and history is needed.

One audience member expressed the importance of performing comparative studies in order to take away an important lesson, and not just for the sake of comparison. He indicated his interest in seeing a comparison between the writings of Mark Twain and Monteiro Lobato. Professor Borges pointed out that Twain was a contemporary of Machado de Assis. He compared Machado de Assis' regulated hatred and brutal honesty, articulated in a way that elites would find acceptable, to Jane Austen's writing. He also pointed out that while Twain's humor is broad and colloquial on the surface, it is similarly very controlled. There are points of comparison in the content of their writing as well – Machado de Assis talked about American imperialism in the Philippines, and Twain also wrote about that war. He agreed that comparing Twain and Lobato would be interesting, albeit problematic, though perhaps fruitful if examining their use of the folkloric for political purposes. He noted that almost everyone in the US has had to adopt a comparative approach for career reasons – one must study Guimarães Rosa *and* Lispector *and* others together – which can sometimes dilute a good reading of a single author's work. Professor Braga-Pinto countered by suggesting that this is not all comparative literature does.

A book on Machado de Assis could be comparative in nature but singular in focus. Parts of authors' biographies, such as Lispector's Jewish heritage, can close debates about their work when not treated comparatively. The construction of race, for example, is happening in Brazil but not only in Brazil, so comparison can help put this phenomenon in a wider context. Brazilian literature is by nature comparative. Professor Borges agreed that Brazilian authors were wide readers, aware of literary works in other languages. Professor Garfield pointed out that history, even within one country, is always comparative as one compares people across different cultures and centuries. In his presentation, he was merely cautioning against political and methodological approaches that lead to essentialist assertions about who someone or what something is.

Professor Borges expressed a wish for better conditions for studying the US in Brazilian universities. The US is very heavily policed against outsiders, questioning foreign researchers' competency and sources. He does research on Japanese literature even though he does not read Japanese – the membrane on the US is much thicker and would make such a study there difficult. It is possible for a talented student in Brazil to get an education in European history, but it's not as easy for an average Brazilian student to study the US and Japan.

Professor Schwartz quoted Thomas Skidmore, who said that the first generations of Brazilian scholars were *afilhados de Fidel*, since the concern was that Brazil would become the next Cuba. It led the US to encourage the study of Portuguese, which is how his generation of scholars got started. He stressed the need to create more opportunities for high school students to go to Brazil, because they would then come into college already interested in studying the country and its language. The importance of Brazil as a world player should encourage more people in the US to study it. He lauded the FGV's important role in fomenting the social sciences in Brazil and for its engagement in collaborative projects. Professor Borges noted that there are institutional hurdles that keep students from studying in Portuguese: the FLAS grant, for example, will not fund language study in Portugal. There is little stimulus to engage with Portuguese scholars, and with Luso-African scholars it is easier in the field of politics than in literature or history. Professor Schwartz discussed an initiative by a university in Ceará that brings students from Mozambique and Angola to study at their institution. Chico Buarque wrote that Brazil is *um imenso Portugal* during the political crisis of the 1970s, and pointed out some interesting changes that are currently happening in Portugal. He praised Projeto Resgate, an initiative that microfilmed all documents on Brazil extant in Portuguese archives. He

stressed that continued contact between Portugal and the American academy will be important for the study of Brazilian history. Professor Braga-Pinto said that Lusofonia is helpful but not necessary, more so in the US than in Brazil. He works on Mozambique and taught there for a year, and he found more differences than similarities with Brazilian history and literature there. He admitted that Jorge Amado perhaps had an influence in Cape Verde, but not in Mozambique.

SESSION 4: CULTURE - ART HISTORY, COMMUNICATIONS & EDUCATION

Saturday, December 1, 2018.
11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Moderator: Cécile Fromont,
Associate Professor of Art History,
Yale University.

Discussion Questions: In thinking about research in Brazilian culture and education from the perspective of the American academy, how important are these fields of research in the United States? What is their place in the academy at present, and what is the importance to the academy of their contribution to Brazil? Have you seen any change in these perspectives?

David Plank, Research Professor
and Executive Director of Policy
Analysis for California Education,
Stanford University School of
Education.

Professor Plank began by stating that he now works almost full-time on educational policy in Brazil, thanks to Stanford University's Lemann Center. He then admonished the audience for not having mentioned the name of president-elect Jair Bolsonaro until that moment, as if he were He-Who-Must-Not-Be-Named from the Harry Potter book series. He warned

that he would be mentioning his name from now on. He noted that education faculties are like Noah's ark: there are two sociologists, two philosophers, two English teachers, and so on. His presentation would reflect this array of partial perspectives.

Brazil has had a huge influence on the field of education in the United States. Paulo Freire's critical theory and its analysis of the structures of domination and oppression have revolutionized education faculties in the US. Freire is the patron saint of Brazilian education, both for better or for worse. He has inspired action researchers in both countries, as well as deep work that changed how children learn and how teachers teach. At the same time, however, this tradition has also fostered a general posture of critique as a substitute for engagement. There seems to be an unhelpful attitude that society is unfair, people are exploited, and the government is uncaring toward teachers and education, so nothing much can be done until a real and deep revolution takes place. Among education faculty in Brazil Plank finds plentiful rhetoric about how bad the system is, but little real effort to change it.

In the US, Freire's powerful influence can be seen, for example, at the Paulo Freire Institute at UCLA, which operates in partnership with the Paulo Freire Institute in São Paulo. There are disciples of Freire's in virtually all education department faculties. At Stanford, the Lemann Center

published a volume to commemorate the 25th year of his death. Work influenced by him will almost certainly continue into the foreseeable future, with renewed energy. Bolsonaro, however, has stated that he wants to “take a flame thrower to the Ministry of Education, to get Freire out of there.” The oppositional stance that Freire advocated now seems much more urgent. The challenges under this new regime are quite real.

Research on education in Brazil is often conducted outside of the education departments in universities, in economics departments and technical agencies such as INEP and IPEA, and often with support from international agencies. Plank has been involved in some of these projects, which mostly dealt with policy evaluation and design. Over the past twenty years, huge improvements and changes have been seen in school financing systems, teacher preparation, curriculum development, and large-scale assessment systems (of which Brazil is a global pioneer at all ages and levels). Such evaluations of how policy has affected school performance have produced good social science together with good educational reforms. Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s presidency was the high point for economists and technocrats, laying the foundation for new and more equitable finance policies that led to higher salaries for teachers and also to the introduction of an early version of the Bolsa Família. The PT built on these reforms, on a

larger scale and with greater Freirean emphasis. Lula virtually universalized basic education and introduced affirmative action in universities. (Plank noted that this would be an interesting point of comparison with American universities.) The Base Nacional Comum Curricular displayed greater acknowledgment of gender and racial inequalities in classrooms and society. Under the PT, MST schools were encouraged and private higher education was expanded.

Professor Plank began working in this field forty years ago. Since that time, he has witnessed a decline in deference to North American scholars in Brazil, which has strengthened Brazilian scholarship. He has also seen close cooperation between Brazilian and American scholars in the Freirean tradition on how to resist the state, and also on how to develop and implement policy.

The Lemann Center at Stanford was founded eight years ago. The education faculty at Stanford is small (about 45 people), but four of them had experience in Brazil, so the Center emerged somewhat organically. The Center’s mission is to support improvement in the Brazilian educational system via research and projects that seek new strategies. Students and visiting professors are brought to Stanford, where they meet to discuss topics such as the economics of education, pedagogy, and educational technology.

Currently, the Center is working with a number of partner universities in Brazil to change the way that teachers are trained, which remains a great failure of Brazilian universities. Plank highlighted the *Dados para um Debate Democrático em Educação (D3E)*, an initiative that aims to increase the impact of academic research in educational policy-making. He is also working on projects that aim to better implement the Base Nacional and the Reforma do Ensino Médio in classrooms. He briefly discussed other education initiatives in the Center, including data-sharing arrangements with multiple states, *municípios*, and federal agencies; work with the Cearense *município* of Sobral on new techniques in science education; and a research project that investigates how small changes in student environments can lead to big changes in the behaviors and mindsets of students and their parents.

Professor Plank described Brazil as being in a liminal moment. He believes that we will see the re-emergence of old debates regarding whether or not to overturn recent governments' educational reforms, including affirmative action, teacher training, and curriculum reform. Who owns the curriculum is a major debate in Brazil. Is education a private affair? Is it the responsibility of the family and the church rather than the state? Although these concerns are now being voiced primarily by Evangelicals rather than Catholics, the debate remains the same as it was in the 1950s. As a teacher friend said to him, "All curriculum is fascist."

Teachers are protective of their autonomy in the classroom, and some see the Base Nacional Comum as fascist as well. Will this new government see it as too infected by Marx and Freire and throw it out? Bolsonaro's priorities on the campaign trail have seemed to be Escola Sem Partido; attacking universities, teachers, and ENEM; and banning discussions about gender and sexuality in schools. It is unclear how these priorities will play out once he is in office. If the US' recent example tells us anything, it is that such promises tend to worsen once the candidate obtains office, so the current situation in Brazil is one of anxiety.

Joseph Straubhaar, Amon G. Carter Centennial Professor of Communication, The University of Texas - Austin.

Professor Straubhaar discussed the importance of research on communications and media in Brazil. Brazil is a crucial case study in the US and in international debates surrounding media and communications. It was an emerging power even before the emergence of the BRICS, which is how he first became interested in it: he wanted to see who would challenge American dominance in this field. Brazil seemed to directly challenge US cultural imperialism in the debates of the 1970s. Brazil is currently a more important communications power than China.



In the US, Facebook has become more open as a public relations effort, but it is not a legal requirement.

Brazil has been an innovator in alternative media, from the VCR to the internet. As a case study, it is an important example of the growth and power of national media companies, families and empires. Brazil's innovation in new media can be seen in its widespread use of the application WhatsApp, whose encrypted data played a major role in the recent elections (even more so than Trump and Facebook). Brazil also makes for an interesting case study when looking at how the Radio Nacional was used to construct Brazilian national identity. The poorly managed TV Tupi could teach us much about success and failure in the media business.

The progression of the telenovela is an interesting hemispheric case study. Colgate Palmolive created the telenovela in Cuba in order to sell soap. When Castro got rid of the telenovelas in his country, he inadvertently spread them throughout Latin America, including Brazil. Rede Globo's history is fascinating to study because in the 1970s, while supporting the military

dictatorship, Globo employed a number of left-wing writers who found a haven for their ideas in the telenovelas they were writing.

RCA and the United States influenced TV Tupi, and it is interesting to trace how that influence became transformed over time. TV Tupi existed from 1950-1981, run by Assis Chateaubriand. It is a study in how something can seem so powerful while being the worst run television network in the world, which led to its eventual collapse. The twentieth century in Brazil was marked by extreme decentralization, where programs were never played at the same time and advertising became impossible. Roberto Marinho and Joe Wallach (an American who received the Ordem Nacional do Cruzeiro do Sul) helped to commercialize Brazilian TV on the American model.

Professor Straubhaar perceives a generalized attitude in Brazil that TV is globalized, capitalist, and not to be trusted. The effect of the media on Brazilian society has certainly been powerful, and there was much capital flow into Rede Globo during the military dictatorship. That government was happy to turn Brazil into a capitalist, consumer society so that its citizens would not desire a left-wing revolution should one threaten to arise. Yes, Brazilian TV has been an instrument of cultural imperialism, but only focusing on that aspect ignores other interesting

cultural developments that took place because of it. Professor Straubhaar is currently studying how TV Globo will cope with internet streaming providers such as Netflix.

Returning to the history of Brazilian media, Professor Straubhaar discussed how Roberto Marinho wanted to “glocalize” the US model when he took over Rede Globo. There is debate as to whether it was a violation of the Constitution when the network took American technology and then essentially kicked them out of the country. These events demonstrated the considerable power of that media empire. Another interesting historical figure is Dias Gomes, a man who was popular theater productions were censored by the military dictatorship. He then transitioned into TV because he felt the theater had become too elitist. He faced a choice: to become either a leader of a communist party or to write for Rede Globo. From his unlikely position at Rede Globo, although the network promoted capitalist modernity, he was able to offer a platform for leftist playwrights to talk about their vision for Brazil. It was an interesting compromise that got everyone at least a little bit of what they wanted.

Brazil is an innovator in technology for alternative media, including favela and village media. Such folk media and communication has a long history in Brazil, as seen for instance in the *cordel* and *forró* traditions in the Northeast, which are deeply intertwined with regional

identity. Brazilians are the largest group of social media adherents in the world. He doesn't want to seem determinist, as if the results of Bolsonaro's election were a foregone conclusion, but he does admit that the strategy was well-chosen, since many Brazilians do not have access to conventional media but do have access to WhatsApp.

Professor Straubhaar concluded by presenting an overview of his professional involvement in Brazil. He has worked with Intercom since the 1970s, describing himself as “their pet gringo”. He has participated in the Colóquio Brasil-Estados Unidos de Estudos da Comunicação since 2002. He feels that his role as an outside observer can be positive so long as it is performed in good faith. He is also a member of the Academy of US Brazilianists, an organization based in Brazil. In that organization, he finds a lot of productive dialogue and little power politics or presupposition of superior knowledge.

Cecile Fromont, Yale University, Panel Moderator

Professor Fromont echoed previous presenters' urging for better and earlier language study, particularly linked to study abroad, since issues of translation are so central in teaching and research. There need to be more classes teaching Portuguese for Spanish speakers, which would accelerate learning and increase the quantity of people in the field quickly.

The field of Brazilian art history in the US academy is useful to other fields as well, such as anthropology and history, and she finds much solidarity amongst these disciplines. There is a desire to grow these fields together, through the help of institutions such as the Getty Foundation. In art history, digitalization is also crucial but insufficient, since one cannot simply download works of art. Cultural cooperation remains key, as well as support for museum programming and traveling exhibitions. The last major exhibition on Brazil in the US was the Brazil: Body and Soul exhibition at the Guggenheim in 2001. In order for the field of Brazilian Studies to grow, we must foster more study of the many diverse faces of the many different Brazils.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

An audience member asked what the role of academics should be in mitigating fake news in elections, public health, and so on. Professor Straubhaar gave a brief overview of court cases in Brazil where judges unsuccessfully attempted to obtain encrypted data from WhatsApp in order to prosecute drug traffickers. The company preferred to shut down for days rather than acquiesce to this demand. However, Facebook is now the owner of WhatsApp, and the extent to which they may or may not cooperate with researchers in the future will depend on a number of factors. In the US, Facebook has become more open as

a public relations effort, but it is not a legal requirement. The technology is so far in front of our ability to regulate it that he is not optimistic that any changes will be forthcoming. He discussed the urgency of media literacy campaigns, since this new technology meant that many people were unprepared to filter the news that reached them. In Brazil, many people without prior access to the internet suddenly had a smart phone in their hands, and if a trusted relative sent them something, it surely must be true. He believes that there is no real government interest in investigating the technological innovations that helped to elect them, therefore this initiative will have to come from civil society and other actors.

An audience member noted an increase in literacy and functional literacy in recent years, as well as the highest support for Bolsonaro coming from the college-educated. What will the impact of this increase in functional literacy be on Brazilian society? Professor Plank noted that when he was in grad school, there were more illiterate than literate people in Brazilian society. Literacy changes the way people think about the world, as transmitted facts seem more real. We need to reckon with the fact that not everything written down is true, and with the recent proliferation in sources of information. Literacy is just one more tool that humans can use. The optimism he had held felt over literacy campaigns has been qualified. Just making people

literate does not necessarily make them more civic-minded, historically aware, or politically astute. Professor Straubhaar explained that people must be taught to be skeptical of sources of information, which is a cultivated rather than natural impulse. Professor Plank said that this kind of literacy is Professor Weinstein's main occupation at Stanford, where both students and teachers need assistance in sorting out the truth from multiple sources. Professor Straubhaar said that we must teach people to be post-modern: just because something is new and interesting does not mean that it is true.

Another question was posed concerning the changes that will come due to upcoming educational reforms in Brazil along a capitalist model— reforms such as increasing privatization and distance learning, in which certain cabinet members have a financial interest. This also converges with the agenda of the Evangelical bloc. What will be the likely effects of these reforms, and how is the field of education in the US thinking about these? Professor Plank answered that the effect will be powerful. There is a large private sector in education, particularly in higher education, in part because of new policies and in part because of an *emenda constitucional* that limits public expenditures. This is likely to increase over the course of the next president's mandate, and have an impact for at least twenty years or so. This will be compounded by financial backers pushing for this, as well as constituencies that are hostile to the

state's involvement in education (seeing the state as leftist and union-friendly). The situation is similar in the US.

SESSION 5: SOCIOLOGY, DEMOGRAPHY AND URBAN PLANNING

Saturday, December 1, 2018.
1:30-3:00 p.m.

Moderator: Claudia Vallengia,
Professor of Anthropology and
Spanish and Portuguese; Chair,
Council on Latin American and
Iberian Studies, Yale University.

Discussion Question: Regarding studies
on urban formation and Brazilian
environmental challenges from the U.S.
perspective, what are the best ways in
which U.S. researchers can contribute to
the debate in Brazil?

John Logan, Professor of
Sociology, Brown University.

Professor Logan began by presenting
data mapping as an example of a way
that US researchers can contribute to
urban research in Brazil. He drew from
his experience with China in order to
address the discussion question. At this
conference, many of the panelists seem
at least semi-Brazilian in a way, although
he has no such connection to China.
When he was at Albany, they created
a joint PhD program with a Chinese
universities that allowed students to
spend a few years studying in each
country. These students were the earliest

possible professors in sociology, which
filled a vacuum. In the 1980s, when
this was happening, population control
was a major sociological question,
although this never interested him
as much as urban development. The
Chinese universities needed the financial
resources that the US academies could
offer. Nowadays, the research network
is much more secure and mature.
However, now there is no more money
in the US for this kind of research – it
is all in China. He is no longer teaching
the rudiments of his discipline to these
students, since they can obtain that
knowledge from their own professors.
Now this joint PhD can offer the
reputation of the American university,
which helps students get published and
acquire funding. Many US researchers
engage in collaboration in order to
develop the field in another country
where it needs help developing.

Although his research focuses principally
on China, he did develop the Map Brazil
Project which makes GIS data on urban
change in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo
in 2000 and 2010 publicly available. This
allows for many actors from different
disciplines to interact at the same time
with the same data, rather than keeping
their perspectives siloed. This project
uses the IBGE data available online
to present maps where urban spatial
inequalities (which are central to urban
social science) become clearly visualized.
While this data is technically available,
it is difficult to find, understand and

interpret. While he does not feel capable of interpreting urban inequalities in Brazil, he does feel competent to map it using these data sets, dissemination systems and mapping systems.

The Map Brazil Project was built partly on Google and is more user-friendly than the raw IBGE data. He demonstrated for the audience how a person could use the map's layers to display urban inequalities between the Rio de Janeiro neighborhoods of Leblon and Rocinha, the former wealthy and the latter a *favela*. There were clear disparities between the two neighborhoods when comparing the percentage of college degrees held, number of street signs (with implications for access to gas water, trash pickup, etc.), and regularity of streets. Particularly when working with students who may not have been to these cities personally, such visual imagery can be an important pedagogical tool. It is available at: <https://s4.ad.brown.edu/webgisnew/webgisbrazil/>

Brodwyn Fischer, Professor of Latin American History and the College, University of Chicago.

Professor Fischer is a historian by training, but her recent work has bearing on current events such as the right to the city, race, citizenship, and the meaning of the law. When she first read the discussion question about what the US can bring to the study of Brazilian cities, she thought the question sounded imperialist. However, when considering educational

policy and the allocation of resources, it is important to think about what can be gained from these relationships from a Brazilian perspective. She sees these relationships as circular – as exchanges – and not a one-way street.

She outlined three ways that the US' influence has been important in Brazil. First, the vision of what a city is has become more abstract. Material and symbolic signs and symbols of cities include neon signs, sidewalks, transportation, public works, skyscrapers, and so forth. The city is part of a normative architectural spatial and social revolution, an incubator of a vision of the modern grounded in Marx and Weber. Cities display an evolutionary notion of unitary human progress. The city is still a North Atlantic construction that does not conform to lived realities in the so-called "global South", and even in the North Atlantic such a paradigmatic city was always a fantasy, anyhow. The number of cities without such categories is greater outside of the North Atlantic, and they often include shanty towns, forms of violence as extralegal forms of power, and networks of relational power that can be as important as legal liberal institutions. We need to be self-critical on this point and to understand cities in terms of what they are, as well as what they should, can or want to be.

The US has greatly influenced how cities should be studied and what in them should be studied. Methodologies and

paradigms such as census techniques have been coming from the US, although Brazil has had an influence, too. She cited a publicly available census map from Recife in 1907 which mapped even the shanties, and was the only map of its kind available in the world at that time. With the rise of the Chicago School of Sociology, some researchers focused on Brazil and created its first social science institutes, such as USP. They also influenced Boas at Columbia and other researchers. The Chicago School influenced Freyre's work on race, cities and evolution, such as the evolution of shacks to formal neighborhoods. Donald Pierson researched racial dynamics in Bahia and São Paulo, and help set up their first social science institutes. Ruth Landes conducted anthropological research on Candomblé. Some of the first articulations of the connections between race, space and inequality happened because of exchanges between American and Brazilian scholars. Floristan Fernandes' work was modeled on the Chicago School, and Ann Teles (among others) used modern mapping techniques to gain insight. The focus on race and cities, as well as urban informality, from the 1930s onward was heavily influenced by the US. American researchers went to the Brazilian *favelas* to better understand urban anthropology and sociology, so Brazil was crucial to the development of these fields.

A third factor to examine is the influence of immigrants and the children of

immigrants in US institutions. The cosmopolitanism of early anthropology transferred over into urban studies as the discipline emerged. This multidisciplinary field is empirical and inductive, sending researchers out into the world to build knowledge from the bottom up. She discussed Luis Bettencourt of the Mansueto Institute for Urban Innovation at the University of Chicago. He was trained as a theoretical physicist and housed in the ecology department, so his work and that of the institute were interdisciplinary from the start. One modern iteration of this interdisciplinary approach is this application of mathematical models of topology to access to urban resources such as access to health care, education, and sanitation. A big challenge in urban planning is how to keep people from having to travel far for access to such basic services, but creating streets without forcing evictions is difficult in places like Rio de Janeiro, where the alleys of the *favelas* are often twisty and unplanned. Many conflicts arise over how to regularize access to services with minimal disruption. Such mathematical modeling can help with this, generating maps that can be taken into community meetings to examine what options are available. Such interdisciplinary work is now being expanded to Cape Town and Mumbai in conjunction with Slum Dwellers International, which is an organization against forced removals and authoritarian urban planning.

Professor Fischer echoed Toqueville in highlighting how a foreigner can sometimes bring a fresh perspective on things that have become so normalized that they don't seem worth studying. In Brazil, urban racial and spatial inequality is usually studied by foreigners, or by people who studied in the US: perhaps such research is harder to dismiss or marginalize when a famous institution or foreigner is bringing it to the table. During the military dictatorship, the US was a safe haven for researchers from Brazil, and as Americans we have to take that role seriously. We must continue to be a safe space for researchers from threatened countries, and sometimes we need that kind of care ourselves: this is an important aspect of exchange. The US fosters university spaces in Brazil that are free and not-for-profit, and she is concerned for their future under the incoming regime. Education is not just for entrepreneurship. There must be a focus on free speech and knowledge production, and it must remain accessible to all sectors of the population.

Researchers make a real contribution to a country when they are really lucky. Otherwise, their best function is as translators of what is already being researched in Brazil, and serving as a bridge to bring that knowledge to the US. Although some argue that this is unnecessary since so much research gets published in English, there is still a great deal of social context that goes beyond literal translation. Intermediaries are still needed to explain the richer context of

ongoing debates. Universities in Brazil sometimes speak only to each other and not to the outside world, so researchers need to participate in order to widen these debates. She loves going to Brazil because of the high level of scholarship she finds there, which shows her how much she still needs to learn.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

An audience member asked the panel to reflect on ways in which collaboration is not always positive, citing an example of multiple teams “collaborating” on a paper but in practice only working together at the end of the process. How could researchers balance what is positive in both local and cosmopolitan networks? Professor Logan explained that social science researchers do not organize themselves around a project. There is a huge number of people active, but who are only sometimes influenced by each other. They are disconnected, usually only working together on a local level. This disjointedness is not what the discussion question would seem to anticipate. This insularity means that many researchers—such as sociologists, economists, and anthropologists—never read each others’ work. Some of these divisions are due to theoretical orientations. For example, some sociologists would never want to hear that the Chicago School had any positive influence at all. We must push for more cooperation and communication. Professor Fischer cautioned, however, that too much communication can lead

to paradigms generated in one place that do not apply in another. But, in the balance, now there is a place in which to conduct urban studies. This allows new categories to be created and to translate those ideas to a broader audience. When you support these initiatives locally, you gain the ability to contribute internationally. Usually such collaborations involve people of equal resources that end up talking to each other, so we much endeavor to make systems robust in all places.

Another question was posed concerning the future of Brazil given the governmental transition, when the government is usually what galvanizes academic research. Professor Fischer acknowledged the enormity of this present discussion. Will there be a repeal of affirmative action, or will limitations to equal access to education be enacted? The state agencies that are responsible for funding research influence what kinds of knowledge will be available and produced. Politics changes research agendas and funding. The US can play a role if this happens, which would be

similar to when the Ford Foundation stepped in to finance research on race in the 1970s. Professor Logan noted that when he first started working in China, the one-child policy was the main concern of sociology. Now its focus is more on income inequality and the marginalization of rural-urban migrants. These studies are cloaked in phrases such as “social harmony”. He noted that authoritarian regimes that want to last long-term can be good for progressive sociology. Fifteen years ago, it was difficult to talk about housing reform, but eventually he found a way to conduct that study that was acceptable to the government. He imagines something similar could happen in Brazil. There may be a way for researchers to study what they want without attacking the regime. Perhaps support from foreign foundations won’t even be necessary if there is a critical mass in US academics pushing for collaboration, although he admitted that his lack of knowledge about Bolsonaro might mean that his outlook is too optimistic.



When you support these initiatives locally, you gain the ability to contribute internationally.

SESSION 6: PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICINE

Saturday, December 1, 2018.
3:00-4:30 p.m.

Moderator: Albert Ko,
Department Chair and Professor of
Epidemiology (Microbial Diseases)
and of Medicine (Infectious
Diseases), Yale School of Public
Health.

Discussion Questions: With respect to public health and medicine, how to effectively study Brazil as a field of study? What impacts and challenges are there for the exchange of this knowledge developed between American and Brazilian universities?

Marcelo de Oliveira Dietrich,
Assistant Professor of Comparative
Medicine and of Neuroscience, Yale
School of Medicine

Professor Dietrich confessed to feeling like an outlier on this panel, and so he chose to discuss an updated version of what he presented at the May conference that pre-dated this one. He presented a small but energetic initiative in Brazil aimed at fostering biomedical research. He noted that the inequality gap in biomedical research is huge because of its expense. In countries like Brazil, it becomes difficult to keep up with the growth of the field. He

also noted that basic biomedical science is dominated by a system organized into highly hierarchical structures. A researcher's background (or pedigree) counts more than any other metric of scientific capability when it comes to obtaining the funding and opportunities that lead to discovery. The system is "winner takes all".

His hypothesis is that providing more opportunities at early stages in the careers of people from all kinds of backgrounds would lead to new kinds of scientific discoveries. He cautioned young scientists about working too closely with a famous professor: you will spend the rest of your career trying to sustain someone else's theories. If you break with this hierarchical structure you will have the freedom to think, but no one to fight for you.

He proposed an intervention similar to the talent scouting used by professional soccer teams and modeling agencies. With a robust talent scouting system, good "players" (read: scientists-in-training) would be rewarded, no matter their socioeconomic background. This kind of educational scouting should occur outside of the US and Europe, who currently dominate the field. With his "pet project", BioSCoP at UFRGS, he tries to acquire Brazilian funding for students to be trained in the biomedical sciences. He supposes that the impact of this project—which involves a personal financial risk on his part—will perhaps be seen forty years from now. It creates an environment

of scientific discussion and competitive science in Brazil, rather than removing the most talented students from there. He does, however, recognize the importance of training talented young Brazilians abroad. Although he has been doing this project for the past ten years, he feels his youth was an impediment to obtaining better resources until recently. BioSCoP at UFRGS invites junior faculty and post-docs to give talks so that younger researchers can connect with them. He showed a video clip from the conference, whose upcoming iteration had 150 people registered. This project also runs a blog with resources and an “incubator lab” in Brazil. About 20 students who have come through the lab have gone on to PhD programs, which showcases its effectiveness. The blog resolves issues about a lack of awareness of funding opportunities, as well as providing instructions about how to apply for grad schools and grants. There are currently six students at the incubator lab, with whom he holds weekly Skype meetings.

He lauded the CAPES-Yale Doctoral Scholars Program in the Biomedical Sciences, which helps 5-10 students per year pursue doctoral studies at Yale. CAPES is providing the financial support necessary to bring three times as many Brazilian students in than there had been in previous years. This program is continuous, high impact, and judged by Brazilian educational standards, which increases the diversity of the applicant

pool. However, he cautioned that such initiatives are always in danger because the funding sources in Brazil are drying up. He encouraged people to reach out to him if they know of potential funding solutions.

Marcia Castro, Professor of Demography, T. H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University.

Professor Castro began by explaining that much of the work in public health involves biomarkers, clinical trials, and experimental trials. Obtaining access to such trials is additionally difficult when researchers come from outside of the US. In order to do this kind of work well, it is crucial to get out of the Ivy League and into the field in order to truly understand the local situation. She stressed that dissertations in particular must be done in the field, particularly in order to understand a culture’s perception of risk and subsequent behaviors. One’s work will be useless or even harmful if its conclusions do not apply in the local context. Researchers must be humble: while they may know the science, the locals know the context. One must be quick to understand but slow to judge. One must go back in history in order to understand the root of public health problems. A lack of historical vision can result in, for example, papers studying malaria in 1955 and 2018 yet showing the same problems. She stressed service-learning, which should be adopted by all schools of public health. Such programs

benefit communities in addition to getting students on the ground. She lamented that Harvard needed to be doing more in this area. However, she did cite her institution's January three-week field intensive in Brazil, as well as a course structured to address problems on the ground. Harvard is just beginning to be concerned with such service-learning initiatives that give back to communities.

In the field of public health, real partnerships are imperative. Both Brazilian and American universities have to win in such collaborations, exchanging both faculty and students. She noted that a lack of real partnership can lead to ugly situations, as happened during the recent Zika outbreak. Some partnerships amounted to simply demanding samples from each other, which is not a real partnership. Thankfully, Brazil was able to produce most knowledge locally during the outbreak because it had the resources. This kind of capacity must be stimulated. Researchers in public health must know how to translate the results of their research into actions on the ground. It must reach communities and make their lives better, otherwise one is not doing good public health. Involving policy-makers is important so that they feel ownership over the proposed solutions and greater incentive to implement them.

Professor Castro described two major problems in this area. Financial barriers provide the biggest obstacle to collaboration. When a project is proposed,

a Harvard professor's first question is whether there is money to pay their salary. Without it, the collaboration dies. Working in Brazil requires commitment, a little bit of risk, and often working without money. Like planting a seed, some of these initiatives will sprout and some will not, but no beautiful tree is possible without planting the seed. She pointed out imbalances in the payment system between the US and Brazil. Another problem she described is the political context in both countries. Both nations are experiencing a lack of trust in science, and it becomes difficult to navigate the news and the government in order to prove that you are doing good science. Anyone in the US who is working on public health and climate change is currently in trouble, and it looks as if Brazil is headed that way. The COP conference that would have been held there was recently canceled. Bolsonaro has talked about withdrawing from the Paris Agreement as well. He has publicly proven himself misinformed on matters of health, like in a recent speech wherein he nonsensically blamed infant mortality on poor oral hygiene. These political situations force researchers to ask themselves how they wish to position their research and persons in this context. The time for research that leads to published papers is over; public engagement is crucial now, even when the audience is tough. The situation is similar to driving down the roads of the Amazon: they are unpaved and difficult, but they can be driven with persistence and determination.

Mitermeyer Reis, Researcher of Molecular Epidemiology and Immunopathogenesis of Parasitic and Genetic Infectious Diseases, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz).

When Professor Reis received the prompt question, he opened discussion with many of his colleagues at American universities. They cited a number of instances of cooperation between American and Brazilian universities. John David at Harvard discussed the three-week field course for graduate students mentioned by Professor Castro, as well as laboratories set up by Americans in Brazil and funded either by the NIH or privately. Lee Riley at UC Berkeley commented on the international course on molecular epidemiology that he has taught for 17 years, which has led to on-the-ground projects in Rio de Janeiro. Riley cautioned that sustaining funding is always a challenge. Mary Wilson from USC talked about the importance of opening databases and of diversity in the field, which leads to a rich landscape for research. Uriel Kitron at Emory discussed the importance of Science Without Borders and the Bolsa Sanduíche program which brought Brazilian doctoral students to study in the US. Warren Johnson at Cornell coordinated the Cornell in Bahia program, which has existed since 1964 and coordinates the exchange of both faculty and students. Ronald Blanton at Case Western pointed out that one of the

obstacles working against both nations' research are restrictions on the flow of information and material.

When he posed the question to his Brazilian colleagues, they found the condition of the field in Brazil to be similar to many other places. Brazil has a good research infrastructure and a qualified, diverse group of scientists at work. However, laboratory structures need to be improved in order to benefit the public health of Brazil and the world. Truly beneficial partnerships need to be created and maintained, and people must be trained to work on health matters both locally and globally.

Professor Reis discussed one successful case, centered around the work of this panel's moderator, Albert Ko. He spent fifteen years in Brazil while conducting his work, and he knew everyone at the hospital where he worked. His research focused on leptospirosis, a disease which had once been seen as rural, occupational or recreational but which had witnessed an urban outbreak thanks changing climate patterns. Many cases of leptospirosis were misdiagnosed as dengue. Ko first had to prove that leptospirosis was a problem in order to convince people to pay attention. Around 12,000 cases were reported per year, with a lethality of around 10%. These cases were spread throughout the country, most occurring in São Paulo. Many of the symptoms mirror other contagious diseases – such as fever,



The image of America as the hero is gone, at least in the field of public health in Brazil.

headache, and muscle pain— so it is important to look for leptospirosis in addition to dengue, yellow fever and zika. Since it is transmissible by rats, it is especially important to screen for it in areas such as the *favelas*. Fatality rises to over 70% if it spreads and becomes pulmonary hemorrhage syndrome. Ko had to pressure policymakers in order to get adequate equipment into hospitals to treat this outbreak. As a result, community-driven efforts to prevent the disease began to emerge. One group, Pau de Lima, received \$36 million in order to build a closed sewer system that would mitigate this problem.

Professor Reis also mentioned recent Zika studies and the Brazil-Yale program on urban slum health as successful instances of collaboration. He suggests that success be measured by the number of trainees doing research and obtaining positions of influence, as well as by the quantities of grants obtained, public actions enacted, patents granted, and publications written.

Albert Ko, Department Chair and Professor of Epidemiology (Microbial Diseases) and of Medicine (Infectious Diseases),

Yale School of Public Health

Professor Ko further explained that the project that brought him to Brazil from 1995-2010 was at first funded by Cornell and later by the Ministry of Health. He stressed the importance of Brazilian paradigms of public health research, particularly around HIV prevention, universal access to healthcare, and mass immunization campaigns. The Brazilian experience is unique due to this legal guarantee of social rights that includes a health care system. What researchers learned in Brazil is applicable to other places experiencing rapid urbanization, an aging population, climate changes, and so on. These findings can be applied to areas such as South Asia and Africa. He has been impressed by the aspirations of Brazilian researchers. Zika research, for example, was led by a team of Brazilian researchers. They are global leaders on the social determinants of health. They are leaders in the production of vaccines (thanks to the Instituto Butantã and others) as well as in training (for example, of scientists from Mozambique and Angola). Much of the excitement that comes from working in the field comes from learning these new paradigms.

However, as Professor Ko explained, the cup is half empty rather than half full. We can still do more, and perhaps we can be more responsive to the aspirations of Brazilians and grad students. If reflexive work is being done in other countries, such as China, why can't it be done in Brazil as well? The ambiguity of the US' role in Brazilian institutions is growing. In Brazil, much blame for failures seems to be assigned to a lack of vision. Many programs that emerge are organic, but one-off or fragmented. A lack of vision prevents them from unifying with institutional support. We are losing out on the potential impact of collaborative research because of this. An economy of scale and critical mass are crucial issues. There is no business model in place to effect a long-term, sustained impact. It is time to make new paradigms.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

An audience member began by expressing skepticism over top-down approaches to global and public health. They accused American global health initiatives of being ethnocentric, failing to teach students to treat locals as experts and to learn from communities. This top-down savior complex was posited as a reason that many global health programs do not have the success expected of them. Professor Castro agreed that there are many bad examples of such initiatives, although they are not always bad. Some horrible programs seem more like a field trip or poverty tourism, and little interaction with the locals is to be had. She finds the *favela* tourism in

Rio particularly disgusting. Global health is a sexy term that everyone wants to be associated with, although its definition differs and no single one is correct. The best examples engage local populations and give something back, because without these elements the programs are mere tourism. In order to do the right thing, the right leaders with the right kinds of commitment are needed. Professor Ko noted that any of these problems are grounded in our perception of the other. The image of America as the hero is gone, at least in the field of public health in Brazil. Students must be prepared for the kinds of on-the-ground experiences that await them. One defect at Yale is that students' language preparation is often inadequate. How is one supposed to interact with speaking the local language? While the Yale program has a language requirement, no courses are offered by the department, so how are these language skills supposed to be acquired?

Professor Castro discussed another serious limitation: governments that approve any funded projects that are proposed, even when the project will likely be ineffectual. Professor Ko lauded Professor Dietrich's incubator program in Brazil as the type of initiative that is part of the solution to these problems in the field. In response, Professor Dietrich lamented that most universities lack the kind of vision necessary to keep these sorts of projects alive. Many are more invested in briefly expanding their empire or influence than in building long-term solutions and partnerships. Political incompetence,

particularly lack of management skills or experience, is another limitation. Persistence is needed to find the right allies with vision among policy-makers. One must maneuver in such a way subsequent officials cannot take away the advances already made. Brazil as a country suffers from scattered investments and unsustainable initiatives, and its universities are no exception.

The audience asked Professor Dietrich to elaborate on the incubator lab initiative's outcomes so far. Professor Dietrich explained that the initiative is small compared to many of the projects that the panel had discussed. The type of research he does is expensive, although they do manage to implement some cost-saving measures. Buying computers and training students in bioinformatics and computer science has been important. One problem with doing the kind of work he does on animals often proves prohibitively expensive at Yale, so he partners with institutions in China to breed the animals and send them to Brazil. Some of his students are helping with this work at a very high level. Although this work is difficult, it is not impossible and he feels it is important to set an example. He suggested greater institutional investment in Latin America, such as a Yale campus in Brazil. Professor Ko urged American and Brazilian universities to co-finance truly joint professorships, building a robust model for financing these kinds of exchanges.

An audience member inquired about the increase in healthcare costs and incidence of chronic disease in Brazil, conjecturing that those may be due to increased use of farm chemicals. Professor Castro explained that Brazil has a universal health system (SUS) with good primary care program, which has reduced avoidable hospitalizations and mortality. Brazil has also reduced the cost of certain common medicines, and made others available for free to the public. The incidence of disease is actually not getting worse at this time. However, these programs just took major budget cuts, resulting in care changes such as Cuban doctors leaving Brazil. Without the same access to primary care and to these pharmaceutical drugs, the incidence of disease will surely increase. Professor Reis added that certain diseases are on the rise as a result of demographic transition, most notably increased life expectancy. Big cities have seen an increase in violence and the incidence of infectious diseases, and this will be a major challenge in the future. However, he praised SUS' efforts and expressed hope that the problem does not continue to grow exponentially. Professor Ko observed that healthcare costs in Brazil are going to explode since the population is rapidly aging: the population over 60 is going to triple in the near future. The major problems at this time are epidemiological and structural rather than environmental (due to pesticides).

Professor Ko concluded by asking the panel what the next steps should be after this meeting. Professor Reis asserted that pragmatic steps to address the problems of megacities should be priority. Antibiotic resistance and cancer (particularly the forms associated with infectious diseases) should also be given immediate attention. Professor Castro urged professionals in this field to be determined, passionate, and willing to put themselves out there and confront unsympathetic audiences. Professor Dietrich spoke on the importance of teaching people to find their own passion. In the field of medicine, it is important to map out the successful projects that are already in place, in order to learn from their example and invest in what is working. We can also alter the university funding system so that the investigator becomes a commodity. Such a step would be innovative, and would require vision and a willingness to take risk in order to implement. Professor Ko suggested that the quantitative methods used in their research be applied to the implementation of successful programs. He urged the Ministry of Education to do this work so that the evidence of successful experiences does not remain anecdotal.

CLOSING REMARKS

CLOSING REMARKS

Ambassador Fernando de Mello Barreto

As Consul-General of Brazil in Connecticut and Rhode Island, I am very thankful to Yale University and Fundação Getúlio Vargas for having organized the seminar entitled *Road Ahead – Brazilian Studies in the United States*.

I am particularly grateful to Professors Kenneth David Jackson and Stuart Schwartz for their efforts in organizing the event together with Claudia Valeggia and many other faculty and staff members. The professors from other US universities who attended the seminar also deserve our special gratitude for having come to New Haven to make presentations on their respective areas of expertise.

In only one a half day, the seminar provided a large amount of very interesting information for those who have had the privilege of attending it. One after another, professors, researchers and experts have conveyed innovative ideas and stimulating concepts. They shared experiences and provoked thoughts about numerous possibilities of cooperation between Brazil and the United States.

Many expressed their views with passion and good will about how to further connect the academic world of both countries. In doing so, they have used different words to manifest those possibilities, such as cooperation, collaboration, partnership, exchange, connectivity and comparison. They made clear the significant role that academics and institutions can play in promoting cultural exchanges, fostering research of mutual interest and helping people to unite efforts, spread knowledge and improve the quality of life in Brazil and in the US.

Professors of language, demonstrated the relevance of surpassing the language barriers as translations can be very difficult and misleading. Environmentalists have stressed the relevance of the Amazon region for the countries who share it, but also to the world in general. Professors of law have given examples of legal practices that have been borrowed in areas such as the fight against corruption. Historians have fascinated us about the increasing possibilities of further research thanks to the digitalization of documents that is permitting researchers to speed analyses from their respective countries, that is, without having to travel to visit libraries. Experts on Brazilian literature have stressed areas of comparisons that can be of mutual interest in view of both countries past in the Americas.

These discussions were possible because Brazil and the US share democratic values. Professors from both countries could freely discuss all issues, including Brazilian challenges in areas such as education (literacy), health (such as the Zika virus), urbanization (slums) and the preservation of the environment (particularly in the Amazon region). Comparisons are good, sharing experiences and successful solutions as well. As democratic countries, there are no political constraints to engage in such discussions. It is gratifying that people from the academic world can discuss ideas. They might not agree but they can freely propose their ideas and criticisms. This debate was possible because, both in Brazil and the US, there is freedom of press, independence of the judiciary and respect for the rule of law.

Personally, it has been very pleasant to me to have had this opportunity of having Brazil discussed here. It provided the consulate a unique opportunity to promote cultural interactions. Yale provided this excellent opportunity to discuss many challenges Brazil faces at the moment. Scholars of good will brought attention to those issues with a view to offering genuine academic cooperation. This initiative deserves appreciation and support. I hope it will continue in the years to come because promoting culture, trade and investments are perennial efforts to be kept alive and well among countries that have much in common to share.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

HOW DO STUDIES ABOUT BRAZIL AND THE EXCHANGE OF KNOWLEDGE WITH BRAZILIAN UNIVERSITIES CONTRIBUTE TO OUR THINKING ABOUT CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN U.S. ACADEMIES? A UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA PERSPECTIVE.

Bette A. Loiselle^{1,2}, Emilio M. Bruna^{1,2}, Robert Buschbacher^{1,3} and Simone Athayde¹.

¹Center for Latin American Studies, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

²Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

³School of Forest Resources and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

To the point, the exchange of knowledge and collaboration with Brazilian universities and other partners have transformed the way we think about conservation and development and our approaches to research, training and dissemination of results. The Tropical Conservation and Development (TCD) program is an interdisciplinary graduate program that connects University of Florida (UF) faculty, and students from across 28 departments across

campus, and together works with alumni, universities and other partners in many countries across the globe. Our connections with Brazil are especially strong, reflecting the roots of the TCD program and the long history of UF's interactions and focus on Brazil. In addition, partnerships with Brazil are a priority of the State of Florida, as Brazil is Florida's largest international trading partner (www.floridabrazil.org). At UF, Portuguese was first taught in the summer of 1914, and has been regularly taught on campus since 1939, contributing to UF's capacity to work with our Brazilian collaborators. Indeed, UF has arguably the largest number of researchers working in Brazil with MOU's with >40 Brazilian universities, NGOs, and government agencies. More than 100 Master's and PhD students from Brazil are currently enrolled in UF graduate programs, and UF hosts a large number of Brazilian graduate students for semester-long visits.

For the TCD program at UF, our connections to conservation and development issues in Brazil were initially catalyzed by the arrival of the preeminent scholar, Dr. Charles Wagley, to UF in 1971 (Schmink 2014). Well known for his work with communities in the Brazilian Amazon (e.g., Wagley 1953, 1974), the approaches Wagley began in the 1970's, such as providing field research seed grants for faculty and students, inviting visiting scholars from Brazil, establishing research

collaborations with colleagues in Brazil, training next generation of Amazon researchers, professors, and practitioners, are still key components of the program today. The strategies and mechanisms we adopted early on for collaboration include:

- 1) formal agreements that set out responsibilities of collaborating partners and individuals;
- 2) two-way exchanges, including facilitating south-south exchanges,
- 3) training courses co-taught with partners and targeted to local institutions (e.g., conflict management, community resource management, environmental governance);
- 4) collaborative applied research involving UF faculty and students partnering with local organization and universities; and
- 5) joint publications intended not only for scholarly journals, but also practical manuals.

TCD faculty and students recognize that working collaboratively with Brazilian scientists and partners has added significant value to our teaching and research programs. In particular, in-country collaborators bring local understanding of complex issues related to conservation and development, including knowledge of and access to relevant stakeholders, and key insights and lessons learned from past experiences. In addition

to advantages of being able to better identify and address relevant and timely issues, publishing with international colleagues has been shown to result in articles being published in journals with higher impact factors and have greater number of citations relative to other articles published in same journal and year (Smith et al. 2014).

Developing effective collaborations within international research teams or between institutions, however, requires considerable investment in time, energy, and resources. Building trust and learning how to work across institutions, disciplines, and often with diverse set of actors addressing issues that frequently are characterized by conflict (e.g., natural resource governance) is truly a long-term team effort. Further, such collaborative projects also can be expected to evolve over time as they respond to changing conditions that include dynamics and interests of both individuals/institutions involved and the nature of the problems being addressed.

The Amazon Conservation Leadership Initiative (ACLI) at UF exemplifies the long-term alliance between UF, Brazilian universities and NGO partners that has evolved over time and responded to identified needs and issues raised by participatory research and capacity building activities on the ground (Fig. 1). Building on collaborations that began in the 1980's with Amazonian universities, UF developed and was

awarded an interdisciplinary training grant from National Science Foundation focused on “Working Forests in the Tropics”. To complement training of US graduate students, TCD program received a grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to strengthen Amazon universities in Peru and in Mato Grosso and Acre in Brazil. The ACLI collaborative research and capacity building activities resulted in ~25 graduate degrees, >30 short- to long-term visits by professionals to UF, collaborative field research and joint field courses that brought students, faculty, and conservation/development practitioners together. Importantly this led to development of collaborative learning networks that addressed key topics, such as collaboration, stakeholder engagement, resilience, natural resource governance, gender, family agriculture, infrastructure development, among others. Finding ways to work together including innovating how courses were developed and taught, mechanisms to remain engaged, recruiting and developing opportunities for professional development, placing UF graduate students with University or NGO partners to conduct thesis or dissertation research, and at all times being able to be flexible or adapt to changing conditions and better ensure desired outcomes. Bringing individuals together from across institutions in Brazil with UF students and faculty led to three offshoots of the ACLI program, which are still active today

– the Resilient Family Agriculture program, the RECAM network which focuses on municipal governance in the Amazon, and the Amazon Dams Network. The ACLI program and these newer offshoots all incorporate the strategies and mechanisms outlined above to establish and maintain effective collaborations.

To highlight one, the Amazon Dams Network/Rede Barragens Amazônicas (ADN-RBA) (www.amazondamsnetwork.org) emerged as a collaboration between UF, US Geological Survey, and Brazilian universities, with a focus on building capacity for advancing research and adaptive management of socio-ecological impacts of hydroelectric dam construction across the Amazon. The roots of the ADN-RBA can be traced to a 2009 field course in Alta Floresta, Mato Grosso, where individuals discovered a shared research interest and need to address the emergence of rapidly increasing plans for hydroelectric infrastructure development that has potential to significantly alter natural resources and existing use of those resources (Fig. 2). Over the first years of exchange, the group met to discussed shared interests (e.g., Universidade Federal do Tocantins Professor Elineide Marques noted “what unites us in water...” at a UF meeting in 2010), understand existing and needed capacities, exchange knowledge and learn from each other via exchange visits, virtual meetings,

and webinars. These first efforts which relied on relatively little funding enabled the team to establish build personal and professional relationships which facilitated development of action plans, formal agreements, proposals to fund collaborative projects, workshops, and eventually, establish inter- and transdisciplinary thematic working groups to advance the project goals and products. Brazilian universities leading the effort with UF are Universidade Federal do Tocantins, and Universidade Federal de Rondônia; other key Brazilian researchers include scientists from Universidade do Estado de Mato Grosso, Universidade Federal do Pará, Universidade de São Paulo, and Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia.

At UF's TCD program, we were inspired more than 40 years ago by Charles Wagley's "interdisciplinary courage" and commitment to international collaborations (Schmink 2014). Components of his South America program are still present in TCD today, but have been adapted and innovated over the years (Kainer et al. 2006, Duchelle et al. 2009). In summary, working with our Brazilian university and NGO partners has been integral to the success of the TCD program as it has helped us to reflect and identify what skills are needed to effectively address complex conservation and development issues, generate more locally relevant research in collaboration with in-country partners, and build lasting collaborative learning networks that have

transformed our approaches to research, training and dissemination of results.

Kainer, K., M. Schmink, H. Covert, J. R. Stepp, E. Bruna, J. Dain, S. Espinosa, and S. Humphries. 2006. A Graduate Education Framework for Tropical Conservation and Development. *Conservation Biology* 20:3–13.

Duchelle, A. E, K. Biedenweg, C. Lucas, A. Virapongse, J. Radachowsky, D. J. Wojcik, M. Londres, W. L. Bartels, D. Alvira and K. A. Kainer. 2009. Graduate students and knowledge exchange with local stakeholders: Possibilities and preparation. *Biotropica* 41:578–585.

Schmink, M. 2014. Charles Wagley's legacy of interdisciplinary graduate research and training programs at the University of Florida. *Bol. Mus. Para. Emílio Goeldi Cienc. Hum.*, Bel- 9:661-674.

Smith, M. J., C. Weinberger, E. M. Bruna, and S. Allesina. 2014. The scientific impact of nations: journal placement and citation performance. *PLoS ONE* 9(10): e109195.

Wagley, C. 1953. *Amazon town: a study of man in the tropics*. Macmillan, New York.

Wagley, C. (Ed.). 1974. *Man in the Amazon*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, FL.



COMO TUDO COMEÇOU - LINHA DO TEMPO HOW IT ALL BEGAN – TIMELINE



Figure 2. Timeline describing the origins of the Amazon Dams Program, an international collaboration connecting University of Florida to Brazilian universities, among others. For more about the program visit: www.amazondamsnetwork.org

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF BRAZIL AND ITS CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONCEPTUALIZING BIOMES

Suzanne Oakdale
University of New Mexico

Anthropological research in Brazil contributes to the conceptualization of biomes in that it has called into question the boundaries between the categories of “nature” and “humanity.” A biome is understood to be a domain of nature with characteristic flora, fauna, soil, altitude, and tendencies toward natural fire (Cutinho 2006:14). A wide variety of research in Brazil speaks to the question of if we should be thinking of the biome as exclusively a “natural” space. Archeology, research with contemporary peoples based in historical ecology, social anthropology following Eduardo Viveiros de Castro of the Museu Nacional called perspectivism, as well as critiques of perspectivism all complicate our understanding of “nature” vs. “human.” These bodies of research and the dialogue they have engendered with respect to these categories point to many ways that Amazonian peoples are and can be integral to the protection of Brazilian biomes. I will review the contributions of each of these approaches with this as a goal in mind.

Archeology

Archeological research in Brazil has been key for showing how the natural and the human are entangled. Rather than being categorized simply as either “wild” or “wrecked,” forests and *cerrados* are coming to be seen “rooted in and contingent on human actions and social configurations of the past” to quote Susanna Hecht *et al.* (Hecht *et al.* 2014:5-6). This complex relationship between humans and nature is seen with respect to the composition of soils, rivers, flora and fauna. Beginning ca. 4000 years ago, Amazonians started to manage forests – in many places Brazil nut tree stands were encouraged and single species forests of *açaí* palm created (Clement *et al.* 2015:3). At one site (The Central Amazon Project), adjacent to the juncture of the Negro and Solimões Rivers, Eduardo Neves and James Peterson (2006) have shown that over the course of long-term occupation during the first millennium AD, vast amounts of fertile ADE or Amazonian Dark Earth were formed from the acidic yellow soil by humans. Mound building and cultivation methods also created a forest mosaic of secondary growth surrounded by larger areas of high forest (2006: 300).

The Upper Xingu is another key locale for showing the long-term development of landscapes by indigenous peoples. Long seen as pristine and protected by a reserve since the mid twentieth century, areas around the headwaters of the Xingu River are covered with sites where there were

once nodes of high population, house clusters built around central plazas, each node connected by roads to form a lattice like structure. This formation reached its height in the first half of the second millennium (Heckenberger *et al.* 2003:1711). The land between these nodes was carefully managed, with weirs, ponds, causeways, fields of *sapé* grass for thatch, and *piqui* tree groves (Heckenberger *et al.* 2003:1711, 1713).

Research with Contemporary Peoples

Research with contemporary Amazonians shows that forest management and knowledge continues. In central Brazil, the Kayapo's practice of continual low-level burning favors *inajá* and *tucumá* palms and is linked to the formation of dark earth (Hecht 2003; Posey 2002). William Balée (1994; 2013) has found the Ka'apor of eastern Brazil create a new kind of old growth forest which enhances species diversity. Upper Xinguanos who have used fire as a tool for landscape management and have monitored rainfall for their agricultural cycles for thousands of years, have a wealth of knowledge passed between generations about current changes in rainfall and conditions now leading to uncontrollable fire (Schwartzman *et al.* 2012:6). This sort of knowledge is useful both for sustainable management and the documentation of changes in biomes.

It is also a resource that garners international support and income. The

Ka'apor, for example, initiated a project in 2009 (Jande Myra Taka'a Rupi Ha, Our Trees of the High Forest) funded by the World Wildlife Foundation and Rio's Museu do Índio to support the transmission of their forest knowledge. This program has also been influential in fighting logging (Maffi and Woodley 2010:120). In the Xingu, the Associação Rede de Sementes do Xingu with the help of the Instituto Socioambiental has been enlisting Xinguanos since 2007 to gather native seeds to sell for the replanting of other deforested areas (Rede 2017).

Perspectivism

The other body of work that has problematized the boundaries between nature and culture is that of Eduardo Viveiros de Castro and his students, called perspectivism. Based on his fieldwork with the Araweté, his mastery of lowland ethnographies as well as his dialogue with philosophy (Deleuze) and structuralism, Viveiros de Castro has put forth a general characterization of Amazonian thought which has been extremely influential. According to him (2014), in contrast to "Western thought," "Amerindian thought" is guided by "multinaturalism" -- a mode that apprehends humans and animals to be united by their common humanity, but understands them to have different perspectives because they possess different types of bodies. In contrast, "naturalism" characterizes Western

thought. This mode is founded on seeing a shared biological nature between all living things, but a division between nature and culture, culture being the force that separates humans from animals. Agency and creativity belong to humans in contrast to the more passive nature. With the aim of “decolonizing thought,” multinaturalism and naturalism are not simply taken as characteristic of different cultural perspectives on a shared world, but rather as entirely different realities or ontologies.

With respect to the Kawaiwete, a people who have relocated to the Xingu, multinaturalism characterizes well the domains of myth and shamanism. Deep in the forest and underwater live vestiges of beings that populated the earth in mythic times, before humans and animals divaricated. These ancient and powerful beings watch over the regular animals who are considered to be their children. These beings take human souls in revenge for animals killed in the hunt. The souls of the sick, the dead, and the unborn are also kept by them until shamans can negotiate their return to the human world (Oakdale 2005). Aspects of what we would call part of “the natural” environment are always en route to becoming transformed into the human and vice versa. Animals are also non-human subjectivities and moral codes guide engagement with them. This sort of ontology “causes the human condition to cease being ‘special’ and to become instead the default mode or generic condition of any species. The domain of nature ... in

essence disappears” (Viveiros de Castro 2013:3).

Critics (Ramos 2012; Turner 2009) observe that perspectivism leads to the portrayal of distinctive indigenous traditions in terms that are basically an essentialized alter-image of “the West.” As perspectivism has inspired field research in other parts of the non-western world where similar “kinds of thought” have been identified (Brightman *et al.* 2012, among many others), it leads perhaps to an essentialized “global indigenous thought.” Multinaturalism has however become a position from which the problems of capitalist development can be addressed (Danowski and Viveiros de Castro 2017), (see Lagrou 2018 on this point). Because of its elegant formulation and its grounding in myth rather than historical complexity, perspectivism offers a vision of a different kind of world that is possible in the future beyond that of our current world system (see Bessire and Bond 2014). As such, it has the potential to galvanize support in industrialized nations for indigenous peoples and their environments. Shamans working through translators like Davi Kopenawa Yanomami have become compelling spokespersons far beyond Amazonia for this other way to live (Kopenawa and Albert 2013). With respect to its usefulness in movements such as environmentalism, its “*prêt-à-porter*” nature, to quote Ramos, is perhaps an asset as is its futurist orientation. With respect to protecting biomes, perspectivism offers a vision of both an

indigenous world and an ideal future where there is no category of the human differentiated from nature and therefore no human domination of nature.

The problem with this, as Lucas Bessire and David Bond (2014) point out is that this multinaturalist world entirely cut off from “the West” does not exist save perhaps in myth or as they point out, the vague future. Moreover, this leads to an artificial and dangerous perception that Amazonians live in separate realities when in fact they are entangled in the material problems we all share such as the effects of fossil fuels, tailings from mines, poisons such as DDT or mercury, etc. Perspectivism, they caution, may also lead to a discounting and non-recognition of indigenous peoples, the vast majority, who are not fully cut off from a “Western” reality. They suggest instead to look at peoples’ actual working relations with the natural world. With respect to the Kawaiwete, I have written about a shaman’s involvement in the midcentury state project called the “March to the West.” This particular shaman, named Prepori, both worked with the Brazilian air force, ground-truthing across central Brazil to establish new landing strips in the 1940s at the same time as he communicated with the “True Animals” and spirits of the sky so that these teams could have game as they worked and their airplanes would not be taken down by heavy winds (Oakdale 2018). He did this, he said, to bring Kawaiwete

the better medical treatment that air travel allowed. Finding how indigenous alterity is entangled and enmeshed with goals and projects shared across ethnic boundaries, provides a more realistic template for how conservation (or development, sustainable or otherwise) projects involving indigenous peoples have worked and can work in the future.

One current project sponsored by the Instituto Socioambiental is the production of organic honey from the European *Apis Mellifera* bee. This honey is produced in the Xingu and sold to grocery stores for a profit. While Kawaiwete had experience with native stingless bees and gathering their honey, the art of bee keeping was new. According to Simone Athayde, this venture has led to the documentation of Kawaiwete observations of the interactions of native and European bees and the monitoring of forest blooms (Athayde et. al. 2016). It has also led to the discovery by of a new spirit, Maruari, that controls and watches over this European bee (ibid.).

In conclusion, all of this research contributes to shifting our conceptualization of biomes and can work toward their protection. Archeology and cultural ecology produce fine-grained understandings of humans’ roles in particular contexts and their historical trajectories. Perspectivism, providing compelling, even if abstract, philosophical positions, can be used

as a platform to fight environmental destruction. Critiques of perspectivism document the way environmental protection (or degradation) happen in more historically specific ways, across interethnic divides and conceptual worlds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Athayde, Simone, John Richard Stepp, and Wemerson C. Ballester. 2016. Engaging indigenous and academic knowledge on bees in the Amazon: Implications for environmental management and transdisciplinary research. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* 12(26):1-19. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4915142/pdf/13002_2016_Article_93.pdf. Accessed on November 25, 2018.

Balée, William. 1994. *Footprints of the Forest: Ka'apor Ethnobotany—The Historical Ecology of Plant Utilization by an Amazonian People*; Columbia University Press: New York.

_____. 2013. *Cultural Forests of the Amazon: Historical Ecology of People and their Landscapes*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Bessire, Lucas and David Bond. 2014. Ontological anthropology and the deferral of critique. *American Ethnologist* 41(3):440-456.

Brightman, Marc, Vanessa Grotti and Olga Ulturgasheva, eds. 2012. *Animism in Rainforest and Tundra: Personhood, Animals, Plants and Things in Contemporary Amazonia and Siberia*. New York: Berghahn.

Coutinho, Leopoldo Magno. 2006. O conceito de bioma. *Acta Botanica Brasilica*. 20(1): 13-23.

Clement, Charles R., William M. Denevan, Michael Heckenberger, André Braga Junqueira, Eduardo G. Neves, Wenceslau G. Teixeira and William I. Woods. 2015. The domestication of Amazonia before European conquest. *Royal Society Proceedings B*. Downloaded from <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/on>. Accessed on November 15, 2018.

Danowski, Déborah and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro. 2017. *The Ends of the World*, Rodrigo Nines, trans. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heckenberger, Michael J., Afukaka Kuikuro, Urisspá Tabata Kuikuro, J. Christian Russel, Morgan Schmidt, Carlos Fausto and Bruna Franchetto. 2003. Amazonia 1492: Pristine Forest or Cultural Parkland. *Science, New Series*. Vol 301. No 5640 (Sept. 19, 2003): 1710-1714.

Hecht, Susanna. 2003. Indigenous soil management and the creation of Amazonian dark earths: Implications of Kayapó practices. In *Amazonian dark earths: Origin, properties, management*. J Lehmann, D.C. Kern, B. Glaser, WI Woods eds. Pp.355-372. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Hecht, Susanna B., Kathleen Morrison and Christine Padoch. 2014. From Fragmentation to Forest Resurgence: Paradigms, Representations, and Practices. In *The Social Lives of Forests*. Susanna B. Hecht, Kathleen Morrison and Christine Padoch eds., pp 1-8. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kopenawa, Davi and Bruce Albert. 2013. *The Falling Sky*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Lagrou, Els. 2018. Copernicus in the Amazon: Ontological Turnings from the Perspective of Amerindian Ethnologies. *Social Anthropology* 8(1):133-167.

Maffi, Louisa and Ellen Woodley. 2010. *Biocultural Diversity Conservation: A Global Sourcebook*. Earthscan from Routledge: New York.

Neves, Eduardo G. and James Petersen. 2006. Political Economy and Pre-Columbian Landscape Transformations in Central Amazonia. In *Time and Complexity in Historical Ecology: Studies in the Neotropical Lowlands*. William Balée and Clark Erickson, eds, pp. 279-309. New York: Columbia University Press.

Oakdale, Suzanne. 2005. *I Foresee My Life*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

_____. 2018. Brazil's "March to the West:" Memories of an Indigenous Shaman and other "Moderns." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 74(1):54-73.

Posey, D. 2002. *Kayapo Ethnoecology and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ramos, Alcida. 2012. The Politics of Perspectivism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:481-494.

Rede de Sementes do Xingu completa dez anos de história 2017. <https://www.socioambiental.org/pt-br/noticias-socioambientais/rede-de-sementes-do-tingu-completa-dez-anos-de-historia>. Accessed on November 24, 2018.

Schwartzman, Stephan, André Villas Boas, Katia Yukari Ono, Marisa Gesteira Fonseca, Juan Doblaz, Barbara Zimmerman, Paulo Junqueira, Adriano Jerolimski, Marcelo Salazar, Rodrigo Prates Junqueira, and Maurício Torres. 2013. The Natural and Social History of the Indigenous Lands and Protected Areas Corridor of the Xingu River Basin. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0164>. Accessed on November 24, 2018.

Turner, Terence. 2009. The Crisis of Late Structuralism. Perspectivism and Animism: Rethinking Culture, Nature, Spirit, and Bodiliness. *Tipiti* 7(1). doi: <http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/tipiti/vol7/iss1/1>. Accessed on November 24, 2018.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2014. *Cannibal Metaphysics. For a post-structural anthropology*. Minneapolis: Univocal.

_____. 2013. The notion of Species in History and Anthropology. *Hemispheric Institute E-Misférica* vol. 10(1). <http://hemisphericinstitute.org/hemi/en/e-misferica-101/viveiros-de-castro>. Accessed on November 25, 2018.

HOW THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BUILT AN INTELLECTUAL AND PRACTICAL IDEOLOGY OF REGULATION THAT BRAZIL NEEDS TO DO

Sérgio Guerra
FGV Law School

The 1891 Constitution was modeled upon that of the United States, institutionalized Brazilian federalism and the separation of powers. So, the method of comparative research between the Brazilian and North-American institutional and legal systems was - and still is - relevant in Brazilian constitutional matters. There are studies on the federation, on the separation of powers, on the presidential system, and on the checks and balances system. Indeed, cases tried by the U.S. Supreme Court are customarily relied upon by the Brazilian Supreme Court as the basis for their arguments.

The same is happening in administrative law. Considering the Brazilian agency model is close and was influenced by the system of independent regulatory agencies of the United States of America, it is appropriate to conduct legal research from a comparative perspective.

Having gone through several phases during its history, the long-lived

American agency model is very rich, containing elements that could contribute to the clearing up of certain misunderstandings about the Brazilian regulatory standard. In early twenty century, the progressive movement in the USA raised the agency model against the chaotic scenario revolving around the government at the end of the nineteenth century. The movement spread through the middle class located in urban areas, shocked by the corruption and fraud in the political field. The solution to these problems was to create agencies to control certain industrial activities that should be decided by experts, rationally and free from partisan pressures, in the format known as spoil system.

Considering the impact of agency decisions on the lives of citizens and businesses, a statute was enacted in 1946 to proceduralize their actions, bring transparency, and guarantee fundamental rights. The Administrative Procedure Act was enacted to guide the operation of the agencies, detailing the mechanisms of action. Indeed, the APA provides guidelines for the issuing of regulatory standards, hearings and society participation, judgment of individual cases and, in addition, parameters for the judicial control of the acts of the agencies by the courts (judicial review). The APA is the true “constitution” of administrative law at the federal level.

The actions of an agency must comply with the details contained in its law of creation. When there is a dispute about its actions, courts examine the data in accordance with appeal standards established by the law that granted powers to the agency, generally keeping the regulatory choice due to what is informally known as the principle of deference. Most of the laws of creation of agencies have vague and open terms (that the doctrine

model agencies favor the occupation of positions by experts, public participation, transparency in procedures and decisions and with a procedural safeguards system similar to the jurisdictional model.

Brazil is living a tough moment shocked by a systemic corruption and fraud in the political field and is going to have a new President (Jair Bolsonaro), promising a huge privatization program. So, like what



It is important to stress that the Brazilian bureaucracy, even with the advent of regulatory agencies, is still different from the U.S. bureaucratic system in terms of governability and governance structures.

call “intelligible principle”), allowing the agency flexibility and even discretion to create its own rules and procedures.

With this background, despite some opponents, the U.S. regulation model has been kept since the nineteenth century to the present day with the support of the Supreme Court. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court validated tenure and the delegation of powers and recognized the legality in the accumulation of quasi-legislative, quasi-executive and quasi-judicial functions. Presently, the U.S.

happened in the new deal reforms, this issue is very important to the social and economic development of the country.

The Brazilian agency model is a (partial) reproduction of an existing standard in the United States of America. The Master Plan of the State Governance Reform in 1995 brought a new model of independent regulatory agencies in order to restructure Public Administration. It was implemented at a time of the restructuring of the state’s way of intervening in the economy during the administration of

former president Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Mr. Cardoso led a huge privatization program. At that stage, the creation of regulatory agencies was paramount. First, to attract private capital (especially foreign). Second, to deal with technical issues for decentralizing the executive power.

The goal was lending some predictability and making the agency less susceptible to conflicts and political interests typical of the routines of the Brazilian's Congress. Bringing novelty to both Brazilian constitutional and administrative law, independent regulatory agencies were created under a special autarchy nature: headed by a collegiate body; granting tenure for its commissioners; administrative autonomy; quasi-executive, quasi-legislative, and quasi-judicial functions. Right now, Brazil has independent regulatory commissions in relevant industrial sectors like oil and gas industry; electric power; health care; transportation; and telecom.

The introduction of regulatory agencies brought some legal controversies in Brazil. First, the offense to the principle of the separation of powers. Second, the delegation of power from the legislative branch to unelected commissioners. Third, the violation of the principle of unitary executive. Fourth, the lack of legitimacy of the commissioners of independent agencies holding fixed terms. Looking toward

the constitutionality of the Brazilian model, in two cases the Supreme Court validated the tenure system, the normative functions (with mention to the so called "intelligible principles"), and the decision-making autonomy.

It is important to stress that the Brazilian bureaucracy, even with the advent of regulatory agencies, is still different from the U.S. bureaucratic system in terms of governability and governance structures. However, there is no doubt that part of the institutional design, granting tenure to the agency commissioners and decision-making autonomy was influenced by the American model. Indeed, because of these factors, analyses should be produced about what happened and has been happening in the North American model, in the various stages along its over one hundred and fifty years of history. Some matters related to the American system of regulatory agencies can contribute to the development of Brazilian agencies and not only in regards to the administrative law. It would be helpful to further research in several areas. Thus, the studies could contribute to debates on the Brazilian regulatory standard, aiming to improve or to identify potential measures to be investigated in greater deepness.

In conclusion, for Brazilian academy the goal is doing research to contribute to the effective construction of a new Brazilian regulatory state in a moment

the country needs to have strong
bureaucracy to avoid systemic corruption
and for fostering the social and economic
development.

THE STUDY OF BRAZILIAN LAW AND POLITICS IN THE UNITED STATES

A Search for The Open Road
Fabio de Sa e Silva^{1*}
University of Oklahoma

This chapter proceeds from a conference panel that asked, “How does the foreign view [coming from] the North-American academy contribute to the development of research on Brazilian politics and institutions in both countries?”

Posed as such, the question is clearly meant to invite prospective and creative thinking. To many of us, however, it only raises more questions. For example, is there a unified *foreign view* coming from the North-American academy, or is there a myriad of views, with some hegemonizing over others? Moreover, what counts as *research*? If an early career professor with limited Portuguese spends a semester of fieldwork interacting with Brazilian elites to write his next book, may he or she contribute to the development of research on Brazilian politics and institutions? Finally, what counts as *politics and institutions*? Is that a reference to mainstream features of Western politics? Or are we also willing to consider--

and learn from--more local forms of institutions and politics?

This questioning attitude comes not from an academic cacoethes, but rather from a scholarly tradition usually referred to as “law and development”. In this chapter, I review that tradition, the lessons it has generated², and the extent to which these apply to the broader challenge this book embraces--i.e., to chart “the road ahead” for Brazilian Studies in the United States.

The assumptions of law and development

The scholarly tradition known as “law and development” was a product of both intellectual and political conditions that marked the United States in the 1960s.

Intellectually, the study of law had been reinvigorated by “legal realism” and an interest in “law in action” (i.e., the production, implementation, and effects of legal rules), more than “law on the books” (i.e., the decisions and doctrines produced by lawyers and judges). This shift created opportunities for both legal scholars and social scientists to engage in critical inquiry of legal rules and institutions. The Law and Society Association was both a product and the most visible expression of these emerging academic identities and prospects.

1 *Assistant Professor of International Studies and Wick Cary Professor of Brazilian Studies, University of Oklahoma; co-Director of the Brazil Studies Program. E-mail: fabio.desaesilva@ou.edu

2 These considerations are based on Trubek (1972) and Trubek and Galanter (1974) and, to a lesser extent, Gardner (1980).

Politically, the world was divided by the Cold War and the US foreign policy relied heavily on “developmental assistance” to bar what North-Americans feared could be the advancement of real socialism. These “development projects” were generally inspired by modernization theory and its understanding that, for one, societies tended to “evolve” from “underdevelopment” (commodities-based, rural, autocratic) to “developed” (industrialized, urban, democratic) and, for another, that this “evolutionary” process could be accelerated if “underdeveloped” countries were to adopt some structures typical of their “developed” counterparts.

It did not take time for “legal developers” to emerge and initiate “legal development projects” in countries around the world, Brazil being one of them.

These “developers” shared a very clear-cut “view” about law and its relationship to development, which they drew from readings of Max Weber. They thought of law as a system of general rules (as opposed to particularistic ones), backed up by the state (as opposed to traditional or charismatic sources of authority), and applied by specialized agencies (i.e., Courts, as opposed, for example, to community-based decisionmakers) in a universal and uniform manner (i.e., regardless of the gender, race, or socioeconomic status of the parties).

“Legal developers” also understood that law had a “purpose”, i.e., that instead of representing transcendental ideals of justice, those general legal rules were meant to preserve or change society in a given, purposeful way. It followed that, passing and applying proper laws, was a powerful way for countries to walk from “underdevelopment” to “development”.

But what would these “proper laws” be and how would they lead to “development”? “Legal developers” considered that “proper laws” were those that would structure and protect a private sphere (property rights, corporate law, and capital markets law). They also maintained that, once in place, these laws would produce a US-style marketplace and expand individual freedoms altogether. As a result, the societies adopting and implementing these new laws would become both advanced industrial



But what would these “proper laws” be and how would they lead to “development”?

economies and politically liberal, “catching up” with their role-models in North America and Western Europe.

The critical legacy of law and development

Once “legal developers” landed in their countries of destination, they quickly unpacked an agenda that included both research and reform. Consistent with their assumptions, they carefully reviewed the laws, legal institutions, and legal practices they encountered in place, searching for discrepancies between those and the ideal models they had brought to bear. In light of their findings, they would not hesitate to propose changes.

One of the areas these “legal developers” focused on, in the case of Brazil, was legal education. They were struck by the high formalism of Brazilian legal culture and were supportive of reforms in law school pedagogy to infuse Brazilian law students with better analytical skills and a more “purposeful” legal reasoning. The CEPED, or Center for the Teaching and Research of Law, was established in Rio de Janeiro as an experiment of such reforms.

As time went by, however, these “legal developers” found themselves deeply troubled. To begin with, they encountered different socioeconomic structures, which

did not quite fit their models. Brazil was, and continues to be, an economy in which the state, before the marketplace, gets to play a central role in economic development³ and beyond⁴. New laws to structure and protect a private sphere were not sufficient to change this state-of-affairs and, of course, did very little to curb the authoritarian turn that Brazil eventually took in the mid-1960s.

In addition, some of the reforms undertaken by “legal developers” generated rather unintended results. Legal education offers, once again, a case in point. As authoritarianism mounted in the wake of the 1964 civil-military coup, the attempt to give lawyers a more “purposeful” thinking enabled those working for the state to more effectively implement, rather than challenge, a growing body of illiberal rules.

Last but not least, “legal developers” ended up losing their faith in their own models. Amidst the malaise caused by the Vietnam war, they questioned, for example, whether the US was a desirable template for other countries to follow, and how noble the policy motives behind the push for “law and development” projects were.

3 This arrangement would be later recognized—and analytically valued—by political economists like Chang (2002) and Hall and Soskice (2001).

4 Since the “law and development” movement was launched, the meaning of development itself was expanded to include minimum social protection and the expansion of political freedoms as goals in their own right.

Back to the question

By the mid-1970s, disappointments of “legal developers” and changes in the priorities of US foreign policy brought the first generation of “law and development” to an end. Its critical legacy, however, endures. Hence, when questioned, “How does the foreign view coming from the North-American academy contribute to the development of research on Brazilian politics and institutions in both countries?”, those who are familiar with the legacy tend to immediately respond, “it depends”.

Is that “view” aware of the structural contradictions and conflicts that constitute Brazil and how scholarly work fits such context—whether to challenge or reinforce it? Does the “view” involve an open commitment to freedom, equality, and democracy, instead of the abstract belief that, with the right economic reforms, those will, one day, inevitably come? Is the “view” based on horizontal and solidary relationships with Brazilians, beyond elites that often make strategic use of foreign connections to enhance their own positions of power (Dezalay and Garth 2002)? The answers to these questions will determine very different forms of “contribution to research” (or will move us through very different “roads ahead”), as they did before.

But how could we develop a better “view” and pursue a “road” that, in the future, will not put us, yet again, in “self-

estrangement” (Trubek and Galanter 1974)? While any good “Brazilianist” may have found his or her own way through this challenge, the answer needs to be given at a more collective and institutional level. Through university programs and learned societies, we must work to create a permanent infrastructure that will enable students and faculty to learn the language, to immerse themselves in the Brazilian context and culture, to develop relationships, and to be challenged in their certainties and assumptions about that country.

At the David L. Boren College of International Studies, University of Oklahoma, we are establishing a program that I hope will be up to this task. Through cross-departmental collaboration, we are building a core-curriculum of Brazilian Studies, including Portuguese and study abroad requirements, which we expect will be given the status of an academic minor. Through events and exchange programs, we are attempting to increase the Brazilian presence on our campus, allowing our students and faculty to interact more directly with a “Brazilian community”. Through a publication series (soon to be launched), we wish to educate the North-American audience about contemporary Brazilian issues. And through study abroad programs, we have aimed to give our students and faculty a chance to get immersed in the Brazilian complexity and develop long-term ties with Brazilian academics and institutions.

Needless to say, none of this is easy.

Obstacles begin in the US, where financial support associated with foreign policy interests has long gone away, and the reigning academic structure offers no tangible rewards for the time and energy spent by faculty in efforts to create Brazil Studies programs.

Hardships have also grown in Brazil, where, in spite of pressures for “academic internationalization”, higher education institutions face cutbacks in funds and threats of privatization; affirmative action and policies that have made student bodies more inclusive and diverse are under siege; and anti-intellectualism and attacks on academic freedom have mounted, as represented by the *Escola Sem Partido* movement and the recent election of Jair Bolsonaro.

With persistence and mutual support, however, these are challenges we will face and overcome. And while, to some of us, a call to chart “the road ahead” for Brazilian Studies in the US may raise questions and doubts, hopefully it will make us feel more like Walt Whitman (1856), who once used “road” as a metaphor for a utopian, open space, finally attained:

“Allons! the road is before us!

It is safe – I have tried it – my own feet
have tried it well – be not detain’d!”

REFERENCES

- Chang H-J (2002) *Kicking Away the Ladder: Development Strategy in Historical Perspective* (Anthem Press, 2002).
- Dezalay Y; Garth B (2002) *The Internationalization of Palace Wars: Lawyers, Economists, and the Contest to Transform Latin American States*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gardner JA (1980) *Legal Imperialism: American Lawyers and Foreign Aid in Latin America*, The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hall PA; Soskice D (2001) *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative*. Oxford/ NY: Oxford University Press.
- Trubek DM (1972) "Toward a Social Theory of Law: An Essay on the Study of Law and Development", 82 *Yale Law Journal* 1-50
- Trubek DM; Galanter M (1974) "Scholars in Self-Estrangement: Some Reflections on the Crisis in Law and Development Studies", 1974 *Wisconsin Law Review* 1062-1102
- Waltman W (1856) "Song of the Open Road", available at: <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/48859/song-of-the-open-road>, last access Jan 4, 2018.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH ON BRAZILIAN LITERA- TURE AND CULTURE TODAY: CROSSROADS, DEAD ENDS, NEW AVENUES

César Braga-Pinto
Northwestern University

The following pages are meant address to address the questions proposed to us (one literary studies scholar and two historians) in the conference “Brazilian Studies in the United States: The Road Ahead”: *What are the challenges in research on Brazilian history and literature at US universities: elements of attraction and indifference from American students to exchanges with Brazilian universities?* So, as a scholar of literary and cultural studies (the only one in this conference), I want firstly to stress that historians are, and indeed should be our best friends. Firstly because with them we share a keen interest in memory and, often, in the case of Brazil, *a fear* for the fate of our documents and precarious archives. In addition, if it is true that the participants in this event share a general interest in, as well as concerns for the future of Brazilian studies in the U.S., we, historians and literature scholars, find ourselves in the middle of an additional and broader crisis, which is the much-discussed *crisis in*

the humanities that affects both the U.S. and Brazilian institutions. But among the humanities, it is the language and literature departments that are the most vulnerable; more specifically, the foreign languages; and among these, the teaching and research in so-called less-commonly-taught languages, such as Portuguese, are the most vulnerable of all, constantly struggling to prove their relevance and sometimes their existence.

However, I want to avoid, as much as possible, the catastrophic, sometimes apocalyptic tone that has characterized much of the recent debates on our discipline. It is true that it is rather difficult not to be alarmed, or even to panic when we consider the present and the future of the humanities in higher education in general, and in Brazil, in particular. A recent piece by Eric Hyot, Professor of Comparative Literature and Asian Studies at Penn State U, in one of the publications of the Modern Languages Association, gives plenty of evidence of the dimension of the crisis we endure (to have an idea, the article is entitled “The sky is falling”!)⁵. In summary, Eric Hyot calls attention to the rapid and steady decline of the tenure-track jobs advertised in the MLA’s Job Information List, particularly in the last 10 year or so, when the numbers dropped *more than 50%*. [I should point out that, in Portuguese, 2018-19 was

⁵ Hayot, Eric. “The Sky is Falling.” Modern Languages Association, <https://profession.mla.org/the-sky-is-falling/>

not a bad year, with 5 or 6 tenure-track positions open, but we cannot say that this is really a trend]. As expected, this decline in jobs also corresponds to an overall decline of 50% in humanities majors at several institutions.

After presenting this dramatic picture, Hayot suggests that, in order to remain relevant, the only way out for literary scholars is interdisciplinarity: “We may want to double down on [this] interdisciplinarity, seeing our courses as training in the humanities (in general), ourselves as humanists (in general), and our work as orienting our students to the big human questions, which are, after all, not constrained by the boundaries of the university’s disciplinary divisions.” I couldn’t agree more, although the case of literatures produced in less-commonly taught languages is always much more dramatic, among other reasons because we almost always need to rely either on high level of language proficiency from the students, or the availability of works in translations. In fact, many schools do not even offer a major or minor. A survey conducted by the BTAA (formally known as the Big Ten) indicates that in 2017-2018, the average of graduating majors was five students, with most of the 14 schools (U. of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, U. of Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Nebraska, Northwestern, Ohio State, Penn State, Purdue, Rutgers-New Brunswick, Wisconsin) having graduate no majors at all, whereas Minnesota declared 23, Wisconsin 9 and U. of Iowa

5. In addition, the scope and the viability of the interdisciplinarity imperative vary according to the nature of the institution.

I should also note that the nature and scope of our research, on the one hand, and of our teaching, on the other – or of our discipline, on the one hand, and our departments, on the other – do not always coincide. And yet, as scholars of Brazilian literary and cultural studies, we too must understand our research as inherently interdisciplinary, and our pedagogical practice needs to be more and more committed to renewed forms of collaboration. Needless to say, studying Brazilian culture in the U.S., at least on the undergraduate level, is quite different from the kind of specialized work one can do in Brazil. Indeed, for decades, courses on Brazilian literature and culture have focused on subjects such as Brazilian Popular music, *mestiçagem* and *democracia racial*, carnival and other cultural exceptionalisms. But this has changed in the last decade, as we understand Brazilian culture and history as part of the world, no matter how complicated this relationship might be. So (perhaps because I was trained as a comparatist) I firmly believe that today, more than ever, Brazilian cultural studies is to be undertaken transnationally and interdisciplinarily.

Without intending to be exhaustive, I want to illustrate some of the issues scholars of Brazilian cultures working most often in Spanish and Portuguese

departments face (as there are really only two departments of Portuguese in the country, namely at Brown U. and U. Mass at Dartmouth) by narrating my own experience in the two research universities where I have taught, two institutions which are nevertheless very different from each other. After finishing my Ph.D. in Comparative Literature at U.C. Berkeley, my first teaching position was at Rutgers University at New Brunswick (New Jersey), where I taught for more than ten years. Rutgers, like Berkeley, is a public university, with one of the most diverse student populations in the U.S. At the time (about twenty years ago), the field of Luso-Brazilian studies was starting to change, and I would say that things seemed pretty auspicious. For example, before I had often heard (I was often warned) that there was a clear divide within Spanish and Portuguese departments; that Luso-Brazilianists were marginalized in decision making; and they were often excluded from graduate teaching and advising. To chair a Spanish and Portuguese department, or even to direct the graduate program, was pretty much unthinkable (whereas today at least two Brazilianists chair Spanish and Portuguese departments in major research universities). Moreover, someone who had a Ph.D. in literature many times had to teach Portuguese, and in some cases even Spanish language. However, this is not what I encountered. On the contrary, at least in my experience, Spanish and Portuguese departments welcomed, and actually were enthusiastic about having

Brazilianists as their colleagues; and, in fact, I was asked to teach a language course only once in my entire career. At the time (around 2000) Rutgers had a very large Portuguese, and a growing Brazilian student body, as well as a huge population of Spanish heritage speakers. Therefore, enrollments were never a concern, and I was not worried about enrollments in classes on Fernando Pessoa, Machado de Assis, Graciliano Ramos, fado or MPB, always taught in Portuguese. There was also some support from Portuguese foundations and the Portuguese government – which contrasted with the Brazilian government, which seemed much more interested in financing programs in the wealthiest research universities, rather than supporting the growing Brazilian community in the U.S., the so-called Brazucas (today we see a growing presence of heritage students even in the private elite institutions, and this is something worth paying attention at, as it has started to have a significant effect on teaching and research on Brazil). On the other hand, beyond the Spanish and Portuguese department, there was a growing interest in courses taught in English, particularly in the Program in Comparative literature, to which I was affiliated and soon became the Director of Undergraduate Studies, but also in other unities, such as Africana Studies, African Studies and Women and Gender Studies. A few years later, my department hired a second tenure-track faculty, when until then it was rare to have more than one professor of Portuguese in the same department. Today, a few

departments have, are about to have, or until recently had more than one tenure-track position in Luso-Brazilian Studies: UCLA, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, Ohio State, Vanderbilt, Penn State, Princeton, Georgetown, Tulane, UW-Madison, Duke, Dartmouth College, U. of Michigan, Indiana, Rutgers-Newark, Emory, NYU, U. of Texas-Austin, New Mexico, U. of Miami, U. of Georgia, and Minnesota. But after the place of Brazilian studies in research universities seemed consolidated, the financial crisis and the resulting crisis in the humanities came about. However, as professors retire or leave to another institution, it seems unlikely that those positions will be replaced. I left Rutgers in 2010 and my colleague a few years after me, but our positions were never replaced. For almost ten years, Rutgers-New Brunswick has had no tenure-line faculty in Portuguese, having to rely on one NTE faculty for all courses in the Portuguese major, and is only this year that the department is finally opening a search for one position.

Northwestern, where I have been teaching for almost ten years now, is a private and much smaller elite university which, to some extent, emphasizes professional degrees and the sciences, with some humanistic training added. In my department, there is practically no demand for a major in Portuguese, as the few students who take Portuguese language rarely attain proficiency beyond the intermediate level, and therefore literature courses with readings in Portuguese are simply out of the question. So, I had to adjust our expectations, and designed an interdisciplinary minor in “Portuguese Language and Lusophone Cultures,” in which some of the requirements can be fulfilled with literature courses taught in translation or courses originating in other departments. In fact, the readings and discussion in all of my courses are in English translation, which is not always ideal, but at least it is possible today, partly thanks to the translation subvention grants offered by the Biblioteca Nacional (which I do hope they will continue during the dark times ahead) which fomented the translation of numerous literary works into English and several other languages.⁶

6 Among the new translations or retranslations to English that were published in the last two decades are: Raul Pompeias *The Athenaeum* (Northwestern U. P., 2015); Machado de Assis’s *Esau and Jacob* (Oxford U.P., 2000) and *The wager* [Memorial de Ayres] (Peter Owen, 2005); The *Oxford anthology of the Brazilian short story*, edited by K. David Jackson (Oxford U. P., 2006); new editions of Jorge Amado’s *Tieta and Tent of Miracles* (U. of Wisconsin P., 2003), *The War of the Saints* (Dial Press, 2005) and *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* (Vintage International, 2006); João Cabral de Melo Neto’s *Education by Stone: Selected Poems* (Archipelago Books, 2005); Clarice Lispector’s *Complete Stories* (2015), in addition to new translations of five of her novels, all published by New Directions; João Guimarães Rosa’s *The Jaguar and other stories* (Oxford U.P., 2001); Lúcio Cardoso’s *Chronicle of the Murdered House* (Open Letter, 2016); Haroldo de Campos’s *Novas: Selected Writings* (Northwestern U.P., 2007); Luiz Fernando Veríssimo’s *Club of Angels* (The Harvill P., 2001), *Borges and the Eternal Orang-Utans* (Vintage, 2005) and *The Spies* (Quercus, 2012); Caio Fernando Abreu’s *Whatever happened to Dulce Veiga?* (Texas U.P., 2000), Moacyr Scliar’s *Max and the Cat* (Plume, 2003); Ignácio de Loyola Brandão’s *Teeth Under the Sun* (Dalkey Archive P. 2007); Renata Pallottini’s *Renata & other poems* (Host Pub., 2005); *Quilombhoje, Black note-*

Still, even minors in Portuguese are few, among other reasons because courses with a Brazil component in other departments are almost inexistent. In fact, if I am not mistaken, I think that I am now the only Brazilianist in the entire School of Arts and Sciences, perhaps even on campus.

So, again, interdisciplinarity and collaboration has become an imperative, but a very welcome one, I would say, as it has opened the study of Brazilian literature and culture to students in a variety of fields, not only those closest to us, such as Spanish or Comparative Literature, but also to majors in fields such as Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Business, Journalism, Screen Cultures etc. -- not to mention student athletes who are drawn at first by their interested in soccer or

capoeira. I am frequently and pleasantly surprised to learn that these students do not want simply to fulfill a general requirement in the humanities, but rather, they find it important to have a broad humanistic education –even with a course on Brazilian culture, which they often call it a “niche” course. [I should add that this might not be as viable in other institutions with less resources. For even though I have had very healthy enrollments in my classes, in places such as Northwestern, Yale and Princeton, we are allowed to run a class with five, sometimes even less students].

Now, on the graduate level: I would say that in despite of the discrepancy in resources, Northwestern students are not so different from those in the doctoral program at Rutgers and other

books: contemporary Afro-Brazilian literary movement (Africa World Press, 2008); Rubem Fonseca's *Crimes of August* (Tagus, 2014); Patricia Melo's *Inferno* (Bloomsbury, 2002), *Black Waltz* (2004) and *Lost World* (2009); Chico Buarque's *Budapest* (Bloomsbury, 2004) and *Spit Milk* (Bloomsbury, 2012); Milton Hatoum's *The Brothers* (Bloomsbury, 2003), *Tale of a Certain Orient* (Bloomsbury, 2004), *Ashes of the Amazon*, (Bloomsbury, 2008) and *Orphans of Eldorado* (Canongate, 2012); Bernardo Carvalho's *Nine Nights* (William Heinemann, 2007) and *Fear of Sade* (Canongate, 2012). Paulo Lins' *City of God*, (Black Cat, 2006). Alberto Mussa's *The riddle of Qaf* (Aflame, 2008) and *The Mystery of Rio* (Europa Ed., 2013); Adriana Lisboa's *Symphony in White* (Texas Tech U. P., 2010), *Hut of Fallen Parsimmons* (Texas Tech U.P., 2011) and *Crow Blue* (Boomsburry, 2014); Cristóvão Tezza's *Eternal Son* (Tagus, 2013); João Paulo Cuenca's *The Only Happy Ending for a Love Story is an Accident* (Tagus, 2013), Luiz Ruffato's *There Were Many Horses* (Amazon Crossing, 2014); Edney Silvestre's *If I Close My Eyes Mow* (Doubleday, 2013); Michel Laub's *Diary of the Fall* (Other P., 2014) and *The Poison Apple* (Vintage, 2017); Paulo Henriques Britto's *The clean shirt of it* (Boa Ed., 2007); Conceição Evaristos' *Poncia Vicencio* (Host Pub., 2007); João Almino's *The five seasons of love* (Host Pub. 2008), *The Book of Emotions* (Dalkey Archive P., 2012), *Free City* (Dalkey Archive P., 2013) and *Enigmas of Spring* (Dalkey Archive P., 2016); Hilda Hilst's *The Obscene Madam D* . (Nightboat Books, 2012), *With My Dog's Eyes* (Melville House, 2014) and *Letters from a Seducer* (Nightboat Books, 2014); Marcelo Mirisola's *Joana Against My Will* (KBR, 2012); Tatiana Salem Levy's *The House in Smyrna* (Scribe, 2015); and Alexandre Vidal Porto's *Sergio Y*. (Europa Ed. 2016). According to Feres and Brisolara, in 2010 no Brazilian books received support for translation into English. Since then, the numbers have increased steadily: four in 2011; fifteen in 2012.; sixteen in 2013; fourteen in 2014; five in 2015 (not necessarily literary works). See Lilia Baranski Feres and Valéria Silveira Brisolara, "A literatura brasileira em tradução: o programa de apoio à tradução e à publicação de autores brasileiros no exterior como ferramenta de interferência no polissistema literário." *Revista da Anpoll* v. 1, nº 44, p. 331-345, Florianópolis, Jan./Abr. 2018.

research universities, either private or public. Most of these institutions do not have a doctoral program exclusively in Portuguese, and I believe that in the current situation it would be unrealistic and even irresponsible to consider creating one⁷. And yet, students in my department, which focuses largely on Latin America, are always enthusiastic about graduate courses on Brazilian literature, film or theory, and many include a significant Brazilian component in their dissertation. I believe this is a trend in other universities as well, as we can confirm with the monographs published in the last decade. Indeed, when K. David Jackson wrote a comprehensive survey of the field more than 15 years ago, the picture was entirely different⁸. According to his study,

“[comparative studies remain rare, theory is deemphasized, and most advanced studies continue to describe authors and genres. Brazilian authors are still rarely but increasingly discussed in essays originating in other disciplines using the latest concepts and schools of criticism... The appearance of comparative and theoretical topics notwithstanding, the majority of theses continue the author/theme pattern established in the 1950’s...]. A brief survey of the most important titles published in the last ten years, many of which result for Doctoral dissertations, show precisely the opposite. They are often interdisciplinary (with an emphasis on film), comparative and increasingly with hemispheric scope and almost never on a single author⁹. In my department all graduate students are

7 U. of Wisconsin-Madison offers an M.A. in Portuguese and a Ph.D. with a major in Portuguese; UMAss-Dartmouth has a M.A. in Portuguese and Ph.D. in Luso-Afro-Brazilian Studies & Theory; Brown U. has M.A.s in Brazilian Studies, Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, Portuguese Bilingual Education, as well as a Ph.D. in Portuguese and Brazilian Studies; UCLA offers a M.A. in Portuguese; Harvard offers a Ph.D. program in Portuguese and Luso-Brazilian Literatures; Ohio State U. offers a PhD program in Studies of the Portuguese-speaking World; Indiana U. offers M.A. and Ph.D. in Portuguese. BYU offers M.A.’s with specializations in Luso-Brazilian Literatures, Portuguese Linguistics and Portuguese Pedagogy; U.C. Santa Barbara offers both M.A. and Ph.D. in Portuguese. Many others have combined programs in Spanish and Portuguese.

8 Jackson, K. David. “Literature, Culture, and Civilization.” *Envisioning Brazil: A Guide to Brazilian Studies in the United States*. Marshall C. Eakin, Paulo Roberto de Almeida (1945-2003). The U. of Wisconsin P, 2005. I should also note that whereas at the time the MLA maintained three convention sections dedicated to Luso-Brazilian studies, as Jackson indicates, today these have more than doubled.

9 *Cannibal Modernities: Postcoloniality and the Avant-garde in Brazilian and Caribbean Literature* (2005), by Luis Madureira (Wisconsin, Ph.D. U.C. San Diego); *Nossa and Nuestra América: Inter-American Dialogues* (2011), by Robert P. Newcomb (U.C. Davis, Ph.D. Brown); *Terms of Inclusion: Black Intellectuals in Twentieth-Century Brazil* (2011), by Paulina Alberto (U. of Michigan, Ph.D. U.Penn); *Transnational discourses on class, gender, and cultural identity* (2011), by Irene Marques (U. of Toronto, Ph.D. U. of Toronto); *Porous City: A Cultural History of Rio de Janeiro* (2013), by Bruno Carvalho (Harvard, Ph.D. Harvard); *The Object of the Atlantic: Concrete Aesthetics in Cuba, Brazil and Spain 1868-1968* (2014), by Rachel Price (Princeton, Ph.D. Duke); *Breaching the Frame: The Rise of Contemporary Art in Brazil and Japan* (2014), by Pedro Erber (Cornell, Ph.D. Cornell); *Literary and cultural relations between Brazil and Mexico : deep undercurrents* (2014), by Paulo Moreira (U. of Oklahoma, Ph.D. U.C. Santa Barbara); *Memory’s Turn: Reckoning with Dictatorship in Brazil* (2014), by Rebecca Atencio (Tulane, Ph.D. Wisconsin); *Oshun’s Daughters: The Search for Womanhood in the Americas* (2015), by Vanessa K. Valdés (CUNY, Ph.D. Vanderbilt); *Latin America at fin-de-siècle Universal Exhibitions. Modern Cultures of Visuality* (2016), by Alejandra Usleghi (Northwestern U., Ph.D. NYU); *Confluence Narratives: Ethnicity, History, and Nation-Making in the Americas* (2015), by Luciano Tosta (Kansas U., Ph.D. Brown); *Delirious Consumption: Aesthetics and Consumer Capitalism in Mexico and Brazil* (2017); by Sergio Delgado Moya (Emory, Ph.D. Princeton U); *Media Laboratories: Late Modernist Authorship in South America* (2017), by Sarah Ann Wells (Wisconsin, Ph.D. U.C. Berkeley); *Anti-literature : the politics and limits of representation in modern Brazil and Argentina* (2017), by Adam Joseph Shellhorse (Temple, Ph.D. U.C. Berkeley); *Public Spectacles of Violence: Sensational Cinema and Journalism in Early Twentieth-Century*

required to be proficient in both Spanish and Portuguese, and are very excited to learn. But whereas writing a dissertation exclusively on Brazilian literature is possible, it is not encouraged, unless the student plans to work in Brazil, which seems more and more unlikely. In fact, one thing that we should expect (and which I have already noticed in the last two or three years) is that graduate applications from Brazilian students tend to increase dramatically, depending on how uncertain political and economic situations, but also on how much some of the increasing attacks on higher education, intellectual work, critical thinking and academic freedom prove to be effective. Now, one of the problems that those prospective students who were trained in Brazil is that they often need to be proficient in both Spanish and English, and preferably willing to consider a career teaching Spanish in order to be competitive at all. Again, it remains to be seeing if foreign languages, and Spanish in particular, will be a priority in the Brazilian curriculum in next few years.

In any case, both on the graduate and undergraduate level, both in teaching and research, students as well as faculty

need to reach out to other unities and disciplines, and to collaborate, now more than ever. For example, at Northwestern I co-direct an interdisciplinary cluster called Global Avant Garde and Modernist Studies, a growing field that has offered great opportunities for the study and visibility of Brazilian literature and its very unique avant-garde movements. Some of my most exciting collaborative projects have been with faculty in the French Department, with whom I organized events on Modernism, 1968, etc. Another area that remains promising is the visit of Brazilian writers. With some support of the Creative Writing Program, last year we hosted a most diverse group of 13 Brazilian poets, writers of fiction and graphic novelists (and this year we will try to bring another 5 or 6 artists) as part of a program created by Leonardo Tonus, a literature professor at the Sorbonne. We wanted to make sure that other universities took advantage of the fact that these writers were in the U.S., so we coordinated with them so that different writers visited other universities. In any case, as a result of that event, we invited the 13 artists to produced works to be collected in a volume we a calling *Navegar Chicago*, or *Navigating*

Mexico and Brazil (2017), by Rielle Navitski (Georgia, Ph.D. U.C. Berkeley) *The Unfinished Art of Theater: Avant-Garde Intellectuals in Mexico and Brazil* (2018), by Sarah Townsend (Penn State, Ph.D. N.Y.U.). *Foundational Films. Early Cinema and Modernity in Brazil* (2018), by Maite Conde (Cambridge, Ph.D. UCLA); *Mandarin Brazil: Race, Representation, and Memory (Asian America)*, by Ana Paulina Lee (Columbia, Ph.D., Ph.D. USC); *Slavery Unseen: Sex, Power, and Violence in Brazilian History (Latin America Otherwise)*, (2018), by Lamonte Aidoo (Duke, Ph.D. Brown); *Documentary Filmmaking in Contemporary Brazil Cinematic Archives of the Present* (2019), by Gustavo Furtado (Duke, Ph.D. Cornell).

Chicago, forthcoming in Portuguese next April, and hopefully in English at some point. Bringing Brazilian writers either for short visits or longer residences, if done consistently, has proved to be a successful way of drawing interest to Brazilian literature for both undergraduate and graduate students. This is the kind of initiative of which the João Almino, today a member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, was a great supporter, wherever he served as a diplomat. For example, when he was the Consul General in San Francisco, he created a writer in residence program at U.C. Berkeley, which hosted writers such as Milton Hatoum and Bernardo Carvalho for about three weeks. Unfortunately, I see that many of these programs were discontinued in the few last years. Hopefully, they will come back and include not only one university, but several.

Finally, I want to point to the burgeoning fields of decolonial theory and a renewed interest in critical theories from the south as an opportunity for introducing the works of some of Brazil's most important intellectuals. However, here too there is still need for translations of the essays by classical as well as contemporary thinkers, something which can be hardly be attained without some sort of subvention (Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda's seminal *Raízes do Brazil* was translated into English only a few years ago; more recently, collections of the works by the foundational critics of Brazilian cinema such as Paulo Emílio Salles Gomes and Glauber Rocha; and

writings by the Brazilian philosopher Marilena Chauí were finally published. In short, in spite of my pessimism, I still see some relatively promising signs of growing interest in Brazilian Cultural Studies, as professors are located not only in Language and Literature Departments but also in programs or departments of Gender Studies, African American Studies, Performance Studies, English and Comparative Literature, Art History, Musicology and so on. Therefore, to my fellow Brazilianists, I want to reiterate: yes, now more than ever, we will need to collaborate with colleagues in Brazil. We should not restrict all presentations to LASA and other discipline-specific scholarly associations based in the U.S. We will probably have to travel to Brazil at our own expenses, in order to participate in conferences, give talks and mini-courses at Brazilian universities – and we should do that beyond São Paulo and Rio universities. We shall remain interdisciplinary while we work on national, comparative, transatlantic and world literatures.

Having said that, I, and perhaps most of my colleagues, today have many more questions than answers regarding potential collaborations with Brazilian scholars and institutions, and probably many more questions than we had a few months ago, when we accepted the invitation to participate in this event. For I cannot help but wonder about the short and long-term effects of the statements of the incoming Secretary of Education, Ricardo

Vélez Rodríguez, whose preliminary agenda included “norms for a conservative society, traditional values associated with the preservation of the family and humanistic morality.” Also, and this may sound controversial, but I believe that all of us sometimes ask ourselves: how can we make a case for the study of literature and culture in such critical times, namely, when global warming and the effects of deforestation are denied; when the rights of indigenous peoples are threatened; when social movements and human rights are demonized; and when there are attempts to erase events from history? In other words, how can Brazilian and Lusophone literary studies, or Portuguese language and literature departments prove to be relevant next to the subjects of anthropology, environmental sciences, public health, social sciences, law, and even the pressing work of my fellow historians? Or even closer to home: how can we promote and argue for the study of *Brazilian* literature as opposed to, say, the monuments of French, German, Russian, Chinese, or even Argentinian literary traditions?

At any rate, it might be that the road ahead will indeed be bumpy, and I want to believe that, after that which seemed unimaginable occurred, there is some value and urgency in studying the works of our best creative writers, and how they have responded to times of crisis, skepticism, or even despair; and perhaps today, more than ever, it is urgent to better understand the rules of rhetoric, irony,

dialogue, fiction, narrative, storytelling, speech acts, alternative truths, etc. And if I can't really argue that Brazilian literature is among the best in the world (I don't even know what that would mean), I feel encouraged as I witness the emergence of a vibrant and heterogeneous new generation of writers and readers who, in spite of everything, continue to make literature not only relevant, but also a mode of resistance, even for some, an alternative form of citizenship.

CONCLUSION

THE BURDEN OF BRAZILIAN STUDIES

Stuart B. Schwartz

George Burton Adams Professor
of History, Yale University; Comen-
dador da Ordem do Cruzeiro do Sul
(2000)

I live not far from New Haven, my office at Yale is twenty minutes away in Guilford, a small New England town on the Connecticut shoreline. Little did I know when I took up residence there over twenty-five years ago, that Guilford was the birthplace of America's first consul to Brazil, Mr. Henry Hill, who was appointed by Thomas Jefferson in 1808 to represent the United States at the court of Portugal which had just arrived in its tropical American colony. In his letter of introduction to Dom Joao, the Prince Regent, Hill spoke with admiration of Brazil as a "country so favored by the gifts of nature," and as American trade with Brazil exploded with the opening of the ports in 1808, Hill, first in Rio de Janeiro, and then after 1810 in Salvador, Bahia accompanied and guided the growing relationship between the two countries. He remained in diplomatic service in Brazil until 1815, and then retired to "Colombiana," his beloved Bahian fazenda from where he raised his ten children and continued to write and comment on his adopted country as he accompanied its complicated course from colony to an independent nation.

Unfortunately, Hill himself was a jaundiced observer. He loved his adopted country, its majesty, its exotic plants and animals, its economic potential, but he savagely ridiculed and criticized its political class and its people. Although he was sometimes an astute and experienced observer, he was also a captive of the political, religious, and racial prejudices and preconceptions of his place and time. He sadly underestimated the capacities of the peoples of Brazil. He, like other foreign observers of Brazil, before and after his time often seemed to bear the *fardo do homem branco*, the white man's burden, the idea that the definition of "civilized" life, attitudes, culture, and behaviors was theirs alone to make.

Brazilians have long recognized the potential for that external vision to prejudice the perception and understanding of Brazil's life, politics, and culture. I recall in 1968 or so, an issue of *Veja*, Brazil's Time magazine, in which the cover had images of great figures of Brazil's history--Dom Pedro I, Ruy Barbosa, Getulio Vargas -- speaking their famous statements in cartoon character balloons but in English!! The cover was an announcement of an interior essay criticizing the "Brazilianists," that is foreign observers (mostly Americans) who were imposing their limited (mis) understandings of the country's history and culture on the way Brazilians themselves saw their country.

While some of that fear was exaggerated, it did reflect a certain cultural insecurity and a disparity in economic and political power that has often laid just below the surface of Brazilian – United States relations. But much has changed in both countries – since the 1960s. The papers in this volume are evidence of a significant modification in the approaches, the fields of study, the methodologies, and the nature of and degree of collaboration and cooperation between Brazilian and North American humanists, social and physical scientists, legal scholars and diplomats. This meeting in which papers ranged from constitutional law to cartography and from demography to neuroscience and epidemiology is evidence of a broadening range of collaboration and common interests, but also of a growing parity in these collaborations and in the levels of research, in part a result of the significant changes in Brazilian higher education in the last half century. They perhaps also reveal a certain unloading of the fardo, by those of us who study Brazil; a kind of recognition both of the achievements of Brazil, but also in recognition of the growing realization of the fragility of our own political, educational, and social institutions. The current challenges, environmental, democratic, economic, and social, that confront our two countries are broadly shared, and that more than anything provides for our common interests. Yale University with its long history of Brazilian Studies under the

leadership of former faculty members like the American Richard Morse and the Brazilian Emilia Viotti da Costa was pleased to organize this meeting with the collaboration of the Brazilian Ministry of Education, but the participation of scholars of many nationalities and from a broad range of institutions confirms the increasing globalization of knowledge and the need for further study and collaboration in the future by all of us fascinated by and hopeful for Brazil, the country of tomorrow, o país de amanhã, and for all its citizens.



Copyright 2020 by Yale University
All rights reserved