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The Censorship of History and Fact-Finding in Brazil (1964–2018)

Antoon De Baets

History was censored in multiple ways in Brazil between 1964 and 2018, and specifically between 1964 and 1985, the period of the military dictatorship. In a broad sense, history encompasses not only the work of historians but also the work of truth commissions and similar initiatives. These commissions, in producing reports about past injustices, often act as protohistorians who write a first draft of history. This brief overview, consequently, provides some insight into the constraints within which historians and fact-finders had to work in Brazil.¹ It mines a database of cases of censorship of history that was compiled over the last three decades and covers most countries in the world for the postwar period until today. Part of it is available on the website of the Network of Concerned Historians. This summary overview is far from exhaustive but sufficiently representative to give a reliable impression of the restrictions placed on historians and human rights data collectors in Brazil since 1964.

Historical Writing

The military coup of 1964 installed a dictatorship that would last until 1985, although a period of relaxation was initiated in 1979. This was a time of harsh repression, especially during the first decade when the work climate in the universities abruptly changed. Hours after the military coup on 31 March 1964, Eremildo Luiz Viana, historian and director of the National School of Philosophy of the University of Brazil in Rio de Janeiro, occupied Radio MEC (the radio of the Ministry of Education and Culture) with the support of military troops. The radio’s director, historian Maria Yedda Linhares of the same university, was removed from her post on the accusation of being a ‘fanatic communist’ and of ‘having invited two known communists to be her
instructors’, including historian Hugo Weiss (who was dismissed himself). A commission of inquiry, created in May 1964 to investigate this alleged communist infiltration, did not find any evidence. The university’s historians, however, would experience an atmosphere of denouncement and persecution until 1979, when the historians who had been expelled together with Linhares – Eulália Lahmeyer Lobo, a historian of the Americas living in exile, and Manoel Maurício de Albuquerque (Weiss was by now deceased) – were rehabilitated.²

Linhares herself was subjected to seven investigations by the military police. At a certain moment, she received permission to work in France and Britain. After her return in 1965, she participated in the anti-dictatorial movement. She was then arrested and imprisoned three times. In addition, she was dismissed in April 1969 under Ato Institucional 5 (Institutional Act 5, a military decree) of December 1968. Following protests from French historians, she was released and she went into exile in France where she worked as a historian until 1974. After her return, she was unemployed until 1977 when she started working as a historian of Brazilian agriculture. In the 1980s and 1990s she twice became secretary of education under the governor of Rio de Janeiro.³

A famous episode of history textbook censorship began in February 1964, just weeks before the military coup, and exploded in the weeks after it. The Ministry of Education and Culture had published five volumes of a new ten-volume history textbook series for secondary schools, História nova do Brasil (A New History of Brazil). The books had been written by a group of mostly young history teachers under the supervision of General Nélson Werneck Sodré. Sodré was a Marxist military historian and head of the history department at the Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB; Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies). He was considered by many as the official historian of the Partido Comunista Brasileiro (PCB; Brazilian Communist Party). The controversial textbook series focused on the Brazilian people and emphasized the economic dimension of history. Several newspapers and television channels gave voice to fierce protest against the plan to make the textbook obligatory reading throughout Brazil. In March, ISEB’s premises were broken into, and documents relevant to future volumes stolen. Then came the coup. A decision to reprint two volumes that were out of stock and publish subsequent volumes with the Editora Brasiliense in São Paulo met with a hostile reception. The books were indeed edited but seized afterwards because they were said to blacken national heroes and propagate Marxist ideas. As they were deemed subversive, the ministry now withdrew its support. The
military police investigated the matter, imprisoned and tortured the
textbook authors and deprived them of all opportunities to lecture.
With the exception of Sodré, they were exiled for many years. The
textbooks were confiscated from bookshops, burned and banned, and
the ISEB was closed.4

According to my estimate, in 1964 alone, at least nineteen profes-
sional historians were dismissed, persecuted or exiled, especially those
suspected of left-wing sympathies. The newly installed military cen-
sorship affected contemporary history above all: the government did
not welcome unofficial analytical studies of current conditions, and
publishers consequently shifted to more distant history or issued little
on contemporary Brazil. In 1972, for example, journalist and historian
Hélio Silva, director of the Centro de Memória Social Brasileira (Centre
for Brazilian Social Memory), interrupted the chronological order of
the publication plan of his multivolume series on twentieth-century
Brazilian political history, in order to avoid description of the sensitive
Getúlio Vargas years (1930–45 and 1951–54), especially the period
between 1937 and 1945 during which the Vargas government, inspired
by Portugal’s Estado Novo (New State), had taken an authoritarian
turn. Instead, a volume about the year 1889 (when Brazil turned from
an empire into a republic) appeared. Later, in 1977, Silva was one
of the intellectuals who presented an anti-censorship petition to the
minister of justice.5

Many of the leading historians did not escape the dictator’s grip.
Four of the better-known cases were those involving Jânio Quadros,
Celso Furtado, José Honório Rodrigues and Caio Prado Jr. Quadros, a
lawyer, historian and former president of Brazil (serving in 1961), was
deprived of his political rights from 1964 to 1979. Nevertheless, História
do povo brasileiro (History of the Brazilian People), a six-volume work
of which he was the co-editor, was allowed to be published in São
Paulo in 1967. In spite of this, he spent four months in internal exile in
1968 because of his public statements. After the dictatorship, he made
a comeback as the mayor of São Paulo.6 Furtado was a dependency
economist internationally renowned for his retrospective studies. A
minister of planning before the coup, he was forced out of his post and
expelled. He went into exile and became a professor at the Sorbonne
in Paris. Meanwhile, his work La economía iberoamericana desde la
conquista ibérica hasta la revolución cubana (The Ibero-American
Economy from the Iberian Conquest until the Cuban Revolution) was
banned in Chile after Pinochet’s coup in 1973. Furtado was granted
amnesty in 1979 and returned to Brazil, where he eventually became
minister of culture.7 Around the time of the 1964 coup, director of
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The National Archives and historian of historiography José Honório Rodrigues was also removed from his post; he went to the United States for brief stints. Despite dire circumstances, he remained a prolific author. His collection of essays, História combatente (Combative History), published in 1982 when dictatorial control had become weaker, included previously banned articles on the role of chance in the historical process and the military in the era of Pedro I (1822–31).

As early as the Vargas era, communist historian and politician Caio Prado Jr had clashed with the powers that be, for which he suffered frequent harassment, interrogation and imprisonment before 1964. His 1966 book A revolução brasileira (The Brazilian Revolution) was understood to have inspired a new generation of urban guerrillas. In 1968, he competed for a chair of Brazilian history, with a thesis entitled História e desenvolvimento: A contribuição da historiografia para a teoria e prática do desenvolvimento brasileiro (History and Development: The Contribution of Historiography to the Theory and Practice of Brazilian Development). According to many, Prado was the best candidate but the contest was never completed because of political interference. In the same year, he was deprived of his political rights and sentenced by a military court to four years and six months of imprisonment for a ‘subversive’ interview in a student magazine. The court was reportedly in doubt about whether the word ‘struggle’ used in the interview actually meant ‘armed struggle’. The sentence was reduced on appeal. Eventually, Prado was imprisoned for almost eighteen months until his acquittal by the Supreme Military Court in 1971.

Many students and staff of the history and geography department of São Paulo University were purged under the dictatorship. They were accused of participating in so-called ‘parity committees for educational reform’, set up in 1968. One of the victims was Maria Emília Viotti da Costa. In an inquest carried out in 1969, the military police of São Paulo accused her of spreading subversive propaganda in her classes. She was dismissed. In protest against this mass dismissal of his colleagues in 1969, leading historian Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, author of Raízes do Brasil (Roots of Brazil; twenty-two editions by 1995), resigned from his post as a professor of the history of Brazilian civilization. Later he declared that, in the absence of a free press, he wanted the departmental minutes to bear witness to these arbitrary official acts. This was the second time that Buarque de Holanda had lost his position. The first time was in 1939, during the Vargas dictatorship, when he was an assistant professor of economic history at the University of the Federal District in Rio de Janeiro: he was dismissed for his socialist sympathies.
Some historians and history teachers became actively involved in political or military resistance. One of them was Dulce Pandolfi, who in 1968 was a politically active student of social sciences at the Federal University of Pernambuco in Recife. She joined the Ação Libertadora Nacional (National Liberation Action), a left-wing armed organization led by Carlos Marighella. Persecuted, she fled to Rio de Janeiro, where she was arrested in August 1970. During her detention at the Destacamento de Operações de Informações – Centro de Operações de Defesa Interna (DOI-CODI; Department of Information Operations – Centre for Internal Defence Operations), the intelligence and repression agency, she was tortured for more than three months. She was used as a guinea pig to demonstrate torture techniques and simulated executions during classes for DOI-CODI recruits. In late 1970, she was transferred to other prisons until her conditional release in December 1971. She became a historian specializing in Brazilian political history and political sociology. In May 2013 she testified about her experiences before the Comissão Nacional da Verdade (National Truth Commission).12 Jacob Gorender’s fate was similar. A leader of the Partido Comunista Brasileiro Revolucionário (PCBR; Revolutionary Brazilian Communist Party), he was imprisoned in January 1970 and tortured by the DOI-CODI in Rio de Janeiro before his release a year later. In 1978 he published O esclavismo colonial (Colonial Slavery), reportedly largely written in prison.13 Pandolfi and Gorender survived but others were killed for their political or armed resistance. One of them, in 1972, was history teacher Antonio Benetazzo, also a member of the Ação Libertadora Nacional.14 Among those who disappeared were Ivan Mota Dias, a history student who was also a member of an armed group, in 1971, and Vandick Reidner Pereira Coqueiro, a history teacher and guerrilla fighter, in 1974.15 History professor Afonso Henrique Martins Saldanha, president of the teachers’ union of Rio de Janeiro, was imprisoned in 1970; he died in 1974 when he was released from prison after complications resulting from the torture he had undergone.16 Two examples of historians who went into exile were Ciro Cardoso and Ângela de Castro Gomes. While he was completing his PhD thesis in France, Marxist-inspired historian Cardoso was named in military police investigations; he decided not to return and spent the years from 1971 to 1979 in Costa Rica and Mexico.17 De Castro was registered and watched by the police because of her (nonviolent) political activism; in 1971 she went to France for about a year.18 The case of Luiz Basílio Rossi, although fairly typical of what could happen with historians actively interested in politics, deserves
special mention. In 1972–73 the human rights organization Amnesty International decided to expand its mandate with an international campaign against torture. Not only did it publish an influential report against torture worldwide and lead a successful lobby for what was to become the United Nations Convention against Torture in 1984, it also started the quick distribution of casesheets regarding individuals at immediate risk of torture. The first ever such campaign worldwide was for Rossi. A professor of Brazilian history at various higher education institutions, he was abducted by the military in 1973 and tortured, apparently because of his friendship with politically active persons. He was released on bail in October, and in February 1974 went into exile to Belgium. Meanwhile, his trial took place in March 1975; he was not sentenced but an arrest order was issued.19

As the dictatorship waned in the 1980s, more democratic conditions gradually prevailed. This was not always the case, however, as demonstrated by the suspension in 2001 of part 15 of the series Sociedade e história do Brasil (Society and History of Brazil). Written by historian Marco Antonio Villa and distributed to public schools and libraries, this booklet criticized the government of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (in office 1995–2002). Other parts of the series were also attacked. Part 1, about Brazil’s independence in 1822, for example, met with criticism by the governor of Minas Gerais state because it maintained that the Inconfidência Mineira (Minas Gerais conspiracy), a rebellion in 1789, had been organized by the elite in that state for economic reasons. Part 13, about the 1964–85 dictatorship, was criticized by Member of Parliament Yeda Crusius – after she had sought the advice of five historians who remained anonymous – and by a group of ex-military, apparently because the text mentioned the thousands of victims of human rights violations in that period and because it defended the thesis that fear of initiating reforms under President João Goulart (in office 1961–64) was the principal reason for the coup in 1964.20

The dictatorial past lingers on in the collective memory until the present day. In the run-up to the presidential elections of 28 October 2018, historian Janaína de Almeida Teles and her mother Maria Amélia de Almeida Teles were interviewed on television about their experience as victims of torture under the military dictatorship during the broadcast time of one of the two presidential candidates, Fernando Haddad. Both were promptly subjected to a wave of attacks on social media, including death threats, by adherents of the other presidential candidate, Jair Bolsonaro (who won the elections). In December 1972 Maria Amélia de Almeida Teles and her husband, two members of the
Partido Comunista do Brasil (PCdoB), had been imprisoned and tortured in the DOI-CODI detention centre in São Paulo, including by the prison’s director, colonel Carlos Alberto Brilhante Ustra. Janaína Teles and her brother, then five and four years respectively, were kidnapped by the Operação Bandeirante (Oban), also under Ustra’s command, and forced to attend the torture sessions of their parents. In 2008, the Tribunal de Justiça (Court of Justice) in São Paulo declared that Ustra had been a torturer. Punishment of his crimes, however, was prevented by the 1979 amnesty law. Janaína Teles specialized in the history of the military dictatorship.21

More distant periods of Brazilian history were generally less subject to public controversy, although the situation did sometimes become tense. In 2000, for example, the police impeded a protest march organized by two thousand indigenous leaders from across Brazil during the quincentenary of the arrival of the first Portuguese explorers to Brazil in 1500. The violence employed by shock troops against the indigenous activists led the president of the official indigenous institute Fundação Nacional do Índio (FUNAI; National Indian Foundation) to resign in protest.22

The writing of biographies was seriously hampered when the civil code was reformed in 2002, making it mandatory for biographical films and books to receive authorization from the biographee prior to their public release. This caused many authors to practice self-censorship. In addition, several celebrities – such as Garrincha, Pelé, Roberto Carlos, Vinicius de Moraes, Ruy Castro, Teixeirinha and Di Cavalcanti – initiated defamation cases against journalists and historians who risked publishing their unauthorized biographies. After several failed attempts to have the clause repealed on the grounds that it encouraged censorship, the Chamber of Deputies passed the so-called ‘biographies law’ in 2014, allowing the disclosure of biographical information without prior authorization.23

Like the historians discussed above, fact-finding commissions encountered similar obstacles when they tried to cope with the violent past.

Fact-Finding

Specifics about fact-finders between 1964 and 1979, when a certain relaxation of the dictatorship set in, are virtually unknown to this author, but from 1979 onwards their history was quite eventful. During the twilight years of the dictatorship (1979–85), an almost
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unbelievable secret operation of source collection and fact-finding took place. It started when an amnesty law, promulgated in August 1979, gave lawyers piecemeal access to the records of the Supreme Military Court in order to enable them to prepare amnesty requests on behalf of political prisoners. In collaboration with the Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, a team of these lawyers patiently and secretly photocopied and microfilmed the court’s complete archives and stored duplicates abroad for safekeeping. The files contained complete records of all 707 political cases tried in military courts between 1964 and 1979 – 850,000 pages in total. The copying was done secretly because the amnesty law deterred investigation. In addition, when caught, the lawyers faced reprisals and the archives risked being destroyed. The analysis of the materials led to a twelve-volume, 6,946-page report, indicated as ‘Project A’. A summary of this material was published as Brasil: Nunca mais (Brazil: Never Again) in July 1985, a few months after the return to democracy. The report became the top nonfiction bestseller in Brazilian literary history. It described 1,918 accounts of torture from 1964 to 1979. A list with the names of 444 torturers was made public separately in November 1985. The team of authors maintained its anonymity even after the book was published. Years later, in August 2013, a website containing all the ‘Project A’ materials was launched.

Once the dictatorship had fallen, the files that contained or could contain incriminating evidence of the two decades of repression became the subject of heated controversy. Human rights groups and relatives of those tortured, disappeared and assassinated under the dictatorship sought unimpeded access to personal files – and sometimes risked death threats for their efforts. In 1988, the relatives of forty disappeared submitted a petition to the Supremo Tribunal Federal (Supreme Court) under the new habeas data constitutional provision, which established the right of access to personal files, including those held by the security services.

This lack of access to the repression archives also stalled the historical debate about recent Brazilian history, as one leading historian, Carlos Fico, repeatedly signalled. The Brazilian Historical Association protested against an executive order, issued in late 2002, which extended the classification of many official documents for an additional thirty to fifty years. In another development, thousands of pages of documents believed to have been destroyed were rediscovered in 2004. The military and state intelligence agencies had alleged that these documents had been legally incinerated after the return to democracy in 1985, but they had in fact been kept in secret archives.
Although they were rescued, it later transpired that many of these files were kept in deplorable circumstances.28

An official report published by the Secretaria Especial dos Direitos Humanos (SEDH; Special Secretariat for Human Rights) in 2007 after eleven years of research by its Comissão Especial sobre Mortos e Desaparecidos Políticos (CEMDP; Special Commission on Political Deaths and Disappearances), Direito à memória e à verdade (Right to Truth and Memory), shed light on 475 cases of torture and disappearance during the dictatorship. It was an official recognition that human rights violations had been committed during that era.29 However, many armed forces archives on other disappearances or on the suppression of the communist guerrilla uprising in the Araguaia region, state of Pará, in 1967–74, remained closed. A short time later, the Supreme Court ordered the armed forces to open these secret files.30

In 2009, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights intervened in the controversy. It stated that neither time bars nor the 1979 amnesty could be applied to the crimes against humanity committed under the dictatorship – a view examined but not shared by the Supreme Court in 2010.31 However, six months later, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights found that Brazil had violated the right to the truth (‘direito à verdade’) by not adequately investigating the disappearances of sixty-eight peasants and Araguaia guerrillas and that the amnesty law could not be used to block prosecutions in cases of grave human rights violations.32

In July 2012, around the time that the newly installed National Truth Commission again fuelled discussions about the dictatorial past, the office of Tortura nunca mais (Torture Never Again), a civil society group raising awareness of the repression during the dictatorship, was burglarized and archives containing reports on torture victims were stolen.33 In its 2014 report, the National Truth Commission endorsed the Inter-American Court of Human Rights’ view on the amnesty law. The report identified 377 individuals responsible for human rights violations under the dictatorship. As of December 2018, the Supreme Court’s re-examination of the validity of the amnesty law is pending.

More recently, other setbacks have been noted. In September 2016, the newly installed government of President Michel Temer appointed twenty new members to and removed six members from the Amnesty Commission (established to propose laws and reparations for the victims of the dictatorship). Among the new members was Paulo Lopo Saraiva, a former army sergeant during the military regime who had participated in repression activities during the 1964 coup against Goulart. The Movimento por verdade, memória, justiça
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Reparaç\ão (Movement for Truth, Memory, Justice and Reparation) called this a dismantling of the commission. It was the first time since its establishment that commission members had been removed.\textsuperscript{34}

Impunity was not limited to dictatorship-era crimes, as two cases from the 1990s prove. The first involved a historian; the second a centre for popular memory. Although the cases were related to neither history nor memory, they throw light on the activism of historians in the first case, on an organization that focuses on memory, among other things, in the second case, and on the level of violence in both cases (the victims were killed). In June 1994, poet and historian Herm\ógenes da Silva Almeida Filho and lawyer Reinaldo Guedes Miranda were shot dead in Rio de Janeiro. They were members of the human rights commission of the local council that monitored the investigation into two massacres of street children. Both had also reported that they had received threatening notes, apparently relating to their activities on behalf of black people and homosexuals.\textsuperscript{35} In 1996, Francisco Gilson Nogueira de Carvalho, a lawyer of the Centro de Direitos Humanos e Mem\ória Popular (Centre for Human Rights and Popular Memory) in Natal, was shot dead because he had looked into the connections between a death squad (‘the golden boys’) and local authorities in Rio Grande do Norte. An official investigation into his killing was discontinued a year later because sufficient evidence could not be found. In 1997, the parents sued the state for lack of due diligence while investigating the facts surrounding their son’s death. In 2006, however, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights ruled that it had not been demonstrated that Brazil had violated the right to a fair trial and the right to judicial protection in view of the limited factual support available to it.\textsuperscript{36}

From this quick survey, it is clear that fact-finding efforts alternated between success and failure.

Epilogue: Brazil’s Dancing Procession

It is difficult to draw general conclusions from this overview. Some of the developments described here have been summarized or illustrated with only a few examples taken from many. In addition, a major problem is that censorship is a phenomenon that by definition censors want to hide. Much stays in the dark. We can be certain that for every development described here, another has stayed under the radar, especially in a country with such a wide array of theatres as Brazil. No firm trends can be distilled from it, except for the most general (and
obvious) one: historical writing and fact-finding wither in dictatorial conditions and flourish in democratic ones. But even in democracies, little can be taken for granted. For every triumph in terms of openness and understanding, there is a setback when human rights archives are inaccessible, reports withheld, findings distorted and authors intimidated or dismissed. The road to truth, justice and reparation is long and winding.
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