UNITED NATIONS INTELLECTUAL HISTORY PROJECT
The Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF

PAULO SERGIO PINHEIRO

BY

THOMAS G. WEISS

New York, 8 May 2002 and Brasilia, 18 July 2002

Transcribed by Ron Nerio

THOMAS G. WEISS: This is Tom Weiss interviewing Paulo Sergio Pinheiro at The Graduate Center here in New York. Paulo is in New York for the Special General Assembly Session on Children. I wondered whether we might start actually at the beginning, and whether you could tell me a bit about your own family's background and how you think your own childhood, and your own education contributed to your own interests in international cooperation, and more particularly, a preoccupation with human rights.

PAULO SERGIO PINHEIRO: I look backward making some effort to see how I became involved. I think my family was making big plans that I become a diplomat, because there were not very many options. Happily, I escaped the navy, because my grandfather was in the navy, and my family would have been delighted. But happily, I have flat feet and I did not pass the exam. Then I was just to do the competition for the diplomatic service, because in Brazil there is a *concurso*. But it was the very year of the military *coup d'état*, and I was not approved in French though I spoke it fluently. I figured that I had some kind of a refusal to work for the government in 1964.

Then I thought that my interests in the international community would be to serve as a diplomat. I had a scholarship to Paris where I studied. I did my graduate studies at the *Institut de Hautes Études Politiques,* where I stayed four years and received my doctorate. But then I returned to Brazil. I think it was a progressive involvement, because at the beginning I was in the political science department. In the first ten years, I was doing research on social history—for example, the Third International and large American and European socialist and communist parties, the anarcho-syndicalists, anarchists. Then I had some connections with the international scene, through the working class.

Then, in the next ten years, I was doing research about police repression—comparative social history of repression of the working class. Then I became rather involved with human rights. Fourteen years ago, I established the Center for the Study of Violence. My formal involvement—I think that perhaps this new career happened because, since 1985, I came to teach in this country, at Columbia University, until 1992. Then I was teaching at other universities. I think that I was exposed to the international debate much more than if I had just stayed in Brazil.

But in the beginning of the 1990s, the Brazilian minister of foreign affairs was proposing me to be special rapporteur on Cuba. It was a somewhat strange thing, because Brazil normally doesn't support resolutions on Cuba. But there was a Brazilian, Gilberto Saboia, who was the ambassador to Geneva. And in April 1995 he suggested to the chairman of CHR (Commission on Human Rights)—I think he was from Bangladesh or Malaysia—my name to be the special rapporteur on Burundi. I think why I was selected was because I was not European, American, or African and I was fluent in French. I think this was why, because I am not a specialist in Burundi. Then I immediately came to the meeting of the special rapporteurs in Geneva.

If I look backwards, it is not a complete accident, but I never had any plans to be involved with the UN. My daughter, Marina, when I was beginning to have several UN appointments, she said, "Another UN-paid job?" because these are all unpaid jobs. But in fact, I devoted so much time since 1995—I think one third of my time I devoted to Burundi, and to the sub-commission, and to the working groups, and now to Myanmar. But it was an unexpected involvement. It wasn't something that I intended to do.

TGW: I wondered if we could just go back a bit. Obviously, Brazil is a Catholic country, and you went to the Catholic university. Do you think that this background had

anything to do with informing your own commitment to human rights? How do you see religion and faith, entering into the equation?

PSP: I think that this was very positive, because at the beginning of university, I began to be attracted to all the debate of social justice. It was a very convenient moment, because we had a good pope, John XXIII. I read a lot of his biographies and his memoirs, and all the social encyclicals, *Pacem in Terra, Mater Magister*, and the Second Vatican Council. And I participated in many activities with other Catholic professors, progressive people in university, particularly a very renowned Catholic thinker, a Jesuit sociologist, Father Fernando Bastas de Avila.

My indignation—I was in the window of my apartment and I saw some people, part of the police, putting a man inside the trunk of a car. I was very shocked about that. But I didn't connect—my international involvement, at least rationally, was not developed from this debate on social justice and Christian solidarism, or the debate of the Jesuits and the councilors of John XXIII, discussing the social responsibility of Christians. My first job was a job at the Christian Association of Entrepreneurs in Sao Paulo. I think that I was compelled to address these human rights issues because of my Catholic formation.

But it was not because of my family. My mother's parents—my maternal great-grandfather was Brazilian. The first of my great-grandfathers had arrived in Brazil in the seventeenth century. Just an anecdote—my great-grandmother had the same name of one of the three daughters of my first relative who came from Portugal to Brazil in 1960. They wrecked, and all the women in the family, from the seventeenth century to 1944—because my great-grandmother died the day I was born—she had one of the names of the three girls that were saved of this wreckage of her father.

My maternal great-grandmother was German, from a family of merchants who came to Brazil before the First World War. And the other side of my father, they are very humble Portuguese migrants. My grandfather was a taxi driver, and before he was a shoemaker manufacturer. But my father was very much involved in employee labor unions. I think that my connection with social labor law was also through my father—very strange ways. But I had never thought that I would be involved with the United Nations. I didn't have the slightest idea of the United Nations.

TGW: In student circles in the 1960s, you mentioned the debates about social justice. I wonder what role liberation theology and *dependencia* theory, which were certainly ideas that circulated in other parts of the world—to what extent were these preoccupations among you and your colleagues in coffee shops and bars?

PSP: In my groups, my colleagues—that is, the classmates that I had—they were very progressive people. I was more a Christian-democrat. It was a third way at that point, but I was much more conservative than they. Those who would be involved by Catholic action after the Chinese Revolution, in Cuba they became left activists. They were very much militant. Some were even going to become workers. But I was just following that. I was not really involved. After the *coup d'état*, I went to France. I was not exiled.

And *dependencia* theory was the debate. Fernando Henrique Cardoso was—he was not a leftist leader, but he was an outspoken critic of the dictatorship. His influence was immense. He was an intellectual who was greatly respected, but in university circles he was very much—but much more in the 1970s than in the 1960s, because in the 1960s he was abroad. His most influential book is from the beginning of the 1970s, about *dependencia* and development. I met him for the first time in 1967, in Paris.

In Brazil, the people became involved. Middle class came from the Church, from the Catholic Church—lay people. They were the militants and guerrillas. Most of them came out from the Communist Party or the Catholic Church. You must read a book that is called *A Miracle, a Universe*. It is a book by Lawrence Wechsler, describing the operation that made the book *Torture in Brazil*. *Torture in Brazil* can give you an idea of the biographies of those militants.

TGW: Well, actually, I guess at the beginning of 1964 in Brazil, but elsewhere in Latin America as well, exile, disappearances, murder—these were fairly widespread phenomena. Did this situation strike you as somehow going against Brazilian history and Brazilian culture? Or did this seem a normal development in Latin America at the time? How did it strike you as a young man?

PSP: In Brazil it was normal, because in fact white people and middle class kids—they were not massacred. They did not disappear. I think that 1964 was a very important rupture inside the elites in Brazil. To give you an idea, most of the generals of the dictatorship made revolts in the 1920s. They went to prison. They were severely repressed. But very few of them were killed.

The elites began to be killed and tortured in Brazil after the 1960s. This was very shocking, because this was not supposed to happen. The police just killed the black and the poor, but not the whites, and the affluent, and middle class. It was not normal. You killed Indians, and black, and poor, but not the white middle class or elite—just after 1964. I must say that in the decade between 1937 and 1945, some intellectuals were militant, but repression was much more focused than the open repression of the 1960s.

Another interesting thing—in Brazil I never thought about Latin America. I didn't even know about Latin America. We discovered Latin America in Paris or in Santiago in exile. It was after the exile that we became—there were just a few eccentric intellectuals in Brazil that dealt with Latin America. We didn't feel part of Latin America. We thought we were different. The Brazilian diaspora during the 1960s and 1970s—Fernando Henrique Cardoso contributed a lot about that, because of his research. But in the university, I didn't read anything about Latin America. Spanish I had learned in high school. That was a good thing. But we don't feel ourselves as Latin Americans. Even now, Latin America seems an intellectual representation of the left. We are in MERCOSUR (*Mercado del Sur*), but we are not yet full Latin Americans.

TGW: What else did you discover in Paris besides Latin America? You were there from 1967 to 1971. I think that I was really transformed by political science, or sociology, or social studies in Paris.

PSP: It was very strange, because immediately after Paris I came to the United States in 1974, and the first time that I taught in Paris was 1992. It was very strange, because I became a social historian in the United States because of the people I was connected with were mostly social scientists. But I did discover Marxism. I read Marxism a lot in Paris, or the Marxist critical authors—Nicos Poulantzas, [Louis] Althusser, Michel Foucault. We have all those icons—[Roland] Barthes and [Jean-Paul] Sartre, in his last version. I think that my intellectual formation was in Paris and not in Brazil, where I just did a law degree. I had very good teachers, but I didn't pay too much attention because I was not intending to be a lawyer but a diplomat. When I really studied was in Paris, not in Rio.

TGW: What do you recall of May 1968?

PSP: Ah, that is good, because it was a very strange impression at the very moment of the revolution, or *les évenements*. You had a sensation of the suspension of time, because things didn't happen. A lot of things were happening, but you had this emptiness. I remember Brazilians who were intending to leave France because they were in panic. And of course, I went to all the meetings, and I was in the Comité Paritaire at the Institut d'Études Politiques. For me, it was the seismic event in my life—the critique of the university and the possibility of revolt and of active involvement in political life. I was also reading Herbert Marcuse and all the radical critique of power, of political science.

I think I became more connected with these issues because of the May revolution. And in a certain way—I was not a leader, but I participated when I could. I was the only foreigner in that *Comité*. You had students and professors in equal numbers. My school was invaded by fascists. I remember barricading against the fascists, and all that. But it was a very strange sensation when you were inside the events.

TGW: And how did Brazilian politics appear from overseas? Many people in these interviews have talked about their encounters with other cultures in universities. It gave them new perspectives, new insights on their own country, their own political problems. And you mentioned discovering Latin America. I wondered whether there was anything else in the French education system that really became a preoccupation in terms of the development of your own ideas.

PSP: It was interesting that I discovered the University of Sao Paulo in Paris, because everybody was there. The first time that I met Cardoso, as I said, was in 1967, and all of his colleagues—very important people like the sociologists, the anthropologists expelled by the military from the University of Sao Paulo. They were all teaching or they came to Paris to visit

Alain Touraine. He was one of the main links between Brazil, Latin America, and Paris at the *École de Hautes Études*, the School of Advanced Studies in social sciences. He had a seminar that was coordinated by a Brazilian.

When I discovered sociology and anthropology, I discovered this dealing with *Tristes Tropiques* (Sad Tropics) in Paris. There I discovered Latin America, but I had also discovered the social sciences. I was so much enthusiastic meeting these authors who were alive—meeting, and discussing, and reading them. It was a privilege, really a privilege. I didn't study at the University of Sao Paulo. I studied at the Catholic University in Rio.

TGW: In Rio?

PSP: In Rio, as a lawyer. But I made my *licence* in sociology in Vincennes, which was the university created after 1968. But for my practice, the decisive thing was the University of Sao Paulo in exile in Paris. Dozens of people were in Paris. Some were in the U.K. and they came to Paris. And Cardoso was an attraction, also.

TGW: You've mentioned that it was a bit of a surprise subsequently to become involved with the United Nations. I wondered whether the world of the United Nations, including Bretton Woods, the financial institutions, whether these were in the curriculum or discussed by students.

PSP: In Paris?

TGW: Yes.

PSP: Nothing at all. These seminars were very much worried about fascism, about the Third International, about popular democracies. I don't remember taking any seminar on international law or international institutions. And I don't think this existed too much. It was not fashionable. The UN was something old-fashioned.

I think I discovered the United Nations very, very late. The first thing that I did was a Conference on Disarmament in Mexico in the 1970s. I don't remember who was the under-secretary-general, a Swede, for disarmament. It was my first contact. When I was at law school I went to a huge international conference, a very important organization in Geneva, the International Commission of Jurists. But the United Nations—we didn't care about the United Nations in Paris. Of course, we followed the conference about Vietnam. I went there to see people arrive, the Vietnamese. The things that I went to were Vietnamese and Brazilian demonstrations with Sartre and all that. But the United Nations—nil, zero. Strange.

TGW: Yes, it is.

PSP: Do you hear the same with other people of my generation?

TGW: People who are older would say the same thing. Basically, when they were in university in the 1950s, the UN was a modest if not nonexistent thing. Some very much older people began teaching about the UN in the 1950s. So it was different. But it is interesting in the formative years not to be aware of this.

PSP: Not at all. Complete ignorance, I'd rather say—not belligerence, ignorance.

TGW: What about something that obviously enters into UN debates, then as well as today—the *tiers monde*. I presume that somehow ideas about developing countries, or the third force, entered sometime in this period—the first UNCTAD (UN Conference on Trade and Development) being in 1964.

PSP: The famous conference on solidarity in Cuba—everything that was around Cuba, but not around the United Nations. International conferences, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), [Josip Broz] Tito, Sukarno, [Kwame] Nkrumah in Ghana, [Gamal Abdel] Nasser—these were the guides, not the UN.

TGW: What about the Non-Aligned Movement? When did this enter your consciousness as a phenomenon, and did Latin America or Brazil fit?

PSP: Ah, yes, because I was very much attracted by foreign policy, because since the 1960s we have in Brazil an independent external policy—that is, the recognition of the Soviet Union, of the popular democracies, of China. And we had a president, in the end of the 1950s, beginning of the 1960s, who launched that. I was very much following all this. There was a bright minister of foreign affairs, Santiago Dantas, pursuing this orientation. Before him, Brazil was very conservative, very much linked to the United States. We had broken our relations with the Soviet Union immediately after the Second World War. Only in the 1960s did we reestablish relations.

I had some involvement, some interest in foreign policy, before I went to Paris. That I forgot to mention. I went to several conferences to see the Brazilian ministers, or even to occasions where the president spoke about foreign policy. But it was a link that I forgot. This was my introduction to foreign policy.

TGW: So after your education in France, you returned to Sao Paulo, and you discovered Sao Paulo.

PSP: The awful city that I don't like. I am exiled there.

TGW: So you set diplomacy aside.

PSP: Unfortunately. It was a dictatorship. I tried twice. My French professor was in panic, was offended, because I didn't pass it. I had spoken French since I was seven years old. There was no excuse, but 1964 was a difficult year. And then, because I went to France, I had this scholarship—I forgot this. I had a good job in a university. I was married and then I gave up. But really, I didn't become a diplomat because I was seeing what my friends were obliged to

do with the military, and I was not happy. I became more leftist than when I had the intention to become a diplomat.

TGW: What were your first students like in Sao Paolo? What were they interested in that was different from what you were interested in? I mean, you had been gone for years—

PSP: I taught thirty years. My students said they were very much the children of the May revolution. They were reading Wilhelm Reich, Marcuse, and Nicos Poulantzas. All the authors that I was reading, they were reading. They were very much interested, of course, by the resistance to dictatorship. Very small acts were acts of protest. Then I had students who were involved in the resistance to the government. And they were somewhat politicized in terms of the student movement, but more radical than I was in my school days, my university days. But they were, more or less, a reflection of the professors like myself. Most of us were arriving from London, or from Paris, or from the U.K. The students reflected our readings and our opposition to the dictatorship—very Marxist, reading a lot of commentators of Marxism.

TGW: And how much room was there for open criticism at that point of the government within universities?

PSP: In the State University of Campinas, because it was a compromise of scientists with the military, we had much more freedom than in the University of Sao Paulo. But I remember once receiving a labor MP who was of a very leftist orientation, and there was some Brazilian intelligence the conference—but openly. When we invited Alain Touraine to speak about the Portuguese revolution, the intelligence guys asked me to attend. But in Campinas, probably there wasn't one other student that could be imprisoned, but there was a huge freedom compared to Sao Paulo.

You were much less surveyed in Campinas, which is ninety kilometers from Sao Paulo. Why? Because it was a brand new university, and the rector was very protective of all the communists and Marxists. I remember a joke. I invited Eric Hobsbawm to a conference there in 1975, and the rector offered a lunch for him. He said, “You see all these young people. They are all communists, but they are very efficient—very good professors. I like them.” Eric was laughing. That was the atmosphere.

I remember just one professor went to jail. The rector of the university went to visit him and he was released. That was from 1971 to 1983. Thanks to a gentleman’s agreement of the rector, a serious scientist, with the intelligence and repression, there was a fair amount of freedom in the university.

TGW: I wonder whether you might describe your own academic itinerary. You were at Campinas, and at Sao Paulo, and had a number of visiting assignments in the United States. What do you think you contributed in each of those contexts, and what do you think you got out of each of those contexts that enables you to play your present role as a human rights activist, and now minister of state in the current government?

PSP: My exposure—I will tell you another joke, a very strange thing. In the 1960s, an American woman was a friend to the Kennedys. She established a foundation to invite Brazilians to come to the United States. We spent fifteen days in a summer course in Harvard, one week in Washington visiting people like Robert Kennedy, and ten days with a family in the Connecticut-New England area. I was one of those fellows. Who are those guys now? In the Cardoso government, the vice president of the Republic of Brazil, the minister of development, the former leftist governor of Brasilia, a leftist minister in the military supreme court, the former minister of justice—a former communist also—and several other senators or members of the

house. We were leftists, but we were not anti-America. Very few people in Brazil are anti-United States. Brazilians, left or right, are fascinated by the USA.

In this country, I get accustomed to good libraries, to serious research. For ten years, I was researching in the National Archives.

TGW: Who would you describe as your mentors?

PSP: My "icons," I would say. My icon is Eric Hobsbawm. He is a very good friend of mine. I see him every year. And intellectually, E.P. Thompson, also. And of course, Nicos Poulantzas. He was a Greek. He was a Marxist critic in political science. He knew very much all the political science. I think the basis for my formation was Eric Hobsbawm, Barrington Moore also. I read everything by Barrington Moore, even his papers from the government where he was during the war. Barrington Moore, E.P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, and Nicos Poulantzas are my icons.

Then I think that my real formation in research was in this country. I just came, in the beginning, as a post-doctoral fellow to Yale. I came to Yale two times, in 1974 and 1975. I was a guest scholar at the Wilson Center. Then I had access to the Library of Congress in very privileged ways. Then I taught at Columbia, Notre Dame, Brown. After, I went to Europe—Oxford. For me to come here was to have some time to study and to update. I think I became more modern, more cosmopolitan, thanks to coming to the States. Looking backwards, I spent so much time. If you count the last thirty years, I think six years of this or more—ten years. Twenty spring terms I spent here.

This training was more in skills than intellectual formation. Of course, the other scholars—most recently, that is, all the scholars who discussed political transitions—they are not exactly Americans. Guillermo O'Donnell is Argentinean, but he is here. Juan Linz is Spanish,

but he is at Yale. Among American scholars, Alfred Stepan is more than a colleague. He is a mentor, but a dear friend also. I work a lot with him.

You can't imagine the influence of Thomas Skidmore on contemporary studies in Brazil. I dare say he had perhaps more influence in the public debate in Brazil than in the States. Of course, he has formed dozens of Ph.D.'s in this country. He is a crucial figure, much more than he thinks. My generation and all my students have read all his books and were influenced by him. He was also very important in terms of giving value to research, to documents, to access. And he had the role also of validating race relations research. There has just been published a book in Brazil about the "Brazilianists." I think the leader was Skidmore. He had an immense intellectual influence in terms of researching and studying contemporary history, because history in Brazil was stopped at the empire. He helped to put the republic—that is, the nineteenth century and the twentieth century—on the map.

TGW: He actually mentions you in the preface to his book on 500 years of history in Brazil. He is quite a historian. I just finished reading that.

PSP: He is very generous with me. Tom had also importance as a mediator for the social sciences investment in the Ford Foundation. His contribution is outstanding. I put Skidmore beside my icons as an example of how to work in terms of research and writing, and also as a commentator, as a political commentator in Brazil. His interviews—he's amazing.

TGW: What types of academic research and academic literature do you think have the most impact on governments, or government policy, and why?

PSP: What kinds of research?

TGW: Yes, what kinds of research, what kinds of writing, what kinds of academic productions make a difference to policymakers?

PSP: Political scientists and, of course, economists have influence. Of course, for the effective government, sociological surveys are very important. Among political scientists, I have another icon. That is Norberto Bobbio, an Italian philosopher and political scientist.

TGW: Yes, somebody else recently told me about his work.

PSP: I have read all his works. He has published thirty books or more. Norberto Bobbio had an enormous influence on his generation. Hannah Arendt, also, and Celso Lafer. He is the minister of foreign affairs. He had his Ph.D. with Hannah Arendt. He is a disciple of Bobbio, also.

TGW: Actually, Tom Skidmore said that I would enjoy meeting Celso Lafer.

PSP: Yes, he is adorable. He is a wonderful intellectual. He is into literature. Of course, politicians read literature also. But the basic influence is from those with a political science orientation, like Norberto Bobbio. I think on the left and on the right in Brazil, Norberto Bobbio and Hannah Arendt were the most influential. Of course, Eric Hobsbawm has had all his books published in Portuguese—even the jazz, and all his interviews published in Portuguese. He had an importance for social science, but not for politicians.

I think I must go.

TGW: Why don't I just ask one more question and then we'll stop and continue in Brazil? Why did you found the Center for the Study of Violence? What difference did you see this center's making that a university department would not make? What did you hope to do when you began that center in 1987?

PSP: I think I gave you an article describing my thinking, but I can send it again. I think, to sort of be immodest, to praise myself—not just myself, but my colleagues as well—I think the center made a difference precisely because we were able to tackle the question of violence,

instead of only human rights. We adopted the model of the Center for the Study of Human Rights in Colombia, but we put violence on the top of the agenda. The topic was beginning to have the attention of the university, and it was the beginning of the increase of violent crime. We were able to profit from the transition at the beginning of the democratic change in Brazil. On the other hand, the acknowledgement of this topic as an issue in sociology and political science—there was also, thanks to Norberto Bobbio, the importance of violence in all the discussion of the theory of the state.

In fourteen years, I think we have had some impact on the debate. In the beginning, it was very difficult. People don't pay attention. But just to give you an idea of how much we succeeded, two years ago there was a selection among 130 projects at Sao Paolo State Foundation for Research. Thirty projects were selected, and then finally ten. Just two among the ten were in social science. Guess who? The Fernando Henrique [Cardoso] center—the center that he founded in the 1970s—and our center. We received an eleven-year grant, and it was in a competition with international referees. It was not a decision just among Brazilians. This is a sign that we managed really to have some impact on the social debate.

TGW: But was there something that the center could do that a university department of sociology could not do?

PSP: Departments in universities are the burial of research. That is where you bury research. Department meetings are a kind of psychodrama. I always escape the meetings. Only when I have the feeling that I will be "stabbed in the back" do I go to the meetings. I don't take very seriously academic life in Brazil. The importance of university for me as a platform for research and for intervening in the public debate. But I hate academic life—committees, departments. I have been chair of the department. But in the last ten years, I just escaped.

TGW: It's mainly research, then, that motivates you?

PSP: Yes. And we were able to do research and to intervene. I think that I have written, since 1979, one thousand pieces in the media, in terms of articles. This was not very well-considered in the beginning, to intervene in the press, because you have to stay in the university while doing research. I think we broke also a certain tradition of silence—do research and keep silent.

TGW: This is the end of the first tape. We shall continue in July in Brasilia. Thank you.

TGW: This is a resumed conversation that began in New York on the 8th of May with Paolo Sergio Pinheiro. Only this time we are in Brasilia, with Tom Weiss still at the microphone. During the first session we mainly concentrated on your background, your personal life, and university career. Today I would like to really move in on human rights. Several people in these interviews have suggested that human rights may be the most revolutionary idea that has come in, been massaged, and used by the United Nations. Would you agree or disagree?

PSP: The first thing that I must say is that it was a very long process, because you know that until the 1970s the United Nations was not doing very much about human rights in terms of monitoring. They were just defining standards, writing conventions. I think that the real change was when the first special rapporteur, or the other special procedures—Resolution 1503 and the struggle against apartheid were activated. At the same time, I consider it an extraordinary miracle that sovereign states are supposed to abide to some norms and some treaties. Even with so many problems and obstacles, the Commission on Human Rights is something miraculous. If you take into consideration the history of modern states, it is something very strange for the states—the existence of the Commission on Human Rights, even with all the difficulties, all the problems.

I think there are some very positive signs. Of course, there was an enormous evolution in terms of the specificity of several rights. Today more than ever, more groups have norms, have rights to be protected and promoted. That is an extraordinary development. On the other hand, I think that, despite all the efforts by Kofi Annan and also by Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who was responsible for all the world conferences, I think that the United Nations as a whole continues to be dominated by political considerations, and not by human rights. I think it is very revealing the scarce resources that are allocated to human rights. It is ridiculous. I think it is less than symbolic. The Office of the High Commissioner is so much dependant on funds provided by states, most of them earmarked. I think that this is very risky and dangerous.

I would not say that the core of the United Nations has a benign neglect for human rights. But I think that the Security Council would be to have more opening to human rights. The Oscar Arias formula was very convenient, for instance, to the participation of some of my colleagues in important crises. But despite the efforts, and the speeches, and the symbolic gestures of Kofi Annan, I don't think the United Nations as a whole moves predominantly in the region of human rights. Perhaps it is very far away from there.

TGW: I want to open two parentheses. You mentioned two topics that others, speaking more generally, have talked about. One is global ad hoc conferences, world conferences like the one in Vienna on human rights (UN World Conference on Human Rights). And the other is the staff at the High Commission, or those working for Mary Robinson, who labor in the vineyards of the United Nations. I would like to ask you specifically whether you believe these global ad hoc conferences push out the debate. Some people argue they are expensive jamborees. Others say they are essential to the formation of norms. So I would like to ask you, one, what do you

think of the conferences? And two, if it is not unfair, how would you generalize about the quality of the international civil service—the people who work on human rights within the UN?

PSP: Well, let's begin with that. That is, I have been involved with the UN for seven years now. I don't know exactly how many there are in Geneva—perhaps 200. They are exceptional people. The people who have worked with me, the members of the secretariat, are extraordinarily devoted and motivated people. But their situation is outrageous in terms of human rights. I think that ninety-five percent have temporary contracts. I can't imagine how you can intend to impose accountability for human rights if you are not able to succeed in promoting minimum ILO (International Labour Organization) standards inside the OHCHR (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights).

TGW: We are back after a short intermission. We were focusing on the people who work there.

PSP: Yes. I think that ILO standards must apply to the Office of the High Commissioner. It is not the fault of the High Commissioner, of course. But I don't know how to explain those constraints. I think it is disastrous. For instance, my assistant, who is wonderful—she is great, and she works with the High Commissioner on China—she was obliged to take ten days of vacation so that she will have a new contract. This is complete madness. If an American enterprise functioned like that, it would be outrageous. To the United Nations, I think that is scandalous.

TGW: Well, we have our own scandals.

PSP: Yes, not a good word to say these days. But in any case, I think that the majority of people are committed, excellent professionals. But they are submitted to outrageous conditions of work. I think that is unacceptable for an office that deals with human rights. In every meeting

of the special rapporteur, I am always protesting the psychodrama of blaming, complaining. I think everything is secondary. But I think the problems must be addressed properly by the new High Commissioner. We probably will know next week who it will be.

On the conferences, I am completely with the group of people who think they are tremendously useful. Of course, perhaps Vienna was not the best place to organize the human rights conference. It was a very lousy organization. Vienna was a mess. It was very badly organized. But in any case, I think it is great to have the human rights conference in Beijing and in Durban. It is extraordinary. Of course, the best place to have the Office of the High Commissioner is not Geneva. Of course, this will not change. I think it must be in another place. I think that it would be good to have. You have New York in the First World and Geneva in the First World. You must have the office in a Third World country—in Egypt, or Brazil, or South Africa. I think that the conference compensates this localization, this location, of the UN, and the office, and most of the UN in the First World. I think it is time to change that. I think that the United Nations must make a small effort to locate some organizations outside the First World as a symbolic gesture for the South.

TGW: Why is it that you think that conferences like Vienna and Beijing are important? What is the impact?

PSP: The impact is enormous, because when you organize this in Asia, or when you organize this in Africa, it is extraordinary the effect of mobilization, of pressure, on the governments. I am enthusiastic about conferences. I think that you have states more compelled to bear or to tolerate the presence of NGOs (nongovernmental organizations). I think it is much better than to have conferences in the UN in New York. Nowadays, in New York it is a fortress. The UN is almost impossible to enter there. Geneva is less rigid, but it is also a sort of fortress.

I put in the same category the Social Forum in Porto Alegre**.** It was extraordinary. Porto Alegre is a First World capital, but is in Brazil and is in Latin America. Not only the working process inside the conference, the discussion of the documents, but I think this conference had effects on civil society and NGOs. I am enthusiastic. I think Durban was great. It was much better than Vienna, of course, in terms of participation of NGOs and mobilization.

TGW: In speaking about the institution, it is not a secret that there are tensions among agencies and amongst players within the system. Have you, in your missions, either in Burundi, or in Myanmar, or in other capacities—do you see that tensions are healthy, or do you see that they are unhealthy? I am thinking, for example, if we took a specific case of you in Myanmar and Razali. How do people in different parts of the system make it work or not make it work?

PSP: If there are tensions, that is a sign that they are acting and that they working. If you don't have tensions, then you have a lousy agency. I think that the United Nations is not properly a family or even a community. But comparing my experiences between Burundi and Burma, it depends in each country on the resident representative. In Burma, Patrice Coeur-Bizot I think is someone who is able to coordinate, to interact, to make several agencies interact. In Burundi, it was very difficult to coordinate interaction of the agencies. My colleague on Myanmar, the UN special envoy of the SG ambassador, Razali and myself, we never had problems, even the last time he asked me to publish a communiqué to the press supporting his mission. We have a lot of communication. But I think that is first because my ego is not very salient. I don't have any problems of competition with Razali. He is a senior diplomat. I like and admire him very much. I am curious about him. He is a close friend of a Brazilian ambassador friend of mine. Since the beginning, we have had very good cooperation.

In practice in Myanmar there was the full cooperation and full consultation—but because of ourselves. And also because I made an effort to go to DPA, to go to New York to visit Danilo Turk. Then I tried to shuttle between New York and Geneva, as I did with Boutros-Ghali. I met with Kofi Annan once on behalf of my group of special rapporteurs.

I think that what happens with me is OK because I make some effort. I was very happy that they elaborated on "principled engagement," one of my concepts in Myanmar. Perhaps for seven years I did not create disasters. I am not a troublemaker. But usually not too much attention is paid to the special rapporteurs. It is another world.

I will give you a comparison. I respect him very much, but the UN representative in Burundi was a kind of a viceroy. He is an African diplomat, very shrewd, Abdou Abdallah. I had the sensation that I was treated as a nuisance when I arrived in Burundi. I think it was his perception, perhaps.

TGW: In this article that you have been working on for *Global Governance*, I would like you just to tease out here orally your views about being rather more discrete or less discrete—the role of a special rapporteur who, in fact, is there at the pleasure of the government. So there are limitations obviously to how much annunciation and in which context you can do it, and how that is contrasted with what many NGOs think ought to be done at higher decibel levels and with more visibility. What is the balance between these two functions?

PSP: If I take the most important NGOs, like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, for fifteen years they are not going to the country. Then there is a big difference. I can go. They allow me to go. Of course, I try to exchange ideas. Now I am very harsh on political prisoners. I am beginning to discuss the research on access to justice. The government was somewhat uncomfortable, I think, about that in my next report. There are limits. Of course,

I submit advance copies—I think this is normal—advance copies of my report. They make some comments and some suggestions. That is, I do it for all sides. I share with the people that I trust. Perhaps that is the reason that when I present my report, there is a consensus. Everybody has seen the report before and they are not surprised.

I think the main difference is that Amnesty and Human Rights Watch can survive without engaging with governments. I am obliged to engage, because if I want to have some impact—not only impact, but some influence. I am not speaking for the media, even if I am always speaking for the media when I am abroad. But I think that you have to be very rigorous, very fair, but you don't need to offend. Everybody knows that there is a military government. I know the military for a quarter of my life, for twenty-five years. I know very well who they are. I don't need to add something to the analysis that many journalists or social scientists and historians are doing. I think that the danger is to be too much diplomatic. Some rapporteurs in the past—not my colleagues now—as I have read, some were too much soft on the governments.

What I tell the governments is that if they don't cooperate with me, I will go and they will have it much worse. I am sure that they have not available too many people to have this principled engagement, to have some courtesy with the military government. If they push too much, I would announce that I will go. I don't want to stay forever in this mandate if I don't see real progress.

I think the NGOs make tons of recommendations. They can repeat the recommendations. They can invent other recommendations. But most of the time they cannot assess. I think it is a completely different mandate. I think I said in the piece, in the text, "We are creatures of the states. And they in turn are creatures of civil society." It is very difficult to be delegates of leviathans, of sovereign states. It is very complicated. That is what is amazing in this human

rights machinery. If states mandate completely loose cannons—most of the time we are—to investigate about other states, I think this is amusing. I keep doing this because I think it is rather amusing.

TGW: When you founded your own center in 1987, the Center for the Study of Violence, how did you approach civil rights violations in Brazil? With the same tentative, independent, but hands-off policy? Or did you see a different role for the center?

PSP: Completely. I was always making scandals, and denouncing and denouncing in the Commission on Human Rights and the press. No, I don't behave in my country. Even in my government job I don't behave. People think that I am completely mad. I have the support of the president. I went through a terrible crisis because the minister of justice left government in a crisis. It was terrible. Even this morning, I repeated in a public meeting that I am not in this job to protect agents of the states that perpetrate human rights violations. They know that they cannot count on me. But in the Brazilian civil society, or in this job, I am completely different from what I do in Myanmar. When I am in my own country, in government or civil society, I am much more disagreeable than in Myanmar. Some people hate me in Brazil. I have the impression that I just have friends. But my wife, Ana Luiza [Pinheiro], is always telling me that I have a bunch of people that hate me, really. But it is different. I am not a special rapporteur in my country. Now it is rather strange, because I am in government—but just for a while. I will leave there soon.

TGW: We are speaking, I guess, of advocacy here, and about the efficacy of tactics. What about in terms of research? In your view, what are the advantages of being associated with the United Nations—the research parts of the United Nations—versus universities, versus institutional think tanks, as yours is, at the University of Sao Paulo? Are some of these more

effective at doing certain kinds of research and pushing out the envelope on ideas and human rights than others?

PSP: I think that is essential. And I don't think that the office of the High Commissioner devotes too much in terms of research. I think that is one of the weaknesses. I don't blame Mary Robinson, because I like her so much. It is not her fault. But I think that the office of the High Commissioner must be articulating a network with serious research centers in the world. There are so many. There are not so many, but there are a few in the States, in Latin America, in Europe. I think that the Office of the High Commissioner cannot substitute all this work that is being done in all the world. On the other hand, there are places in the realm that super work is being done. For instance, the magic, the miracle of the *Human Development Report* that Sakiko Fukada-Paar is doing. She is a wonderful person. For almost twelve years, she managed to have a very strong—and her predecessor also.

We are just launching now—I am not on the board, just a referee of one chapter—a report on violence made by the World Health Organization (WHO). The ILO does extraordinary things in terms of child labor, slave labor. But the office of the High Commissioner is very incipient. It is just beginning. The site is OK. It is good. Some countries are discussing it, like Brazil—think that it is necessary to have a kind of world report on human rights.

TGW: As you look back to the use of special rapporteurs, and really the beginning of a functioning of a kind of established network within the United Nations—that, of course, was the height of the Cold War. How do you look back on the framing of issues over that time, in particular the clash that we had for years between civil and political on one hand, and economic and social on the other? Now that seems kind of beside the point, but why was it taken seriously for so long? Was it only ideological?

PSP: In the beginning, I think so. Latin America helped a lot, because you were having military dictatorships that we not really aligned. I think that Brazil never left the Non-Aligned Movement or the Group of 77 (G-77). This is just an example. Argentina I think was always there. They were not really aligned with the United States. They were not really in the Cold War. I think that the exposure of the military dictatorship was very helpful to address, to pass the Helsinki agreements on Eastern Europe. I think that in the beginning it was very ideological. But in the process, I think that the criticism of civil and political rights violations was greater than the ideological dispute between the United States and the Soviet bloc—or the capitalist world and the so-called socialist bloc.

Afterwards, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, things are much easier. But just for a while, because in this moment we are witnessing from all sides several considerations against the human rights mechanism. What is very sad, not only from the former Eastern world, or not only from Asia or Africa, but also from the West, from Europe and the United States, this is terrible. The last session of the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) was a disaster.

I was in a seminar that Brazil organized on the universalization of inter-American norms. There were people of fourth grade that cannot say anything.

I think that it was great, the end of the Cold War, the Berlin Wall. But the opportunity was missed. I hope this moment must be overcome because the world must survive. The human rights mechanisms, treaty bodies. I think they cannot survive this. There are now around forty UN special rapporteurs. But the CHR creates special rapporteurs, and they don't give the means. There is a call to cut the possibility of the examination of country in the commission. In the sub-commission, they did this already. We are not allowed to discuss country cases or to pass resolutions on country specific cases.

TGW: If you were czar of human rights research, where would you place your resources in the next ten to fifteen years? What are the biggest challenges?

PSP: I will say this, but I think that I am not very convinced. I think that the biggest challenge is to change the status of social and economic rights for progressive rights that can be accountable. That is, the progressive implementation. I think that the main challenge is how to change the nature—like Philip Alston who proposed the optional protocol for the government on economic and social rights. Then I think what is very important is research on poverty. Of course another area is democracy—not only rule of law, but how to make democracy something more alive, more real for the peoples of Eastern Europe, of Africa, and Asia. How to universalize not just elections? Elections are somewhat universalized, but not democracy. I think that social and economic rights and real, substantive democracy—not elections—but a minimum style of democracy. If I had two options, these would be the options.

Of course, you cannot abandon the denunciation, the research, or how the judiciary operates—the police, gross human rights violations, violence. I think that the challenge of this century is how to make more operative social and economic human rights standards.

TGW: Now that we no longer have silos for civil and political, and economic and social—these are all indivisible—is there any downside to approaching human rights as indivisible, as everything is linked to everything else?

PSP: I think that this will be the dream if this will be the possibility. But the majority of the world is against that, if you listen. The African group cannot bear criticism about horrendous things happening in these countries. Sometimes they try to suppress any debate of the most basic civil and political rights. It is much more difficult. Their emphasis on social and economic rights is that they are trying to dispense with civil and political rights.

And I think that the juncture, this political juncture, is awful for that—the struggle against terrorism. That is, not *the* struggle but the *kind* of struggle that is being imposed on the world by the United States. So I would like to sleep for several years and to wake up in another international juncture. I think it is awful this time. When we had the Cold War, the Soviet bloc, you had dictatorship, to fight. Everything was so much easier. Now everything is much more complicated for me than in the past.

TGW: What about Brazil? In flipping through some things that you had written earlier, I read, "Despite all the advances in the civil society and democratic governance, the poor continue to be the preferred victims of violence, criminality, and human rights violations." Why are the poor subject to so much violence? What has your center tried to do about that?

PSP: In fact, we don't work very much on—there is a division of labor. We deal with civil and political rights. We address some factors such as poverty, income concentration, because we have the second largest Afro-descended population in the world after Nigeria. We have one of the highest levels of concentration of income. The United States is very much concentrated, but we are double. I think that we are much worse than the United States amongst the industrialized. We have structural racism. That is, we are just beginning to scratch, to have some influence changing this situation. It is a very hierarchical country.

Brasilia is the most successful example of apartheid in the world. Where we are going, you just have the functionaries—the whites. There are some mixed colors, but the black and mixed people live around Brasilia. Brasilia has the highest quality of life—the salaries and many indicators. But Brasilia is Washington without the blacks, because the blacks do not live in Brasilia. That is the difference with Washington. They are there, but here they are outside this extraordinary city. Democratic government was not able to transform that. Perhaps we have no

other options than to have a compromise with the right. Center-right is the politically correct word. Nobody in Brazil wants to be called right. It doesn't exist the right in Brazil. You have only center-right. Then you have the most leftist president in the world—with a very conservative congress. Actually, not now because the coalition which supported the government is broken. But until one year ago he was ruling through a center-right, center-left coalition.

The existence of this system at all makes the congressmen not very much accountable. We are more than in any aspects—we are very able in inventing good practice in several areas, fighting forced labor, child labor. We are praised for many things that we do. We have a very modern economic sector—industrial. We are not devastated, as is, let's say, Argentina. We have niches of modernity. But even in the Ministry of Justice, you have very modern councils and economic protection against trusts, when you have to deal with a cartel, criminal monopolies and all that. Even the ministry has a secretariat for economic affairs.

It is a modern state. The president was saying all this because Brazil has a much more modern state than any other in Latin America because of Napoleon. In 1808, the Portuguese state—that was very modern for this time—everything came ready-made to Brazil. This helped us to move ahead much easier. When we compare with Argentina, it is a confederation of provinces. Brazil is a state that functions. President Cardoso was not able to make the fiscal tax reform, but compared to any other Latin American country our tax structure is very First World. We have a control of expenses. But perhaps because of the neglect of the Afro-Brazilians, and also because of the concentration of income, it is a very hierarchical country—in subtle ways. We are not South Africa, or the same kind or race relations in the United States. But it is a very divided country.

I think I told already this anecdote. I think that is very typical of my grandmother saying to me, "Why Paulo, we spend so much money for education. We went to France. And now you return to Brazil to visit prisons. We don't have anything to do with this kind of people. They are the other people." And for centuries, that was the elite. It is a very tiny elite, in a tremendously poor country. But Brazil is the ninth largest industrial power in the world. There is not such a thing as a traditional culture in Brazil—just the Yanomami or some tribes. But even today, I signed an extraordinary cooperation agreement with a boat, managed by an Indian tribe, an indigenous tribe, that goes in the Amazon, distributing ID cards, birth certificates for the population so that they can have access to a social network. It is extraordinary—all indigenous people that do that. Ninety percent of Brazilians have radios, and eighty percent have TV sets—extraordinary. But the past is present in all of Brazil. You have this poverty, but we are not Mexico, or Bolivia, or Peru, where we have traditional sectors of society, alienated from the present.

Just to conclude this, a French mission that came here saying that they were surprised by the anti-Americanism of the businesspeople. I was telling them, "We are not anti-American. We are completely Americanized, but in a different way. We are not, as a Central American, almost an extension. But we not anti-American." Brazilians seem to be critical of President [George] Bush. It is extraordinary—it is now unanimous. From the president, to the labor unions, to the rural people, because of protectionism. But we are fascinated by the United States. Hundreds of thousands of people go to the United States. It is very Americanized. And we are modern. There is no such thing as a traditional society in Brazil. We were 75 percent urban, and 25 percent agrarian. In 25 years, we now have 25 percent rural, agrarian. We are urban for 75 percent.

TGW: Earlier, you were stating that at least the United Nations should respect ILO conventions for staff. So there should be a certain comparability between your norms and your practice. I am curious as to whether UN ideas are used domestically by you. The woman who is working on this project for me, who is a Jamaican woman, has read a lot of Benedita da Silva.

PSP: She is the governor of Rio.

TGW: Exactly. And she is apparently a prominent Afro-Brazilian.

PSP: From the Worker's Party. She is marvelous. I like her.

TGW: Do you, or does she, for example, in her work, take UN ideas and say, "Why don't they work in Brazil? We are falling behind." What is the utility for human rights activists or a government official in Brazil with conventions—the Declaration on the Right to Development, the Declaration on X, Y, and Z? How do these make a difference to people within Brazil who are trying to improve the situation here?

PSP: Civil society has discovered that. They are preparing reports—they are called mirror reports by the government. The government is preparing reports with civil society. I think in the last ten years that was the discovery—of the UN, the special rapporteurs, of the treaty bodies, of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. One of my basic activities here is to suspend reservations or treaties.

For instance, with the support of the president, we are recognizing all of the articles that admit petitions—Article 14 of Convention 169 about indigenous peoples, the standing invitation, Article 22 of the Convention on Torture, the Optional Protocol of the CEDAW (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women), the International Criminal Court (ICC). Everything has been done. I am not the only minister responsible for that, but I think that a third of my time is spent with building negotiations with the Inter-American

Commission on Human Rights, the recognition of the Inter-American Human Rights Code. All of the ratifications of every core instrument, we did this with Fernando Henrique. During the seven and a half years, I devoted most of my time—not because of an aspiration of society, but because I and some colleagues of mine think this is important. And the civil society pressures me also.

Fernando Henrique is completely supportive. He is a very rare member of the elite that is completely human rights proactive—because he was in exile, because he is very intelligent of course. He is charming. He is irresistible, you will see that. I like him so much. Everything I am telling you was made under him. We did all of this progress under him, because he was part of the human rights national plan.

I think we discussed the other day, there is not a coalition in the ruling class that is pro-human rights. It is few people. I think sometimes I am worried about Brazil, because another president can come and abandon completely this. But of course civil society is much aware, very well-informed. I think civil society—that is not fair to say, because you have also judges, you have federal prosecutors speaking the language. Even the Superior Judiciary Tribunal is here in Brasilia. For instance, I tell you—we can't imagine this—we entered the international campaign against torture. We had the ceremony on the 26th of June. The International Day Against Torture was held in that tribunal with the vice president, who was previously a minister under the dictatorship. He wrote a remarkable piece against torture in the electoral campaign. There was an enormous ceremony, with his presence denouncing torture. This is unbelievable. I couldn't believe my eyes.

What is really up-to-date is civil society. But you have several niches in the state apparatus that are pro-human rights. In the congress, you have a bunch. I would say that

amongst 500 congressmen, you have fifty that are proactive on human rights. In the Worker's Party—it was the Seventh National Congress on Human Rights, that is organized by a forum of civil society organizations and the Commission on Human Rights of the congress. Lula (Luís Ignacio Lula da Silva)—the candidate—came. The minister was there, I was there, and of course Lula. He is my friend. Then I said, "What will you say here?" For ten minutes he was praising Fernando Henrique: "People are criticizing the second human rights plan, but we have to support the president. When Fernando Henrique is doing good things like that, we have to support him."

I was very moved. The next day, I called Lula. I told the president. They are good friends. That is another miracle here. They never offended during all their lives one another. After the dictatorship, they are really pals when they meet each other. This is very strange for Brazil, because the elite is very far away from the working class. Most probably, if the official candidate will not win—because here we will have two rounds—probably Fernando Henrique will support Lula and not the other candidate. There is a risk that José Serra will not go to the second round. Then you will have Lula and another candidate of the left. All the four main candidates are from the left, or they are supported by coalitions with the right—even the Worker's Party. But probably Fernando Henrique, if he has a choice, he will choose Lula, not the other.

Then there is a commonality of some principles between the government and the opposition—in human rights, for instance. For instance, Fernando Henrique supported Helio Bicurdo, a former congressman, to be the Brazilian member of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. No government in South America would do this—to support an adversary of the government to be a member of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. But

Fernando Henrique did this. The Foreign Affairs Ministry was working very hard for his election.

TGW: I want to just go back a minute. You mentioned civil society and its relationship to this country and political action. We got off track earlier. Do you see any way in the future to incorporate better the views of civil society in intergovernmental deliberations, or are we going to have the United Nations and NGOs with their parallel forums? Is there a way to pull these together?

PSP: In the United Nations?

TGW: Yes, within the United Nations.

PSP: I don't see any future for that. I think that the reform must be addressed. Of course, the ideal thing would be a tripartite—like the ILO. We cannot continue having civil society and the United Nations. How do you call in English the actors that are not the main actors? Supporting actors—in Portuguese, it is *figurantes*—the people that go to be at the scene of a ball but they are not the main actors. You see how we call these people. People who are not the protagonists.

TGW: They have bit parts in plays.

PSP: Yes, civil society cannot continue having this bit part. You have to integrate. The conferences are a good example for this sort of integration. But at least in the human rights structure, I think that the United Nations could do some progressive reforms. The present arrangement is not convenient—that you have a General Assembly, but you don't have a General Assembly of the peoples. I think that is very difficult. But you have to address the problem.

But the difficulty of the United Nations in addressing the reform of the Security Council is really distressing—how we can survive without India, or Brazil, or Germany, or at the outside,

Japan, or South Africa? We continue being ruled in the world by an arrangement that was contemporary of Nuremberg. The world has completely been transformed, yet we continue to address civil society as troublemakers.

TGW: You started out as a lawyer, and then you moved into social science. As you look back over these years, from your student days in this country and in France, and your various teaching assignments here, there, and elsewhere, how would you describe that your views have changed over this period? What are the most important things that have stayed the same, and what are the most important things that have changed over this period?

PSP: Sometimes I have the impression that people don't change. Sometimes we can make some improvements. I think that my change—that would be not my answer after so many years of psychoanalysis paid by my grandmother—every day for me. I think that it perhaps is a pedantic answer. But I think it was a question of more complex information. I think I didn't change. I have this image that I have not too many enemies, that basically I am good. I have the basic foundations, because I think that I was happy most of the time, even if I had crises. But I was very much protected by my great aunts, and my grandmother. I was very much protected and happy. I didn't have any accidents in my life. In fact, my life was transformed because I did enter the university in France. I went to France, and I told you it was a big transformation.

I was less cautious. But when I was already in the first or second year of the university, having contacts with sociologists, social critics, and all that, I think that I became aware and I didn't change very much. I never had any involvement with any guerrilla group or ideological group. But I think that I am more informed or I have more complex data or knowledge. But I think that I didn't change so much. I have known Fernando Henrique since 1967. I was aware

of his ideas in 1967. Of course, for some years I was distant but I needed to return to his influence—that is social-democratic, center-left. Or left, not center-left.

TGW: How would you like your own contribution to human rights to be remembered? What do you think your legacy in Brazil is today?

PSP: I really don't think that I will be remembered. I have written a lot of things and influenced some policy. I think I have written 1,000 pieces, a lot of them about human rights, since 1979—some articles and a few books. But I think that I would like to be remembered by my activism—very harsh. Ana thinks that I am really disagreeable with some people. And because I have some self-sufficiency, I am able to say terrible things about powerful people. I don't have fear. I think sometimes I am irresponsible. I think I would like to remember saying nasty things to some powerful people—criticisms and denunciations. Perhaps this will be—there will be a lot of images on the television and sounds in radio.

TGW: Is there a question that I should have asked you, that you would like to answer?

PSP: I think that it was well enough the few times that I spoke about myself, because I never say anything about me. There is an interview of me at the internet courier of the OHCHR (Office of the High Commission for Human Rights), but very small. But I think that it is revealing. I can send it to you. I will send you the newsletter of the office of the High Commissioner. It was very nice. It was amusing. I will send it to you by mail.

Well, the question is why you are doing this research. That is my question. What am I turning out? What kind of people are you seeing, because I don't have real importance. I would like to understand your effort. It's a big effort, this interview.

TGW: I will tell you that over dinner.

PSP: I think that I would like to say something about Fernando Henrique. I think that you have prepared and have read his books. He is a combination of an *intellectuel*—in French, not only as an academic—and a successful politician. Why? I think that he is extremely intelligent. He is charming and intelligent. Most of the academics have no charm, and most of them are not very intelligent. They may be charming, but they are not intelligent.

I think that he was lucky. He has a lot of self-sufficiency, also. He came from a military family. His father was a leftist general for the campaigning of the nationalization of petroleum in Brazil in the 1950s. He was a young communist. He was very close to the communist. He became very sophisticated because of exile. He went to Chile and to France, and he taught in the United States, and he gained a lot of visibility. Most of the intellectuals in Brazil that design to be elected are a disaster. I think he is the first intellectual to be a real intellectual in the sense of *intellectuel* who became president. It was an accident. It was really an accident. He is an accident, I think, because he is a product of exile. The Brazilian intelligentsia became—of course, we were always dependent on France, on Europe, and somewhat on the United States. But he was one of the few to have a theory to be above the common ground. He is an original thinker. But I think that the dictatorship contributed a lot, because he was obliged to go abroad. Perhaps he would be the same—I don't know. I think that he would not have the same *parcours* if he was not obliged to confront dictatorship. *Voilà!*

TGW: *Merci*. Thank you very much.

INDEX

Abdallah, Abdou, 22
Africa, 20, 26-27
  and human rights, 27
Alston, Philip, 27
Althusser, Louis, 6
Amnesty International (AI), 22-23
Annan, Kofi, 22
apartheid, 17
Arendt, Hannah, 15
Argentina, 26, 29
Arias, Oscar, 18
Asia, 20, 26-27
Bangladesh, 2
Barthes, Roland, 6
Bastas de Avila, Fernando, 3
Beijing, China, 20
Berlin Wall, 26
Bicurdo, Helio, 33
Bobbio, Norberto, 15
Bolivia, 30
Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, 18, 22
Brasilia, Brazil, 12, 17, 28, 32
Brazil, 1-8, 10, 13-14, 15-16, 20-21, 24-37
  and human rights, 28
  and Latin America, 6
  police repression in, 5
  poverty in, 28-30
Bretton Woods institutions, 8
Brown University, 13
Burma, 21; *see also* Myanmar
Burundi, 2, 21-22
Bush, George W., 30
Bush, Helio, 33
Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, 4-8, 12, 16, 29, 32-36
Catholic University, 8
Center for the Study of Violence, 2, 15, 24
child labor, 25
Chile, 37
China, 10, 19
Chinese Revolution, 4
Christian Association of Entrepreneurs, 3
civil society, 23, 31-34
Coeur-Bizot, Patrice, 21
Cold War, 25, 26, 28
Columbia University, 2, 13
Comité Paritaire, 7
Commission on Human Rights (CHR), 2, 17, 19, 26, 33
Conference on Disarmament, 9
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), 31
Cuba, 2, 4, 9
da Silva, Luis Ignacio Lula, 33
Dantas, Santiago, 10
Declaration on the Right to Development, 31
democracy, 27
dependency theory, 4
Durban, 20-21
Eastern Europe, 26-27
École de Hautes Études, 8
Egypt, 20
Europe, 13, 25, 26, 37
fascism, 7-8
Ford Foundation, 14
Foucault, Michel, 6
France, 4, 7, 10, 30, 35, 37
Fukuda-Paar, Sakiko, 25
Geneva, Switzerland, 2, 9, 20, 22
Germany, 34
Global Governance, 22
Group of 77 (G77), 26
Harvard University, 12
Helsinki, Finland, 26
Hobsbawm, Eric, 12-13, 15
Human Development Report, 25
human rights, 3, 12, 16-19, 23-27, 31-33, 36
Human Rights Watch, 22-23
ideas, 3-5, 15, 18-21, 25, 31, 36
  and the Cold War, 25
  and global conferences, 18-20
  and institutional rivalry, 21
  and the United Nations, 31
  impact of religion on, 3
  repression of, 5
  role of academics in, 14
India, 34
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, 31, 33
Inter-American Human Rights Code, 32
international civil service, 19
International Commission of Jurists, 9
International Criminal Court (ICC), 31
International Labour Organization (ILO), 19, 25, 31, 34
Japan, 35
Latin America, 26, 29
labor unions, 4
Lafer, Celso, 15
Latin America, 5-8, 10, 25
  role of Brazil in, 6
liberation theology, 4
Linz, Juan, 13
London, U.K., 11
Kennedy, Robert F., 12
Malaysia, 2
Marcuse, Herbert, 7, 11

Marxism, 6, 12
Mercado del Sur (MERCOSUR)*, 6*
Mexico, 9, 30
Miracle, A Universe, A, 5
Moore, Barrington, 13
Myanmar, 2, 21-22, 25; *see also* Burma
Nasser, Gamal, Abdel, 9
New York, New York, 1, 20, 22
Nigeria, 28
Nkrumah, Kwame, 9
Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), 9-10, 26
nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), 20-23, 34
Nuremberg Trials, 35
O'Donnell, Guillermo, 13
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 19, 25, 36
Oxford University, 13
Paris, France, 4-11
Peru, 30
Pinheiro, Ana Luiza, 24, 36
police repression, 2
Porto Alegre, Brazil, 21
Portugal, 3
Poulantzas, Nicos, 6, 11, 13
poverty, 27-28, 30
Reich, Wilhelm, 11
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 6, 8, 31
Robinson, Mary, 18, 25
Saboia, Gilberto, 2
Santiago, Chile, 6
Sao Paulo, 3, 10-12
Sao Paulo State Foundation for Research, 16
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 6, 9
Second Vatican Council, 3
Serra, José, 33
Skidmore, Thomas, 14
South Africa, 20, 29, 35
South America, 33
Soviet Union, 10, 26, 28
State University of Campinas, 11-12
Stepan, Alfred, 14
Sukarno, 9
terrorism, 28
Third International, 1, 8
Thompson, E.P., 13
Tito, Josip Broz, 9
torture, 5, 31-32
Torture in Brazil, 5
Touraine, Alain, 8, 11
UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 9
UN General Assembly, 1, 34
UN Security Council, 18, 34
UN World Conference on Human Rights (Vienna), 18, 20
United Kingdom (U.K.), 8
United States (U.S.), 6, 10, 12-13, 25-26, 28, 30
University of Notre Dame, 13
University of Sao Paulo, 7-8, 11, 24
Vienna, Austria, 18, 20-21
Vietnam, 9
Washington, D.C., 12
Wechsler, Lawrence, 5
Worker's Party (Brazil), 32-33
World Health Organization (WHO), 25
World War I, 4
Yale University, 13-14