

---

# ENSAYO BIBLIOGRÁFICO / REVIEW ESSAY

---

## The Politics of Inequality in Brazil: A Historiographical Survey of the Works of Thomas E. Skidmore

JENNIFER LAMBE

*University of Miami*

WITH

ORVILLE A. CAREY TURNQUEST

*Brown University*

YI LIU

*Brown University*

ANA CATARINA TEIXEIRA

*Brown University*

NATAN ZEICHNER

*New York University*

One rarely has the opportunity to witness academic excellence on the level embodied by the renowned Brazilian historian Thomas E. Skidmore.<sup>1</sup> Since his migration from nineteenth-century German history to twentieth-century Brazilian history while a young instructor at Harvard University, Professor Skidmore has inspired a generation of scholars of Brazil and Latin America with characteristically meticulous research, deep insight, and great humor. As Brazilian and Latin American history enter a new phase of expansion and diversification, it seems appropriate to revisit the contributions of a historian who has been fundamental to the process by which these disciplines were forged in the United States and beyond. A critical reflection on the relationship of some of Skidmore's classic

---

lambe.jennifer@gmail.com   oac.turnquest@gmail.com   Yi\_Liu@brown.edu  
Ana\_Loso@brown.edu   natan.zeichner@gmail.com

works to the present ought to accompany this process to examine what, vis-à-vis the current historiography, they have inspired, neglected, and presaged. The following essay will consider nearly four decades of Skidmore's historical work on Brazil through an analysis of four texts emblematic of the trajectory of his intellectual career: *Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy* (1967), *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985* (1988), *Black into White: Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought* (1974), and *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change* (1999).

What seems most audacious in Skidmore's work, even forty years after the beginning of his career as a Brazilianist, is his refusal to seek refuge in the comfort of historical distance. *Politics in Brazil* and *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil*, especially, endeavor to investigate the proximate past and assess its consequences for the present. Many historians still feel uncomfortable venturing into this recent territory, fraught with the memories of those who lived through it. As Laurence Veysey noted in 1971, some would suggest a "wait of two or three decades before a sober, reasonably definitive account of the past can be written."<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Skidmore's work embodies many of the complexities of writing contemporary history. One might reasonably ask what insights in Skidmore's early works are colored by the turmoil and confusion of the events that had recently transpired—and which of those conclusions merit the attention of scholars roughly forty years later. Skidmore's works demand that one assesses them, like all "canonical" texts, as products of their historical and historiographical moments. Moreover, the works are historiographical artifacts, glimpses into historical methods of the past and their influence on present scholarship.

Specifically, the four works in question deal, in quite different ways, with the various ways in which power and inequality have operated in Brazilian society. If *Politics in Brazil* and *The Politics of Military Rule* present primarily descriptive accounts of the vicissitudes of Brazilian democracy and authoritarianism, these very discussions turn around questions of elite and military power, popular movements, and economic inequalities. Another manuscript, *Black into White*, does something quite different—digging into the fairly distant past to trace the evolution of elite Brazilian discourse on race—to arrive at the same territory: a statement about inequality and power in Brazilian race relations in the twentieth (and twenty-first) century. Skidmore's 1999 textbook, *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change*, moves these questions front and center. The thematic arc of the textbook centers on the persistence of inequalities as the deep matter of Brazilian history. Though perhaps still relatively inattentive to race, gender, and class in the ways demanded by contemporary scholarship on Latin America, the work represents a departure from earlier Skidmore texts. These four texts manifest the evolution of Skidmore's scholarly priorities over time in conjunction with

changing methodological orientations within Brazilian history with respect to questions of social, economic, and political inequality.

*Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy* (1967), Skidmore's first monograph, explicitly foregrounds the question of political power and inequality, in its attention to the termination of democracy in 1964.<sup>3</sup> At a time when many Brazilians were still bewildered by the coup d'état and the accidental death of Castelo Branco, this young American scholar, formerly a historian of Germany, endeavored to provide a comprehensive account of a series of confusing events in recent Brazilian politics. Now hailed as a masterpiece of modern Brazilian history, *Politics in Brazil* was selected by *Veja* magazine as one of the "Fundamental Books of Brazilianism" for its remarkable synthesis of the political struggles and economic vicissitudes of that period.

*Politics in Brazil* is actually a byproduct of Skidmore's investigation of the causes that led to the fall of President João Goulart. The book begins in the 1930s, a period characterized by both fascist and communist movements with sporadic regional revolts. During this era, the political and military leaders experienced a rapprochement, and military interventionism in civil politics began to loom on the horizon. It was also at this time that Getúlio Vargas, the gaucho politician and future dictator of Brazil, emerged to dominate Brazilian politics for the next twenty-five years.

As part of his efforts to consolidate power, Vargas established the corporatist *Estado Novo*. Despite intense clashes during the reign of the new state, Brazil succeeded in maintaining political stability and achieving economic development. This is testament, perhaps, to the successes of the authoritarian moderating power in establishing *ordem e progresso* in Brazilian politics. Vargas's regime, which consolidated a federal state at the expense of state power, also initiated new modes of constructing populist and other appeals directed at specific constituencies. Thus, though *Politics in Brazil* begins with Goulart being deposed in 1964, the narrative Skidmore constructs depicts this event as part of a continuous historical process in Brazil reaching back to Vargas's regime, rather than an *ad hoc* occurrence.

After his removal from office, Vargas was succeeded by his war minister, General Eurico Dutra. Four years later, Vargas staged an impressive comeback by winning the 1950 presidential election, but this time the former dictator found it much more difficult to retain power than it had been to seize it. The military, vexed and threatened by Vargas's populist/nationalist posturing, demanded his resignation, prompting his vengeful suicide in 1954. In the following years, Brazil experienced the prosperous and confident presidency of Juscelino Kubitschek and the ephemeral interlude of Jânio Quadros, but Kubitschek's achievements were carried out at the cost of overextending the country's financial resources.

Moreover, the latter figure's astounding resignation further worsened the already tense political situation in Brazil.

When João Goulart, the "permanent" Vice-President, finally assumed office in 1961, he not only failed to garner consistent backing from the left, despite a pro-left posture, but he also aroused the suspicion of the center and the alarm of the right with his unpopular economic policies. Having failed to gain a significant amount of support from any sector, Goulart faced removal from office, via an ostensibly permanent fixture of Brazilian politics, the coup d'état. The problems that plagued Vargas came back to haunt Goulart ten years later, and the "dark forces" that pushed Vargas to his death also toppled Goulart. In this way, Goulart's fall and the subsequent military dictatorship constitute more a "corollary" than an "accident" in Brazilian history.

Evidently, Skidmore's exploration of the collapse of democracy in Brazil relies heavily upon a narrative of the achievements and failings of a series of Brazilian Presidents who were caught up in vast webs of power encompassing traditional elites, the military, and the masses. As Paul E. Hadley has suggested, the book is centrally concerned "with the efforts of Brazilian executives to function in a political system controlled by elites who derive their ultimate sanction from the electorate."<sup>4</sup> Thus, despite the tendency of the work to approach the collapse of democracy through a narration of executive politics, Skidmore necessarily deals with profound questions about the economic and political profile and (dis)empowerment of elites and non-elites.

Indeed, Skidmore asserts that the period in question cannot be understood without attending to the crumbling "rationale of political relationships[.]... threatened by the disequilibrium between the existing political institutions and the society on whose behalf they were supposed to operate."<sup>5</sup> Popular opinion—often fragmented by class and occupation—appears in the narrative as a veritable actor, electorally and politically empowered as never before. Skidmore depicts the participation of these groups in conjunction with older elites and an increasingly political military. He is also interested in the economic side of these questions, as various figures attempted to pursue economic growth while, occasionally, seeking to "direct the benefits of such growth to a constantly larger share of the Brazilian population."<sup>6</sup> Skidmore weaves these political, social, and economic questions of power and inequality into the fabric of his larger narrative of formal political changes. Yet, at this moment, these questions are relegated to the periphery of his account, subordinated to his discussion of executive politics.

In 1988, Skidmore published *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-85*, the follow-up volume to his first work on politics in Brazil.<sup>7</sup> Considering the two works side by side offers the opportunity to see how, if at all, Skidmore's notion of power and inequality evolved over the course of the twenty years between

the two works. *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil* traces the political and economic trajectory of the Brazilian “authoritarian state” during the twenty-one years of military rule. Predominantly a political history of the military regime and the re-emergence of democracy, *Politics of Military Rule in Brazil* offers a broad interpretation of Brazil’s political and economic development, national power dynamics, and processes of social change. As John Markoff has noted, Skidmore’s exploration of the path of the various authoritarian regimes—“the trajectory away from democracy into arbitrary rule and back again”—is governed by the “internal conflicts” of the regime itself.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, Skidmore’s understanding of the operation of the state during military rule nonetheless brings him to reckon with state violence as a mode of exercising power and maintaining inequalities in this period.

Published a generation after Skidmore’s first monograph, *Politics of Military Rule in Brazil* bears organizational and stylistic similarities to its predecessor. Both works employ a chronological narrative constructed from the examination of successive presidential administrations. Here, Skidmore’s discussion focuses on the establishment of control through a corporatist institutional framework during the Castelo Branco regime. He identifies this structure as a powerful legitimizing agent for the regime. Skidmore pays considerable attention to the use of torture as a form of state violence against “oppositional” civil sectors, arguing that such strategies played a vital role in the deterrence of radical opposition to the military regime, as well as the suppression of existing “insurgent” organizations. Skidmore narrates the development of the Costa e Silva government (1967-69) much in the same vein, beginning the discussion with a political analysis of the “hard-line” government assembled by Costa e Silva. The bulk of the chapter, however, is dedicated to the conceptualization of the state as a repressive apparatus.

In his preface, Skidmore notes that the most in-depth section of the book will be his analysis of the Médici government. In explaining his focus on this period, Skidmore identifies the Médici regime as “the ‘national security state’ in its purest form.”<sup>9</sup> According to Timothy Power, Skidmore’s analysis of the Médici government is exceptional in illustrating how the construction of the state under Médici assumed “some of the characteristics of the closed, authoritarian political culture prevalent in Argentina and Uruguay in the 1970s.”<sup>10</sup> In this chapter analysis, Skidmore develops three focal points: first, the rise and fall of several armed resistance movements; second, torture as a means of repression and censorship; and, finally, the controversial national and international issues involved in the development of Amazonian society. As he moves to the Geisel government (1974-78), perhaps best remembered for initiating the controlled process of gradual political liberalization, Skidmore focuses on how civil society



reacted to the early course of *Abertura*. In this chapter, Skidmore paints a vivid picture of the development of civil unrest, addressing important social, political, and economic aspects of the Catholic Church's progressive wing, student activists, and union leaders from the emerging "new left."

However, the push towards change in Skidmore's account comes primarily from within the military regime itself. As John Markoff notes, "for those who think of democracy as something wrested by 'the people' from established authority, Skidmore's account will be provocative: Although business, professional, clerical, student, and labor oppositions play a significant role in this interpretation, the engine behind liberalization is conflict within the military."<sup>11</sup> The multiple voices and positions of these military leaders account for the drastic and often sudden changes in regime policy, as a fairly moderate and reformist group was overtaken by increasingly undemocratic figures, later to be pushed out by liberal reformists. Military figures deployed power and repression in two quite distinct realms: legalistic measures to curb freedom and electoral processes and repressive and violent measures to imprison, torture, and disappear opponents.

In the last two chapters, Skidmore describes the final years of military dictatorship and the resurgence of the reformist position. As civil groups gained more political freedoms, the military government both resisted and abetted the process of democratization. Skidmore offers the reader a simple account of the political processes that would lead to the first "democratic" government in twenty-one years under the (pro-military) civilian politician, José Sarney. In Skidmore's conclusion, he argues that, despite comparative levels of student and labor activity during the last years of military control and the populist period of João Goulart, the future "New Republic" would be far from an imitation of the "Old."<sup>12</sup>

Skidmore's work is a skilled examination of the delegation of power in the authoritarian Brazilian state, especially with respect to his management of extensive primary sources. However, as with every great tale, the full story is rarely revealed. Upon reading *Politics of Military Rule in Brazil*, one cannot help but notice that, while Skidmore addresses select components of the country's social and cultural histories under the military regime, he does not provide a continuous social narrative. He thus again limits himself to a discussion of power that transpires primarily in the realm of formal politics, in the interaction between military elites, leftist activists and guerillas, international (particularly U.S.) politicians, the Catholic Church, and others.

In this respect, John Markoff offers an interesting analysis of Skidmore's perspective on economic and political changes during the military regimes. He suggests that Skidmore's account is structured by a background of a "long-standing pattern of extreme inequality and elite accommodation."<sup>13</sup> Markoff argues

that the military regime's economic policies exacerbated unequal distribution of resources in its pursuit of industrialization and modernization, while the violent torture of members of the elite had a leveling or even "equalizing" effect. He reads Skidmore thus: "democratization has meant not the end of state violence, but the reestablishment of the traditional class boundaries"; the maintenance of heightened economic inequality *and* the reassertion of traditional boundaries around the bodies of economic and political elites.<sup>14</sup> Markoff's analysis gestures at some provocative ways of understanding Skidmore's perspective on inequality and power in this later work. Indeed, if Skidmore remains overwhelmingly focused here on the operation of formal state power and its negotiation among and contestation by various actors, *Politics of Military Rule* nonetheless deals perhaps more explicitly with forms of economic and political violence perpetrated by the state.<sup>15</sup>

While certainly famous for such straightforward political histories, Thomas Skidmore also tackled the vexed social and ideological question of race in Brazilian history in his 1974 manuscript, *Black into White: Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought*.<sup>16</sup> Though Skidmore purports to examine only the racial beliefs and ideologies of Brazilian elites, the work nonetheless presents a decidedly different focus than either *Politics in Brazil* or *Politics of Military Rule in Brazil*. Indeed, he presents himself moving, quite unwillingly, from a focus on various intellectuals of the period between 1870 and 1930 to explicit attention to intellectual currents on race: "To my dismay, I soon found myself launched into an examination of all the major intellectual currents of the era. Only slowly did I realize that I was heading toward a detailed analysis of racial thought in Brazil."<sup>17</sup> The turn to intellectual history at this moment may relate to Skidmore's personal circumstances, but also of interest is the way in which he presents himself as being drawn, to his "dismay," to such a methodology or mode of representing the past—through beliefs and ideologies rather than political maneuvers and events.

Despite being situated in an earlier time period, the work nonetheless constantly suggests its relevance to answering questions about racial inequality in the present. Because of Brazil's history of miscegenation, its persistent ethnic plurality, and the absence of overtly racist laws in the twentieth century, Brazilians, often guided by prominent intellectuals, have come to understand their country as a "racial democracy." The conception of a Brazilian "racial democracy" gains credibility when compared with the situation of African-Americans in Jim Crow U.S. or of Africans under apartheid. Nevertheless, contrary to the myth of racial democracy, racism constantly cracks through the surface of Brazilian society in unspoken acts and attitudes. Both the emergence of a black consciousness movement in the second half of the twentieth century and recent controversial

affirmative action laws attest to increasing awareness of the existence of racial prejudice.<sup>18</sup> If Skidmore is brief about the contemporary relevance of his examination of elite discourses on race here,<sup>19</sup> the work nonetheless manifests a new focus on thinking about inequality in Brazil, drawing on intellectual history, but also pointing towards a more social or cultural orientation.

*Black into White* confronts the silence about racism in Brazil through the perspective of an intellectual history of changing discourses on race, ethnicity, and nationality from the Paraguayan War of 1865–70 to the middle of the twentieth century. It is essentially a narrative of the Brazilian elite's responses to political philosophies in Europe and the United States and the ways in which they adapted those ideologies to fit the Brazilian political and social landscape. Skidmore begins his discussion of changing racial ideologies by contextualizing Positivism, the philosophy behind the abolition of slavery in 1888. In the late empire, Positivism, first developed by the French philosopher Auguste Comte, gained a sizeable following among young, educated Brazilians, who asserted that abolition would allow for economic growth and the maintenance of the social status quo. European liberalism, with its motto of “order and progress” and its message about the dignity of each human being, as well as international pressure, convinced many elites that Brazil needed to emancipate its slaves and thus move forward into the modern era with other countries that had already achieved abolition.

Many Brazilian writers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries turned to Europe, particularly Paris, for cultural and philosophical direction and often unquestioningly accepted the writings of French intellectuals. Proponents of the belle époque literary movement in Brazil mimicked the works of European writers of the late nineteenth century and fomented feelings of inadequacy among Brazilian elites. Skidmore further analyzes the Brazilian elite's veneration of European society by describing the influence of European culture on Euclides da Cunha's *Os Sertões* (Rebellion in the Backlands). Euclides, in line with Positivist thinking, causally linked race and climate, arguing that both the harsh landscape and the racial mixing of the backlands might negatively impact the quality of the Brazilian population. Particularly complex was miscegenation: the Indian was seen as a positive element, even when miscegenation occurred with white Brazilians, while the African might be a retarding element. Employing the work of Euclides and others, Skidmore explores how both domestic and international politics, as well as literature, shaped ideas about Brazilian nationality, particularly in formulating a plan to achieve progress in a nation with a large African population. Skidmore also considers the question of how race is related to nationality when he examines the active promotion of “white” European immigration by the



Brazilian government as a means to better prepare the country for the eventual transition to (European) liberalism.

Skidmore argues that “new nationalism” emerged in the mid-twentieth century in this philosophical and diplomatic climate. A changing discourse on race entered the public sphere, and many Brazilian intellectuals no longer looked to Europe but rather to their own nation. Though Brazilian intellectuals and authorities wanted to portray Brazil as a “European” society, they realized that the European mode of perceiving Brazilian society no longer corresponded to the Brazilian reality. In developing distinctly Brazilian frames of reference, intellectuals also took steps toward re-evaluating the place of African descendants in the cultural past and present of Brazil.

If Brazilian elites came to recognize the value of Afro-Brazilian culture, however, they did not totally reject the “whitening” ideal. In the 1920s, the debate continued about which race of migrant workers would be in the best interests of the nation. There was even a movement within Congress to prohibit the entrance of Afro-American migrant workers into Brazil. Throughout the twentieth century, lighter skin was valued more, and darker-skinned individuals sought lighter-skinned partners, since “the surest means for a Brazilian of African heritage to gain upward mobility was to possess a whiter skin than his parents.”<sup>20</sup> Such overt expressions of racial prejudice have largely disappeared since the 1950s, as the intellectual discourses on race have changed internationally. Nevertheless, as the title of Skidmore’s work suggests, a deliberate national policy to whiten the country has now transformed into a mentality held by many factions of society. Cultural commonsense maintains that individual and societal progress depends upon possessing and cultivating whiter skin.

Thus, *Black into White* tracks the legacy of slavery on the minds of contemporary Brazilians. Importantly, the work offers a more ideologically attuned mode of thinking about inequality in Brazilian history, one that moves the question to the very center of an analysis that admittedly remains focused on elite intellectual discourse. This early work is suggestive of an inchoate (albeit unwilling, according to his narrative) interest in pursuing cultural and ideological answers to persistent problems of inequality and disempowerment in Brazilian society. It does not, however, delve into non-elite perspectives on or experiences of racial inequality and thus bears, in this sense, some similarities to Skidmore’s more politically-oriented works.

Skidmore’s concise but thick narrative of Brazilian history, *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change* (1999), however, foregrounds the question of social, racial, political, and economic inequality in new and more expansive ways.<sup>21</sup> Skidmore begins his text with the explicitly stated project of tracing, through a general history of Brazil, the evolution of the tragically persistent forms of

“discrimination, violence, and widespread poverty” through Brazil’s history.<sup>22</sup> As Bryan McCann notes in his review of the book, Skidmore’s treatment of the subject does not regard racial, social, and economic inequalities as static fixtures of Brazilian history, but rather as structures constantly evolving in response to—and themselves constructing—the particular socio-politico-economic landscape of the period.<sup>23</sup>

Beginning in the immediate aftermath of Brazilian independence, Skidmore argues that, contrary to contemporaneous constructions of the event as a moment of general liberation, independent Brazil in fact displayed a remarkable degree of continuity in the structures of domination and social control governing most Brazilians’ lives. He states:

Incarceration or physical punishment were only the most dramatic forms of control in this society...Monarchy combined with slavery created an atmosphere of deference that was powerfully transmitted to the non-elites. The inculcation of this attitude of subservience that must be shown toward any superior was by and large successful in convincing non-elites there was no way to change their world.<sup>24</sup>

Though other Latin American nations of the nineteenth century witnessed a similar preservation of colonial hierarchical forms, in Brazil, independence meant the end of neither monarchy nor slavery. Thus, class, race, social, and political hierarchies were perpetuated in republican Brazil. Skidmore persuasively argues that the most powerful agents of maintaining hierarchies from the colonial to the independent period were not, in fact, the most violent or public, but rather the encoding of hierarchical relationships into religion, “folk culture,” and the practices of everyday life. Tellingly, these are untapped realms of historical inquiry in Skidmore’s earlier works.

Similarly, the process of abolition in Brazil avoided the overturning of prevailing racial, social, and economic inequalities through the maintenance of other structures that kept freed slaves “in their place,” despite their legal freedom. Skidmore argues that abolition constituted a largely legal formality that did little to alter (nor was it intended to alter) fundamental disparities between different social and racial groups in Brazil. Rather, abolition allowed the “political elite... [to contain] the growing social conflict within a strictly legal framework.”<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless, Skidmore also demonstrates the temporality of these structures of inequality by portraying them in their respective moments of construction and consolidation. His attention to patterns of land ownership across time in Brazil is perhaps most interesting in this regard. According to Skidmore, a radical change

occurred with the passage of a land law in 1850 that decreed that public land could only be acquired by “purchase from the government or by payment of taxes to regularize land agreements already made.”<sup>26</sup> Departing in this moment from the “ad hoc” claims to land (possession by squatting) characteristic of colonial Brazil, the government institutionalized a land ownership system that favored the formation of large plantations, to the exclusion of small land plots. Unlike the United States, which promoted small landholding through the passage of the Homestead Act of 1862, Brazil took a “contrary path” that “institutionalized the concentration of legal land ownership in a country where land was the principal source of wealth.”<sup>27</sup> Thus, it also helped to shape the structures of economic inequality in post-1850 Brazil.

The consequences of the hierarchies established in colonial Brazil and maintained throughout the nineteenth century also had a strong bearing on twentieth-century Brazil. The patron/client relationships structuring many social exchanges in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, for example, largely fit into this mold of institutionalized, internalized, and seemingly incontestable social, economic, and racial hierarchies. Skidmore also links the legacy of inequality and hierarchy to the violent practices still utilized by the police against ordinary citizens in the 1960s. Associating the violence contributing to and reinforcing many of Brazil’s internalized hierarchies with the heritage of colonial times and slavery, Skidmore demonstrates that the varied treatment of elites and regular citizens by the police fit into the “system of differential justice..., [reinforcing] a hierarchical social structure that was tight but not impermeable.”<sup>28</sup>

Overall, Skidmore’s historicization and explication of structures of inequality in Brazil’s past, present, and, most likely, future constructs a realistic, if pessimistic, image of the serious socio-economic and racial hierarchies that have proven to be extremely resistant to change. They also help to contextualize the especial difficulties faced by recent Brazilian presidents, who have had to balance the almost always conflicting needs for, on one hand, success in the global economy and, on the other, social and economic reform. Finally, his mostly political and economic account of these inequalities—and Brazilian history in general—lays the groundwork for the exploration of other ways to interpret the course of Brazilian history, especially through culture, race, gender, and other more recent analytical frameworks. By combining Skidmore’s understanding of these inequalities with examinations of their transmission through culture, religion, language, and other institutions, one would arrive at a fully developed conception of hierarchies of race, class, and gender in Brazilian society.

A proliferation of scholarly work has undertaken the task of expanding the historiography on power and inequality in Brazilian history in the realms of race, culture, religion, and gender. The intellectual debt of many works to Skidmore’s

pioneering efforts is clear. This essay has explored Skidmore's treatment of the questions of power and inequality throughout Brazilian history to suggest some of the ways in which his historical praxis and theory evolved, both organically and, undoubtedly, in response to methodological developments in the literature. The centrality of these questions indicates a scholarly orientation perhaps increasingly attuned over time to the unsavory aspects of Brazilian history, a commitment to excavating and giving the lie to official(ist) historical and historiographical myths about Brazil. Further work could be done to nuance this picture of an intellectual evolution and to explore the concrete personal and intellectual interactions that propelled Skidmore's scholarship—and Brazilian historiography in general. Nevertheless, when the narrative of academic discourse on Brazil is laid out, Thomas Skidmore, the preeminent *Brazilianista*, will inevitably figure centrally in that intellectual genealogy for generations to come.

## NOTES

- 1 This essay is a synthesis of presentations made by Brown University undergraduate and graduate students at "Politics, Culture, and Race in Brazil: A Conference Honoring Thomas E. Skidmore," April 20-22, 2006, Providence, RI.
- 2 Laurence Veysey, "Ways of Writing Contemporary History," Book Review. *Reviews in American History* 1.1 (Mar. 1973): 151-157.
- 3 Thomas E. Skidmore, *Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy* (New York: Oxford UP, 1967).
- 4 Paul E. Hadley, "Review of *Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy*," *The Western Political Quarterly* 20.4 (Dec. 1967): 1004-1006.
- 5 Skidmore, *Politics in Brazil*, xvi.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Thomas E. Skidmore, *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985* (New York: Oxford UP, 1988).
- 8 John Markoff, "The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985," *Contemporary Sociology* 19.1 (1990): 65.
- 9 Ibid., v.
- 10 Timothy J. Power, "The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 33.2 (1991): 198-199.
- 11 John Markoff, "The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985," *Contemporary Sociology* 19.1 (1990): 65.
- 12 Skidmore, *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil*, 309-310.
- 13 Markoff, 65.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Skidmore's work on television, the media, and democracy also points to a new perspective on the political environment of post-dictatorship Brazil, bringing in television as a

- means for understanding the operation of power in a particular political culture. Thomas E. Skidmore, ed., *Television, Politics, and the Transition to Democracy in Latin America* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1993).
- 16 Thomas E. Skidmore, *Black Into White* (New York: Oxford UP, 1988).
  - 17 Ibid., vii.
  - 18 Ibid., v.
  - 19 He has approached these questions in more depth elsewhere: Thomas E. Skidmore, "Racial Mixture and Affirmative Action: The Cases of Brazil and the United States," *The American Historical Review* (AHR Forum: Amalgamation and the Historical Distinctiveness of the United States) 108.5 (December 2003): 1391-1397.
  - 20 Ibid., 215.
  - 21 Thomas E. Skidmore, *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1999).
  - 22 Ibid., xiii.
  - 23 Bryan McCann, Book Review of *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change*, by Thomas Skidmore. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31.1 (2000): 143-144.
  - 24 Skidmore, *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change*, 39.
  - 25 Ibid., 70.
  - 26 Ibid., 52.
  - 27 Ibid.
  - 28 Ibid., 175.

## Works Cited

- Hadley, Paul E. Review of *Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy*. *The Western Political Quarterly* 20.4 (Dec. 1967): 1004-1006.
- Markoff, John Markoff. Review of *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985*. *Contemporary Sociology* 19.1 (1990): 65.
- McCann, Bryan. Review of *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change*. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31.1 (2000): 143-144.
- Power, Timothy J. Review of *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985*. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 33.2 (1991): 198-199.
- Skidmore, Thomas E. *Black Into White*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Skidmore, Thomas E. *Brasil Visto de Fora*. São Paulo: Editora Paz e Terra, 1994.
- Skidmore, Thomas E. *Brazil: Five Centuries of Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Skidmore, Thomas E. *Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Skidmore, Thomas E. *The Politics of Military Rule in Brazil, 1964-1985*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Veysey, Laurence. "Ways of Writing Contemporary History." Book Review. *Reviews in American History* 1.1 (Mar. 1973): 151-157.