

Roberto de Oliveira Campos Oral History Interview—5/29-30/1964
Administrative Information

Creator: Roberto de Oliveira Campos
Interviewer: John E. Reilly
Date of Interview: May 29, 1964
Place of Interview: Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Length: 56 pages

Biographical Note

Campos, Brazilian Ambassador to the United States (1961-1963), discusses U.S.-Brazilian relations under the Brazilian presidential administrations of Jânio da Silva Quadros and João Goulart; the Alliance for Progress; Goulart's state visit to the United States; and the Brazilian reaction to the Cuban Missile Crisis, among other issues.

Access

Open.

Usage Restrictions

According to the deed of gift signed July 20, 1966, copyright of these materials has been assigned to United States Government. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

Copyright

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excesses of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form. Direct your questions concerning copyright to the reference staff.

Transcript of Oral History Interview

These electronic documents were created from transcripts available in the research room of the John F. Kennedy Library. The transcripts were scanned using optical character recognition and the resulting text files were proofread against the original transcripts. Some formatting changes were made. Page numbers are noted where they would have occurred at the bottoms of the pages of the original transcripts. If researchers have any concerns about accuracy, they are encouraged to visit the Library and consult the transcripts and the interview recordings.

Suggested Citation

Roberto de Oliveira Campos, recorded interview by John E. Reilly, May 29-30, 1964, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

AGREEMENT ON USE OF ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

I, Roberto de Oliveira CAMPOS (name), of Rio de Janeiro,
Brazil (place), assign to the United States of America
 for administration by the John F. Kennedy Library, Inc., all my rights, title
 and interest in the tape recording and transcript of the interview conducted
 with me at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (place)
 by John E. Reilly (interviewer) on behalf of
 the John F. Kennedy Library, on May 29 and 30, 1964, 1964.

Subject to any conditions specified by me limiting access to those
 materials and set forth in writing on the transcript prior to its being
 forwarded for the Library, such transcript and recording may be made
 available for research, dissemination, reproduction, publication and other
 appropriate use, in whole or in part, as determined by the Director of
 the Library.

(signed) Roberto de Oliveira Campos
 (Date) Rio de Janeiro, May 30th 1964

Accepted:

(signed) Robert H. Bohmer(date) July 20 1966

Roberto de Oliveira Campos

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1	Campos' positions in the Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira Administration
3	Campos' positions in the Jânio da Silva Quadros Administration
4, 35	Operation Pan American and the Alliance for Progress
8	August 1961 Punta del Este conference
10	Quadros' resignation as president of Brazil
12	Quadros' view's on Brazil's relations with the U.S.
15	Bay of Pigs Invasion, 1961 and Adolf A. Berle, Jr. as U.S. envoy to Brazil
16	Campos' appointment as Brazilian ambassador to the U.S.
19	Teodoro Moscoso
22	Meeting between John F. Kennedy (JFK) and Carlos Lacerda
23, 33	João Goulart's 1962 trip to Washington
30	Non-constitutional governments and the 1962 Argentine coup
32	1964 Brazilian coup d'état
35	July 31, 1962 meeting between JFK and Brazilian students
37	Cuban Missile Crisis
40	January 1962 Punta del Este conference
42	Communism in Brazil and Latin America
44	Robert F. Kennedy's 1962 trip to Brazil
47	1963 Bell-Dantas economic agreement between the U.S. and Brazil
50	Deterioration of U.S.-Brazil relations during 1963
52	Reaction in Brazil to JFK's assassination
53	Campos' views on and assessment of JFK

Oral History Interview

with

Roberto de Oliveira Campos

May 29-30, 1964
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

By John E. Reilly

For the John F. Kennedy Library

REILLY: This is the beginning of the interview with Ambassador Roberto Campos, the Brazilian Ambassador in Washington from October 8, 1961 until January 1971. The interview is being conducted by Dr. John E. Reilly, Foreign Policy Assistant to Senator Hubert Humphrey [Hubert H. Humphrey], in the home of Ambassador de Oliveira Campos in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on May 29, 1964.

Mr. Ambassador, for purposes of background, could you discuss briefly your own position in the Kubitschek [Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira] government during the year prior to the time that President Kennedy [John F. Kennedy] was inaugurated and also your position in the Quadros government [Jânio da Silva Quadros] prior to the time that you were appointed Ambassador?

CAMPOS: I cooperated with the Kubitschek government in several phases: firstly, as managing director of the Development Bank. In fact, even before that I was associated with Lucas Lopes, the principal advisor of Kubitschek, and we prepared jointly what was later to become known as the "target program" of the government. Later on I was successively managing director and president of the Development Bank, and had a rather substantial influence in the formulation of the investment policy of the government, though not in the formulation of the monetary policy. That's why difficulties arose in my relationship with Kubitschek. As time went on he veered towards a builder psychology, accepting all the investment programs we submitted and inventing some of his,

but refusing to accept any program for monetary discipline, credit containment, et cetera. This established a gulf between myself and Kubitschek, which gradually widened. I also disagreed with him because he took what I considered to be a rather complacent attitude towards extreme nationalist groups and left-infiltrated student

[-1 -]

groups. I thought that this might usher in a rather dangerous trend leading to either complete immobilism in economic policy or to an ineffectual government. This was not however a very important aspect, certainly not as important as my disagreement on the subject of financial policies. Eventually I resigned from the Development Bank and went back to the Foreign Service, although I continue to this day to be a friend of President Kubitschek. There was really nothing personal. It was merely a policy divergence, an intellectual difference of views without any amount of personal bitterness.

REILLY: When did you leave the Kubitschek government?

CAMPOS: I left the presidency of the Development Bank in August of '59, as I recall, and then I went, as it were, on leave of absence from the Foreign Office, occasionally called by the Itamaraty for advice on specific points. My last work for Kubitschek was in the delegation to the meeting of the Committee of the 21 of the Organization of American States in Bogota, which drafted the Bogota Act. At that time, although I was at odds with the main policies of the government which then had taken a very sharp inflationary turn, I accepted to be the vice chairman of the delegation, in the hope of avoiding a major split within the American family of nations that then threatened. It seems that there was a lot of dissatisfaction in Brazil with the rather cool reception given by Washington, under the Republican administration, to Operation Pan America. There was also some temptation of bringing things to a head and perhaps to have an open split at Bogota.

I thought that to be a dangerous trend, an unadvisable one, and I accepted the vice chairmanship with the hope of avoiding this split and channeling things in a constructive way, because—I sensed more than I knew—there was a change impending in the Washington outlook on Latin America, and that the era of complete neglect to which Latin

[-2 -]

America had been relegated, the era of residual treatment, was about to end, either as a result of a change of administration (the elections were then near), or even under the Republican administration, because of a realization, which became acute after the Cuban incident, that Latin America was near the explosive point. To my mind an open rift in the American family was thus premature at that time. It might complicate this desirable change of course in the American administration, a trend of events which I think would happen even under the Republican administration, although it was clearly expedited by the succession of the Democratic administration.

As regards Quadros, I had met him a number of times and cooperated with him when he was governor of São Paulo. He did a rather competent job of government in São Paulo. I

had frequent contacts with him because as president of the Development Bank I was in charge of financing basic projects, and I helped him out with loans for electricity, railway equipment, et cetera. Furthermore we come from the same part of the country. We are both from Mato Grosso and that sort of established a bond between us. I helped him a great deal during the campaign by writing policy papers, making suggestions for speeches, etc. But when he acceded to the government, despite our fairly close friendship—he is a man without friends, really never intimate—he thought that he needed to cater to the extreme nationalist group and leftist-minded group and that established really a chasm between us.

He thought also, I am told, of inviting me to the cabinet at that time but he didn't do it precisely because he was fearful of provoking some reaction of the left. So after he took office I didn't visit him or write to him or anything. He called me later and offered the post of Ambassador in Bonn, Germany. I turned it down largely on the grounds that I did not like the trend of his

[-3-]

policies and I wanted to have a long leave of absence from the Foreign Office.

REILLY: This was right after he was inaugurated?

CAMPOS: One month after he was inaugurated. But then he said that he couldn't accept the idea of my leaving even temporarily the Foreign Office, that he needed my cooperation, and he had another type of mission which he outlined as a financial mission to Europe. I discussed with him this possibility in three successive interviews and finally agreed to go to Western Europe as some sort of roving ambassador in charge of financial matters or financial negotiations. This mission was to be a parallel one to Ambassador Moreira Salles' [Walter Moreira Salles] mission to the United States. Moreira Salles was supposed to negotiate the debt consolidation in the United States while I was supposed to do the same job in Europe.

I took this assignment. It was my first assignment under Quadros and occupied me for about three months. When I returned, my second job, shortly after, was the preparation of the Punta del Este conference in which the Alliance for Progress was to be contrived. Shortly after Punta del Este, I was nominated by him to be Ambassador in Washington and he sent the nomination to the Senate, but before the Senate could act he resigned.

REILLY: By the time of the period just before the Punta del Este conference, were members of the Brazilian government—yourself and, to the extent that you can speak for him, President Quadros—satisfied that the Alliance for Progress, the plans for which were to be completed at Punta del Este in August of 1961, was the Alliance for Progress program as it had been presented by President Kennedy and his administration up until that time, sufficiently similar to the Operation Pan America so that it incorporated the substance of Operation Pan America, or as some have alleged was it

[-4-]

completely different in conception? Someone suggested that the Operation Pan America was essentially a Brazilian proposal to take over the leadership of Latin America whereas the Alliance for Progress was really a United States proposal to perpetuate the leadership, and some of course contended the domination, of the United States in the hemisphere.

CAMPOS: I would say that there were mixed feelings on this matter. Clearly there was sufficient similarity between the two proposals to render acceptable the Alliance for Progress ideology. There were, however, some doubts. First the Kubitschek group, as it were, resented somewhat that the name of the entire operation had been changed from Operation Pan American to that of "Alliance for Progress." The American argument at this time—at least I heard that this matter had also been discussed in Washington—was that President Quadros was so antagonistic to the Kubitschek administration and had expressed coolness towards the ideas of the previous administration that unless the operation were renamed to indicate a new initiative, the internal political resentments in Brazil might affect deeply the Brazilian participation in the undertaking. I don't know whether that is true; but certainly, even though the change of name may have rendered the operation more plausible to Quadros, it did not please quite a bit of the Brazilian intelligentsia and some groups of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who had taken a leading part in the preparation of Operation Pan America. The analyses at that time made me conclude that by and large the main tenants of Operation Pan America had been taken over the ideology of the Alliance for Progress. For instance there was the acceptance of target growth, an idea which was violently resisted previously in the United States. Second, there was the acceptance of the idea of long-range planning and of the provision of long-term fin-

[-5 -]

ancing as related to plans. The novelties which were introduced were the insistence on social and structural reforms, and secondly the emphasis on social investment.

In the conception of Operation Pan America, the idea was really to regard social investment broadly defined as health, housing, sanitation, perhaps even education as byproducts of economic development, something that should not be directly aimed at but which would inevitably flow from economic development itself, while the premature emphasis—such was the thinking at that time—on social development, might decrease the needed concentration of investment on basic industry and basic economic projects. So one group tended to regard the emphasis on social investment as really a slowing down of the pace of economic development. Another group thought that this might be dilatory tactics based on the belief that going ahead with heavy industrialization projects but might create a trade competition to the U.S., so that the emphasis on social investment might be a convenient way of slowing down the possible pace of industrialization, thereby affording the U.S. industry more time to get ready for the competition from an industrialized South America.

It was argued that the U.S. had had a disappointment with the Marshall Plan, where after having reequipped Europe, the U.S. was being lambasted by European competition and that this lesson might have taught them not to act too quickly on the side of industrialization of Latin America. It was argued likewise that the insistence on social reforms, very difficult

to engineer and very difficult to achieve, would be a dilatory tactic so that the flow of financing would be by itself slow because of the requirement of embarkation by the Latin American countries on the difficult and steep road of social reforms. There was then much less of a sincere conviction on the usefulness of social reforms than the fear of some sort of

[-6-]

dilatory tactics on the part of the U.S. to avoid massive financial engagement in Latin America.

REILLY: Was this emphasis on social reform immediately regarded as an undue intervention or interference by the U.S. government in the internal problems of Brazilian society?

CAMPOS: No, I don't think that the question of intervention was emphasized at all. It was much more the fear that the emphasis on social investment and social reform might either deviate funds from economic investment or else serve as a protective shield against stepping up the pace of investment. Of course some enlightened groups differed from this, and viewed the U.S. intentions in a much more charitable light. Some people for instance thought that it was a wise move on the part of the United States because, having been accused for such a long time of fostering oligarchies in South America, of favoring purely economic exploitative investment, this emphasis on social reform and social investment improved the U.S. image by disassociating it from traditional oligarchies and by laying emphasis on the human being, the human capital supposedly neglected and handled rather cruelly by traditional capitalism. But even here there was a minority. For the major part the reformulation of Operation Pan America via the Alliance for Progress was received with mixed feelings because of this rather complex motivation which I have just described.

REILLY: To what extent was there an objection to the emphasis on Pan Americanism in the Alliance for Progress rather than concentrating on relations between Brazil and the United States considering the hemisphere as a whole?

CAMPOS: I don't think there was any particular objection to that in view of the fact that we had ourselves made an option some time earlier. When Operation Pan America was for-

[-7-]

mulated, an intense debate both within the Brazilian chancery and the press took place as to whether it was more convenient for Brazil to emphasize the bilateral note in relation to the U.S. or the continental multilateral note. Those who favored the bilateral note pointed to the key position that Brazil might hold, the privileged and special relationship that she might have in relation to the U.S. by exploiting the bilateral avenue. Others felt that the U.S. never really adhered coherently to a "key country" doctrine. In certain periods of the past it seemed

that the U.S. was regarding Brazil, perhaps India, or Nigeria in Africa, as the key countries, but it was not a very consistent policy and there were certain relapses into the so-called uniform-treatment doctrine. So the exploitation, although this is not perhaps a very nice word, of the bilateral relationship had been disappointing in the past and perhaps Brazil ought then to march on to seize the leadership of the Latin America group, to be the main coordinator and spokesman, and therefore to increase the surface or area of pressure on the United States in favor of a more enlightened policy in relation to Latin America. So this dilemma of the bilateral versus multilateral, this anguish of choice, was really settled by Kubitschek in Operation Pan America in favor of a multilateral approach, therefore turning down the "key-country" approach or the "special relationship approach" which had been tried in the past. So when Operation Pan America arose, the fact that it emphasized Pan Americanism continentalism rather than special relationship did not really cause any trauma.

REILLY: Now given this background about Operation Pan America and secondly about the Brazilian response to the announcement of the Alliance for Progress, what was the Brazilian position at the first Punta del Este conference in August of 1961?

CAMPOS: I was largely responsible for the final

[-8 -]

formulation of position. There were rather deep contradictions within the Brazilian delegation at that time but the chairman of the delegation, the then Minister of Finance Mariani [Clemente Mariani], sort of accepted the position which I had suggested, which was really to give a try to this new move and to accept at face value the American protestation that the policies had changed in a very fundamental way and there was a new kind of relationship in the offing. So there wasn't really much fundamental disagreement between the American delegation, for instance, and the Brazilian delegation in Punta del Este. I was myself chairman of a group that redrafted the basic document. The difficulties that arose were relatively unimportant. They centered, for instance, on the role of the Committee of Seven. At that time it was not the Committee of the Nine Wise Men, it was the Committee of Seven, and it was proposed particularly by the small countries that there should be a very strong committee, a view which had also the concurrence of the U.S. But some of the nationalists in the Brazilian delegation took the view that no international committee should have a functional judgment over Brazilian plans and programs, and we were under instructions from Quadros to coordinate ourselves very closely with the Argentineans. The Argentineans not only took the supposedly nationalist position that they did not like to submit their plans for review and examination by any strong committee with allocating functions, but they felt also that this might encourage a sort of ECLA [United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America] approach to planning and programming in Latin America; in short, it would enforce ECLA's influence in Latin America, which they considered to be rather socialistic, anti-liberal, and not suitable for an economy like the Argentine one, which had long suffered from corrupt and inefficient government planning

and intervention. So, we finally adhered to the Argentinean position and voted in favor of a toned down Committee of Nine, rather than the strong Com-

[-9-]

mittee of Seven which was originally proposed.

We also wanted more emphasis placed than the Americans wanted on the question of industrialization, on the problem of stability of prices of raw materials, which the American delegation wanted to consider in a rather marginal fashion. We wanted a much more explicit commitment as regards the source of funds and the size of the proposed assistance. In fact it was at the insistence of the Brazilian delegation, and my own insistence particularly, that the sacred word of \$20 billion over a 10-year period was inserted. I thought it absolutely indispensable to have some numerical references, some sort of pythagorean figure to promote interest in, and increase the appeal of, the Alliance. My argument was that unless there were some sort of numerical commitment, there wouldn't be any confidence that the rather meager amount of assistance given in the past would be substantially increased. So this was a major point of dispute. The other one was that the Americans like to place a lot more emphasis on monetary stabilization than we thought either possible or desirable. Again the feeling was that this might to such an extent reinforce the hand of the International Monetary Fund [IMF] that the disbursement of funds under the Alliance for Progress might become in the end, for all practical purposes, subordinated to clearance from the Monetary Fund. This actually happened later and it was a source of friction during my stay in Washington. But perhaps we could go into that later.

REILLY: President Quadros' resignation came at approximately the same time as the Punta del Este conference, just right after it was it?

CAMPOS: Just right after it.

REILLY: There was no relationship between the two was there? To what extent were the issues which were involved in the Punta del Este conference, to what extent were inter-American issues

[-10-]

or issues between the United States and Brazil involved in the decision of the President to resign, or was the decision so far as you know based purely on domestic and personal reasons?

CAMPOS: The resignation of Quadros is one of the mysteries, perhaps the greatest mystery of the Brazilian history. As far as I know there were not really inter-American actors *per se* involved in his decision, which to this day remains difficult to explain. Certainly the Punta del Este and Alliance for Progress meeting had nothing to do with it. A minor role was played perhaps by the fact that his Cuban policy aroused suspicion in certain circles, particularly in military circles, and was behind the open

break between Lacerda [Carlos Lacerda] and Quadros. From this vantage point it might be said that inter-American factors, or really the Cuban problem, had an indirect effect on his resignation by indicating to him that there was substantial division in the Armed Forces and that he had carried the policy to such a point that one of the most important governors broke openly with him. By and large, however, his motivation was purely domestic. It was the fact that he was disappointed in not being able to carry through Congress a number of proposals. He had a dictatorial, or perhaps not a dictatorial but an authoritarian bent, and he thought that by resigning he might come back on the wave of popular acclaim and therefore squash Congress, at least morally, through an overwhelming demonstration of popular support, which would in fact be a plebiscite in his favor and against Congress. It appears from evidence that he counted on coming back on a wave of popular acclaim and this expectation failed. There might be also some emotional instability involved. Be that as it may, I think it was largely a domestic tactical maneuver that had little if anything to do with international factors. It is true that when coming back and being requested to explain his resignation,

[-11-]

Quadros mentioned hidden forces, hidden external forces, but this seems to be a standard jargon of politics since Vargas [Getulio Dornelles Vargas] popularized it in his final letter before committing suicide, so that people really did not ascribe any importance to that and I don't think Quadros was convinced of that either.

REILLY: You referred to the fact that one of the principal differences, or the principal difference, between Quadros and Governor Lacerda of the State of Guanabara was over the Cuban issue and that it was Quadros' independent foreign policy—that is, independent of the U.S. particularly on the issue of Cuba—that led to Lacerda's break with Quadros. To what extent do you think that Quadros' own views about foreign policy, about this independent foreign policy, were already formed before he took office or to what extent were they developed later? For example, after he was elected but before he was inaugurated he was invited to visit the United States and also to visit Yugoslavia and he declined the invitation to visit the U.S. but did visit Yugoslavia. Was there any special significance to this?

CAMPOS: I think so. I think his views evolved slowly during the campaign but certainly crystallized even before he took office. Partly it was a reactive complex. He was being elected by a conservative party, the UDN, which constituted the bulk of his support. It is a party of landowners, of the rich bourgeoisie, and quite a bit of the bureaucrats, but generally regarded as a conservative party. He suffered a bitter opposition from the communists and from the left generally which voted on Marshal Lott [Henrique Texeira], and he thought that he could increase his margin of victory and acquire a great deal of authority if he were to disprove the feeling that he was a candidate of the conservative, and therefore automatically more or less aligned with the U.S. That's why he seemed to have taken a sharp turn to the left. During the cam-

[-12-]

paign he visited Cuba, for instance, and after being elected he catered, to everybody's surprise, to the left, and even though he never had any use for the communists *per se*, and in this he differed from Goulart [João Goulart], for he remained antagonistic to the communists—he catered to all brands and varieties of the left that were not really associated with communism. He might also have felt that this would be a useful weapon in dealing with the United States, because he had perceived what appears to be a rather basic trait in the U.S. foreign policy. It has a sort of masochistic bent and at times it seems more understanding and forthcoming to enemies that offer some promise of reconciliation than to staunch and traditional friends. There is an inclination on your part to take friends for granted and to cater to and cajole enemies. I heard once Quadros mention this masochistic trait of the U.S. foreign policy which I believe, he described, not to me but to somebody else, as being the love of an apache. This might have been a factor in his policy, but again I think it was purely domestic.

He wanted to disclaim really and demonstrate firmly that the accusations of being elected by a reactionary and conservative party as a stooge of the U.S., et cetera, were completely unfounded. In doing this he exaggerated his line, the independent line to affirm the Brazilian personality in world affairs, for there was a deep national desire for affirmation in foreign policy. While this was accepted by quite a large group, Quadros's antics with Che Guevarra, decorating him, and his altogether too obvious taunting of the U.S. and the Alliance disgusted many people. They thought that we should have an independent line but independence should not be confused with a sort of infantile or childish pro-

[-13-]

vocation, and it was this provocative aspect which in the end alienated the sympathies of the middle class and the bourgeoisie, even of the nationalist bourgeoisie, much more than the substance of the policy, which really reflected a deep national urge for self-affirmation, for projection of the Brazilian personality in world affairs.

In all of my conversations with Quadros—I recall now when I asked him the reasons for this sort of provocative attitude—he mentioned that as a financier who wanted to develop an austerity program at home I should understand that he would have a lot more authority to develop an austerity program at home if he took some bold moves used in international politics. Of course then, austerity and acceptance of standard patterns of monetary behavior could not be interpreted as submission to foreign powers, but as something decided independently, in the light of national interests, so that the provocative foreign policy was perhaps a passport to the adoption of conventional, conservative, stringent, austere, difficult financial policies at home.

REILLY: Were you in a position to know President Quadros' reaction to the election of President Kennedy, and secondly to know Quadros own assessment of Kennedy as a leader?

CAMPOS: I didn't hear of any immediate reaction of him to the election of Kennedy because shortly after being elected he went himself on a trip to Asia and

Europe and I had no contacts with him at that time. From my brief contacts with him on this issue (he always talked much more on financial problems) it appeared that he was glad that the Democrats had returned to power. He was convinced that they had greater sensitiveness to foreign policy and he definitely regarded Kennedy as a liberal. He told me a number of times that it was possible now to talk to the Americans: "I think," he said, "they have changed, and I think they are taking now a much less conservative

[-14-]

and reactionary line on Latin America." So my impression is that he was satisfied with Kennedy's election but he didn't want any close association with Kennedy either before or after his taking of office. In fact, as you have mentioned, he didn't accept an invitation to go to the U.S. because he was still bent on improving his image with the left. He sought to indicate that at the very beginning, by his treatment of Ambassador Berle [Adolph A. Berle, Jr.] who came here as Kennedy's envoy and who sounded him out on the Cuban problem, and also offered him some loan assistance, which he regarded first as ridiculously small and which he interpreted to some extent as an ill-disguised bribe. He was very irritated by that and I think also that he didn't like the Cuban invasion.

His reaction, if I can interpret it, although I don't recall having talked to him directly on that but rather having heard indirect comments, was that either the invasion should never have been tried or then it should have been carried through and this sort of indecisiveness in the logic of error didn't please him at all. It gave him perhaps an impression of weakness on Kennedy's part, an impression perhaps similar to that which Khrushchev [Nikita Sergeyeovich Khrushchev] acquired in the Vienna meeting and which later events proved to be completely wrong.

In my view that time Quadros lost part of his respect for Kennedy, first because he didn't like the idea of invasion (he thought that the presence of Cuban dissension in the hemisphere was useful to prod the U.S. into greater understanding of the problems of Latin America); secondly because he thought it was a grave and fatal weakness after having started the process of supporting an invasion not having carried it through. He used to say that there are two ways of being respected—one is by wisdom and the other by might—and in the Cuban experiment he felt that none of those had been achieved.

[-15-]

REILLY: Wouldn't you say then that the Berle mission was a turning point in regard to Quadros' attitude towards the U.S.? It is well known that Quadros was very unhappy with the Beele and Berle mission. Some people have suggested that it was really from that time on that Quadros became quite anti-U.S. in addition to pursuing an independent foreign policy, or would that be ascribing too much influence to that incident?

CAMPOS: I think it is ascribing altogether too much influence to that. I think he had already set his heart on following an independent course and even taunting and provoking the U.S., in order first to acquire the support of the left internally, secondly to carry out a conservative financial policy. But he was a realistic man

and when he invited me for that financial mission in Europe some people had given him lists of extraordinarily generous offers from European banks and from European suppliers, et cetera. He consulted me thereon. I said that that was ridiculous. There wasn't this kind of money lying around in Europe, and basically if we want to count on substantial help we would have really to go to U.S. I don't think, I added, that the Europeans have either the feeling of responsibility for Latin America, the understanding of our problems, and the financial boldness to take the moves which those secret memoranda would indicate. They come clearly from people who have no experience in the world of international finance. He agreed with me. He said basically our destiny is linked to that of the United States and it is from them that we have to get assistance, but he added that the Americans are basically masochistic and they like the harsh treatment.

REILLY: Your appointment as ambassador came just shortly before the Quadros' resignation and although you were not officially the ambassador during the period of the crisis between the departure of Quadros and the accession of President Goulart to the presidency,

[-16-]

you had already been appointed as ambassador and were in a position then to assess President Kennedy's reaction to the Brazilian crisis at that time. What is your recollection of Kennedy's reaction to it and the U.S. government's reaction to the Brazilian crisis at that time?

CAMPOS: Well I only met Kennedy really three months after the crisis here because this was in August—no, I'm sorry, a little less than two months—because I first met Kennedy in October, so that I couldn't say much about his immediate reactions. The crisis took place in August. I was not directly involved in the events and sort of stood on the sideline and had even abandoned the idea of going to Washington altogether, and asked for a leave of absence from the Foreign Office, when I was called by San Tiago Dantas who was appointed Foreign Minister and by Tancredo Neves who was prime minister soon after the *dénouement* of the crisis, and they both insisted—they are both old friends of mine—that I should not leave the government and they would talk to Goulart on that. They did and Goulart called me in and said he wanted my services in Washington; that there was no reason to withdraw the nomination and that he would confirm it even though he knew that we had some basic disagreements. He thought I was too conservative, I said, "you are wrong, I am just a reformer and not a conservative, only I do not believe in violent reform. I don't think we need that." He laughed and then I asked for instructions. He really hadn't had time to think closely on foreign policy and referred me to Dantas who was anyway a very close friend of mine.

When I arrived in Washington and presented my credentials to Kennedy, we did have a fairly long chat on Brazil. His main question was firstly whether the parliamentary system was viable and secondly whether this would not open the way for a good deal of leftist infiltration or radical movements, et cetera. I told him that it would de-

pend of course on the vigor and effectiveness of the first cabinet named or appointed. So far as the question of extremist tendencies was concerned, my view was that perhaps the parliamentary regime would actually be conducive to a more moderate policy because of the simple fact that the government would have to be elected through coalitions. In the presidentialist regime a president can be intoxicated by a few persons or a single party and therefore take a much more radical line, not having to respond either to Congress or to the electorate except after a prolonged period, while in the parliamentary regime no government could stand without coalitions and the coalitions sort of tend to weaken extremist moves. But I agreed that it was a rather delicate game. We had had experience with parliamentary regimes in the past for 57 years during the empire, but it was a different set of circumstances. In more recent years we had adopted a presidentialist regime.

I added that there was one basic difficulty with parliamentary regimes in all Latin countries. It is that the parliamentary regimes work best when there are only two parties or at the most three parties, so that you don't have to compromise too much for the sake of forming coalitions. In the Brazilian case there were twelve parties, three major parties and nine small ones, and that might make the parliamentary regime rather difficult. Those were the main concerns expressed by Kennedy: first, whether the parliamentary regime could really survive and secondly whether it would have enough authority and strength to fight inflation which then was really becoming serious.

REILLY: Going back to your appointment, why would you say did Quadros choose you as Ambassador to Washington at that time, and secondly why did Goulart maintain the appointment? Did Goulart just accept the advice of Dantas or did he have some convictions of his own?

CAMPOS: With Quadros, I think he had some sort of a guilt complex with respect to me. I had helped him a great deal while he was governor. I had helped him along in his campaign by policy papers, by writing suggestions for speeches, et cetera, and then he sort of decided to cater to the extremist left and he felt to a certain extent guilty. He invited me to be Ambassador in Bonn and in Paris too. When I refused Bonn I took the position that I was not really interested and would rather stay away from government altogether; I added that I was finding his behavior rather strange in view of his past inclinations. Then he invited me for the financial mission in Europe which was successful despite terrific odds. It was a very difficult mission. It was well received by public opinion and the results were interpreted very favorably, and he felt then that I might help quite a bit in Washington with financial negotiations, et cetera. The receptivity to my appointment at that time in the press was reasonably good, given the results in Europe.

As far as Goulart is concerned, we had met briefly in the past, particularly during cabinet meetings in the Kubitschek period. He was vice president and often sat in the meetings. I was president of the Development Bank and often called to the meetings, but our acquaintance was very superficial and very brief. I think he rather took the advice of Dantas

and Tancredo Neves and acted much more on the basis of their advice than on the basis of a personal evaluation of my qualities.

REILLY: Shortly after the time you were appointed as ambassador in Washington, President Kennedy was assembling his team to administer the Alliance for Progress and the man he appointed as the United States coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, was sworn in on November 14, 1961. What was the reaction in Brazil, if any, to the appointment of Moscoso

[-19-]

as the chief United States official to run the Alliance for Progress program and was there any special importance or significance attached to the fact that he was Puerto Rican?

CAMPOS: I think the official reaction was rather favorable but there were people who expressed doubts, first on the fact that he was a Puerto Rican and therefore might not carry sufficient weight in the United States, as Puerto Ricans are described here as second rate citizens, that sort of thing. Others felt that a Puerto Rican background is not the best one to understand problems of Latin America because they have, so it is believed here, developed a rather passive mind in relation to the U.S., so that they do not really understand the often aggressive reactions of Latin Americans. Furthermore, some of the people connected with Operation Pan America were resentful anyway, and seized upon this appointment as evidence that the Alliance was not really being taken very very seriously, because instead of appointing a very prominent U.S. personality they resorted to an important economist and a man experienced in development, but not a big name. I think those comments were quite unfair and I must say I have written in the press and talked to a number of people to dissipate this view which to my mind was unfair, pointing out the very respectable record that Moscoso had achieved in Puerto Rico as the man in charge of development.

[-20-]

[NOTE: This is a continuation of the interview with Ambassador Roberto Campos. The interview is conducted by John Reilly and the continuation interview is being held in the study of Ambassador Lincoln Gordon in his residence in Rio de Janeiro on May 30.]

REILLY: Mr. Ambassador, not too long after your presented your credentials to President Kennedy—I believe it was actually in late March of 1962—you presented to President Kennedy the Governor of the State of Guanabara, Governor Carlos Lacerda. Was there any special significance attached to this meeting? What was the subject of discussion as you recall?

CAMPOS: Yes, it was a rather interesting meeting. Mr. Lacerda had a memorandum in which he outlined the main things he thought the Alliance and the United

States should do in relation to Brazil. He was introduced to President Kennedy in the room by Dick Goodwin [Richard N. Goodwin], who presented him as some sort of dethroner of presidents and mentioned to President Kennedy that Lacerda had directly or indirectly influenced politics to such an extent that at least three presidents had resigned and one had died partly because of his political opposition. Kennedy told Lacerda, "Well it seems like you are a rather dangerous man, but I think our institutions are rather stable so I am not particularly frightened." And then they got into a rather cordial tone of conversation. Lacerda was particularly interested in having U.S. assistance to popular housing and education. He was a bit embarrassed because I think he wanted to comment quite a bit more on communist infiltration in the Goulart government, but since I was present there as an ambassador, he felt a bit inhibited in stating his opinion on this particular score.

Lacerda went on then to the question of expropriation of foreign properties and was rather critical of what he thought was a deal contrived for purchases of public utilities and telephone companies in Brazil.

[-21-]

Actually at that time the problem was merely being discussed and no agreement had taken place between the governments and no negotiation really started.

I intervened because he seemed to be confusing the question of the American Foreign Power and of the telephone company in Rio Grande do Sul with his own problem in Guanabara State, which refers rather to the Brazilian Traction, a Canadian company. He proceeded to outline what he thought would be a reasonable solution: instead of buying out the companies to keep them as minority shareholders. But before he could go much further I hastened to intervene and say that President Kennedy was probably interested in the question of the American Foreign Power and the International Telephone and Telegraph, but was not directly interested in the Brazilian Traction because it was a Canadian company. The Governor, however, insisted a little bit more in criticizing any solution that might involve purchasing foreign utilities, and emphasizing rather his own solution which would be the maintaining of the foreign companies in the country as minority stockholders. He probably was preoccupied with the problem of the telephone company in Rio de Janeiro. He was even at odds then with the federal government. He wanted the state to take over the company or to make an arrangement with the company for the creation of a mixed enterprise and hated the idea of the federal government purchasing the communications setup in the State of Guanabara. Probably he feared that that would be a tremendous political and security weapon in the hands of the federal government that might be directed against the state government.

Be that as it may, I thought that it was not quite appropriate to discuss the matter with President Kennedy since obviously what Lacerda had in mind were questions relating to a Canadian company rather than to an American company. But Kennedy was very interested

[-22-]

in his idea that a major effort on popular housing and a major effort on secondary education would attack two crucial points, one the restless masses, homeless in the big cities, who inhabited the favelas, and secondly the young students who, unless given an opportunity for

education would become embittered, disillusioned, to the point of turning against the system and eventually endangering it. Kennedy received Lacerda's memorandum and turned it over for study to Dick Goodwin. I think that was the gist of the interview. Lacerda behaved rather well, I thought, considering his emotional manner, and was rather prudent in the television broadcast as he emerged from the White House. The press sort of provoked him because knowing him to be a bitter opponent of Goulart, and since Goulart was very much in the news because his visit was scheduled for a month after Lacerda's stay in the United States, the press was interested in bringing to the open a split with Goulart. Lacerda refused that in a rather clever way and the interview was devoid of any further incident.

REILLY: It was just actually a few days later on April 3 or 4 that President Goulart paid his visit to Washington, and in the several events which were held during that visit to Washington I believe you participated in most of them. In addition to the meeting at the airport there was a luncheon at the White House and a long conversation that afternoon, April 3, and other meetings following on April 4 including the dinner at the Brazilian Embassy, which as I recall President Kennedy himself did not participate in but President Goulart did and a number of President Kennedy's key aides. In general what would you today looking back on the visit, regard as the most important subjects discussed and what would be your assessment of the visit? Or would you prefer to discuss some the individual subjects which were discussed between Presidents Kennedy and Goulart, such as the whole question of American utilities

[-23-]

in Brazil, the question of expropriation of foreign private investments, the question of military *coup d'états* and unconstitutional governments—the question, in this case being raised by the deposition of the Frondizi government [Arturo Frondizi] in Argentina—the question of how best to meet the pressing needs of the masses of the people of lower strata of Brazil and Latin America in general. All of these as well as the labor question I understand were discussed during the meetings between Kennedy and Goulart. Which were the most important discussions in your view?

CAMPOS: Your questions range over a very wide field. I worked very intensely on the preparation of Goulart's trip to Washington. It was not a very easy thing to prepare. The environment was rather tense. Shortly before Goulart's trip, his brother-in-law Brizola [Lionel Brizola] expropriated the International Telephone and Telegraph Company, and that company has of course a wide network of publicity agents and launched a major campaign of discredit against the Brazilian government. Little by little through intensive preparation and press work we managed to improve the Brazilian image and Goulart's image personally, before he went to Washington. The first major ceremony was really the luncheon at the White House. It was a colorful affair. President Kennedy had wide assortment of people representing various interests and walks of life—the bureaucracy, the diplomatic world, Congress, business. It was quite interesting but of course no substantive discussions took place. It was gay and pleasant. The substantive discussions took place later and covered a wide variety of fields. On the question of expropriation of utilities,

Kennedy emphasized his interest in getting some procedure that would enable us to engage in the process of frictionless nationalization. He thought that the situation had changed so much, there was such a degree of politicization, if you will, of the prices and tariff rates of

[-24-]

public utilities, that it was very hard for foreign companies to stay in that field in Latin America. Every time a rate had to be raised it became a political problem, and if the company were a foreign one it became a diplomatic problem, and he thought that the interests at stake between Brazil and the United States were much too important, much too serious, for the two countries to engage in bickering every time there was a dispute over telephones or over rates of public utilities.

He however emphasized that he would have a difficult time with Congress and he might be accused of selling American properties down the river unless some procedure for just compensation were found; he understood that to be in agreement with the Brazilian constitution itself, which provides for just payment in case of expropriation. He took pains to point out that he was not defending the interests of big business or big companies. His only interest really was to insure that some sort of fair settlement were reached because otherwise the companies would press on Congress. Congress would pass restrictive legislation and the broader interests of Brazil and Latin America might be negatively affected.

Goulart then answered by asking me to read our position paper on this matter, which substantially involved accepting the principle of peaceful nationalization through a negotiated settlement, stating that under the terms of our constitution we were prepared to pay a just compensation but that we needed to have payment installments over a long period of time, not only because of financial considerations of the companies themselves but also because of the exchange problem; and we hoped the U.S. government would exercise its influence with the companies so that they would ask for moderate and reasonable terms and they would agree to receive payments over a long period so as to minimize the foreign exchange burden. Kennedy agreed that this should be done while taking pains to emphasize that it was really our

[-25-]

proposal which he would look upon with interest because he didn't want to be accused in the United States of taking the initiative of, as it were, selling the companies down the river. That would create a difficult political problem for him. He was accused in Congress of having an altogether too liberal posture on American -owned property. The matter was left with the feeling that a basic agreement had been reached on major principles and from then onwards negotiations should take place between the interested companies and the Brazilian government. A sentence to that effect was inserted in the communiqué.

There were some other problems discussed. Goulart emphasized our economic interest in having access to the U.S. sugar market. For a long time Brazil, despite being a major producer, had been deprived of any statutory quota while other countries not important as suppliers had quotas. He mentioned also our interest in having the U.S. pursue actively the new policy of fostering an international coffee agreement. Kennedy then and later on

emphasized his particular interest on the labor problem. He repeatedly said that he knew fairly well the labor problem because during his stay in the Senate he had been on the Labor Committee and he had studied the growth of communist influence in the U.S. labor unions in the immediate after-war period and subsequently the internal purification of the unions; he thought that that was a serious matter because the labor unions controlled the streets and if they are infiltrated that may bring warfare and strife to the streets. Goulart answered that he was very aware of that, that he was in full control of the labor movement and the extent of communist influence was quite exaggerated. He said that he was more than ever convinced the communists had not really taken over the mass of workers. They had perhaps an exaggerated share in the leadership, but this is a problem that he knew he could handle and he was confident would be handled in due time. He was a bit irked at this mention and Kennedy with his

[-26-]

great psychological intuition perceived this embarrassment of Goulart and hastened to say that he didn't want to intervene at all in Brazilian affairs, he was just making a friendly comment, based on American experience because even in the United States there was a time in the after-war period when there was a substantial infiltration of communists in the labor movement. Goulart also complained about the fact that the International Bank had ceased operations in Brazil for a long while and we hadn't gotten any support from the U.S. for resumption of these relations. He also mentioned—that was in a position paper which was prepared for him—that the Ex-Im Bank [Export-Import Bank of the United States] was taking a restrictive attitude in relation to Brazil and this should be set right. Kennedy promised to talk to the Ex-Im Bank people to determine what was the reason for their reticence but I think those words fell by the wayside and throughout my stay in Washington the Ex-Im Bank didn't show any greater willingness to cooperate. Partly they had been irked by the fact that in the early days of Quadros' administration, when there was a big debt settlement negotiation, the Ex-Im Bank was sort of railroaded into an agreement which they thought placed on them an inordinate share of the burden of alleviating the Brazilian debt. There was some personal resentment of Linder [Harold F. Linder], Ex-Im Bank president, for being under very severe pressure to reach a quick agreement on this issue, and I don't think he ever forgave us or the U.S. Treasury for having pressed him into this consolidation, which he thought enlarged excessively the area of exposure of the Ex-Im Bank.

Be that as it may, it does not appear that Kennedy took any steps to control the Export-Import Bank as a result of Goulart's complaints, and our relations with the Export-Import Bank continued to be rather difficult. Although the staff was very friendly, although some projects in Brazil continued to be sort of pet babies of the Export-Import Bank, by and large, their posture was very strict and I

[-27-]

myself complained several times that they probably hadn't heard of the Alliance for Progress, because they kept insisting that their exposure was exaggerated, while we kept saying that

the whole concept of the Alliance for Progress was the recognition that the financial exposure of the U.S. and Latin America was inadequate, insufficient, and that further funds had to be mobilized.

It is clearly an example of sectorial indiscipline, if you will, in the U.S. government, where the supposedly generous posture of the Alliance for Progress was destroyed by a sectoral reaction based on purely banking considerations. The posture of the Ex-Im Bank then and subsequently was always that they were really responsible to Congress rather than to the administration. Therefore, they wouldn't be railroaded into action by executive diktat.

You mentioned this dinner which took place after a big reception at the Brazilian Embassy which President Kennedy attended for a few moments and over which Goulart presided as the host to the Washington diplomatic corps and the business and bureaucratic community. After that we had a sort of private dinner upstairs in the Embassy, a dinner which was promoted by Dick Goodwin and at which an interesting assortment of top Kennedy collaborators was assembled. McNamara [Robert S. McNamara] was there, if I recall correctly. I think that Walter Rostow [Walter Whitman Rostow], Arthur Schlesinger [Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.], Dick Goodwin, Shriver [R. Sargent Shriver, Jr.]—Shriver was invited but then didn't go—Galbraith [John Kenneth Galbraith], Lincoln Gordon. There were other personalities but I don't recall at the moment—oh yes, Ted Sorensen [Theodore C. Sorensen]—and the idea was to have a frank debate on a number of issues. McNamara made some comment on the importance of Brazil from the viewpoint of the security of the continent and also showed some apprehension in regard to leftist infiltration and asked for some clarification of what the neutralist policy inaugurated by Quadros was.

I explained to him that neutralism was really an inadequate term

[-28-]

and what was involved was really a deep urge of the Brazilian people to assert their personality in world affairs, and that one ought to distinguish between this basic assertion of personality and the provocative ingredients with which Quadros had mixed up this context—the former being probably a rather stable element in Brazilian national politics while the second was about to disappear, if it had not disappeared. An interesting side discussion took place with Galbraith. Galbraith, to Goulart's delight, invested against orthodox financial policies which supposedly were defended by myself and Gordon. He had lots of fun pointing out the fact that Indian economists and statesmen were very much orthodox in financial matters and they could and should use perhaps some of the buoyancy created by the Brazilian inflation, and sort of taunted us with some criticism of our acceptance of the International Monetary Fund domination. Goulart of course who was never particularly enthusiastic about fighting inflation, was perfectly delighted at this exchange of views. Gordon was rather irked.

I took it jokingly and tried to explain to Galbraith that the type of inflation he was thinking about was not the inflation that prevailed in Brazil; that we were risking having an inflammation rather than an inflation, that his sympathy for exchange controls and other appurtenances of inflationary development would disappear if he had the concrete responsibility of handling the tremendous exchange bureaucracy which we had in Brazil. But Galbraith was brilliant, witty, and gay, and his preaching fell on fertile ground since Goulart was inclined anyway not to take very seriously the fight against inflation. In fact he kidded

me saying, "Now, you see, we have a professor who is not orthodox, who is a true liberal. Why don't you change your ways and be as liberal as he is? In fact I think Kennedy's advisors are much more liberal and much more understanding of the problems of inflation and development than you and

[-29-]

other of my advisors in Brazil who are always advising restraint, austerity, et cetera."

Goulart left the dinner in a rather gay mood and quite happy at his discovery of the liberal posture of the Kennedy advisors. Perhaps no other meeting in the United States, in Washington or other cities of the U.S., pleased him so much as this particular one, not only because of the caliber of the personalities involved but also because he thought that he had found a confirmation of his instinctive opposition, as it were, to moderate, truly orthodox, and traditional measures to combat inflation.

REILLY: During some of the other discussions was there much attention focused on the question of military coups and Argentina, or was this just mentioned in passing?

CAMPOS: Kennedy did mention that to Goulart in a general meeting but then he had a private conversation with Goulart which was not attended by anyone on our side, just by the interpreter on the U.S. side, in which I am sure he approached that, and so I know that only in a rather indirect fashion. I know Goulart mentioned to him the danger of encouraging military coups and Goulart was very suspicious and remained suspicious of the alleged interference of the United States in the deposition of Frondizi. It's curious that the Americans always took pains to emphasize that they tried to discourage the generals from deposing Frondizi, and even threatened them with possible non-recognition or withdrawal of aid, but Goulart never really believed that. I don't know what President Kennedy might have told him but I don't believe Goulart ever abandoned the idea that somehow the Frondizi's deposition, if not actively engineered, was at least looked upon with some satisfaction by the State Department, presumably because he himself had had in the past sympathies for the Peronist group, and Frondizi towards the end of his government was trying to bring back the Peronists to the fold.

[-30-]

Be that as it may, the matter was discussed and Kennedy tried to make the point that the U.S. was opposed to military coups and there was no participation in the Argentinean event; but I don't believe that Goulart ever really believed him and subsequently in several of my conversations with Goulart he always brought up the point of American intervention and American sympathies for military regimes. I tried to dissuade him from this viewpoint but I don't believe with any degree of success. It was sort of a basic fundamental suspicion which he never really abandoned.

REILLY: This might be a good time to raise the question about what was your own

reaction then and what is your own assessment today of the policy which Kennedy pursued in regard to support of constitutional governments and opposition to non-constitutional governments, particularly those that came to power through military coups?

CAMPOS: I think that the American policy of discouragement of military coups and non-recognition is basically correct and it has contributed to a large extent to improve the American image in Latin America which suffered decidedly from an excessively close association with military regimes, supposedly conservative and supposedly better equipped to fight communism; and Latin Americans when confronted with this change in policy had an ambivalent attitude. On the one hand, there was sympathy for the desire to preserve normally elected governments against military coups and to this extent the American attitude was regarded as an improvement. On the other hand, there was the traditional principle of non-intervention and they feared that the meek acceptance of the United States' right, as it were, of passing an opinion endorsing or rejecting governments might in the future be abused. Latin American thought has always oscillated between sympathy for a position of preservation of democracies and a morbid fear of intervention.

[-31-]

Brazil in particular has been both very critical of the U.S. tolerance of dictatorial regimes and very inconsistent in its position by recognizing dictatorial regimes always on the ground that, after all, any other attitude would be an intervention in the affairs of individual governments.

I don't know whether you question the events of the present day which involve some delicate problems. What should the U.S. do in the case of Brazil? I think that there are distinctive features in the recent Brazilian revolution. In the first place it has become quite clear from a number of signs that Goulart was not really interested in carrying constitutional normalcy to the end of his period. The indications were that he might relish the idea of repeating Vargas' experiment in '37, when Vargas established an authoritarian *Estado Novo*, only with the signs changed. In '37 the world environment was Fascist and the *Estado Novo* took a rightist turn, but it was an experiment in personal power more than any ideological experiment. Goulart wanted also an experiment in personal power, but in keeping with the changed world conditions it would take a turn to the left. There was basically no difference between the two and it was an indication of Goulart's lack of imagination that he tried to repeat the program of his master a little less than 20 years apart. Since the evidence was quite clear that Goulart was not interested in a normal constitutional transition, because he didn't offer any alternative candidate to Kubitschek and did not do anything to reinforce Kubitschek—since he obviously was not interested in the election of his major opponent, Lacerda, the only possible conclusion was that he did not believe in normal elections and was looking for a third way out, which would be to confront the nation with the possibility of Lacerda victory and then mobilize deep resentments against Lacerda in favor of his own continuation in the government.

[-32-]

Given this background it is difficult to say that to oppose the new turn of events in Brazil, to oppose the revolution, would be really to help Brazil to maintain intact constitutional procedures, because constitutional procedures would be violated anyway and the choice was to have them violated by a revolution which was a centrist, middle class revolution (which has been wrongly described as a rightist one) or to have constitutional procedures violated through the continuation of Goulart in power, with the danger that gradually he might be dominated by the communists and, rather than using the communists, be used by them. I think the latest happenings in Brazil have to be considered in a completely different light from the traditional military coup in Latin America, where you have merely a substitution of leadership within the same class and an interruption of normal constitutional procedures. In the Brazilian case there would be in all likelihood an interruption of constitutional procedures and the choice was to have that interrupted by a leftist minority or to have them interrupted by a revolution of the middle class, which has all the possibilities of preserving the country in a centralist position.

REILLY: What was your overall appraisal of the visit of President Goulart in April of 1962? Was Goulart pleased with the consequences of the visit and were you yourself satisfied that some important results had been accomplished?

CAMPOS: I think that by and large the visit was extremely useful. Goulart was pleasantly surprised at what he considered to be a rather warm reception. He was nervous and fearful of a hostile reception in Washington, and the general cordial tone of the visit, including the press which improved enormously its rendering of Goulart's image, caused in him a very, very good impression. He was personally struck by Kennedy's personality and liberal posture, and for a while it looked as if it might be possible

[-33-]

to convert Goulart into a liberal leader of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America. There was a general relaxation of tensions in Brazil; Goulart's image improved enormously both externally and internally. Kennedy offered him, as it were, a special position in Latin America as a man left-of-the-center, capable of contact with the masses, a popular leader but also capable of maintaining a center position. Goulart tended to accept that role and for a while there was general hope that this area of agreement with centralist forces in Brazil would be broadened. But this was short lived and once he returned to Brazil he again got persuaded by some of his advisors that he couldn't do anything unless he toppled the parliamentary government and unless he regained full presidential powers. He exhausted himself in the fight for the overthrow of the parliamentary regime, getting a plebiscite, and he forgot completely the normal business of administration. He was never very fond of administration anyway. He liked power but he detested government. But this continuous preoccupation with regaining power and with demoralizing the parliamentary regime diverted his attention from the great challenge of becoming the really centrist leader in Latin America; gradually he turned to

a close alliance with the U.S. and identification with the Alliance for Progress would be a fatal contamination which would render him unable to ride the nationalist wave which he thought to be the wave of the future in Latin America.

REILLY: There was some speculation at the time about why Mrs. Goulart did not accompany the President to Washington. Was there any special significance to that? It was originally intended that both Mrs. Kennedy [Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy] and Mrs. Goulart [Maria Teresa Fontela Goulart] would participate in this. This turned out not to be the case.

CAMPOS: Clearly there was quite a bit of talk about this. I myself recommend that. From the publicity viewpoint it

[-34-]

might be extremely helpful, but Goulart had two arguments: First, that his wife did not really like the spotlight and hated official ceremonies, etc. She is a very shy and reticent girl. And furthermore that he would like to give this visit a businesslike approach. He was a labor leader talking to a capitalist government and the fewer the social trimmings, the better. And bringing his wife along would generate a great deal of social dispersion, and he wanted the trip to be short and conducted with a businesslike sort of approach. That was his argument basically for not bringing his wife to Washington.

REILLY: One final question on the visit, at one point during the visit according to press reports, President Kennedy did express some dissatisfaction with the way in which the Brazilian government was responding to the Alliance for Progress, some dissatisfaction with the machinery in Brazil to implement the Alliance for Progress. How did Goulart respond to this?

CAMPOS: That was correct. The President said that despite his wish to assist Brazil, it was rendered difficult by the lack of planning and organization within the government. Goulart acknowledged that that was true; after talking to myself and to Dantas he expressed the view that a special machinery should be created in the government to coordinate projects to be presented to the Alliance for Progress. But he quipped back that the bureaucratic organization of the Alliance for Progress was a ponderous one and that there was a great dissatisfaction in Brazil with the extreme bureaucratic difficulties and the rather rigid attitude taken by the Alliance so that there was a share of guilt on both sides.

REILLY: Moving on now to the period following the Goulart visit to Washington, several months after that in July, actually July 31, 1962, you had a meeting with President Kennedy to present a large group of Brazilian students who were then touring the United States. How did Kennedy handle himself with this group? Did he en-

gave in substantive discussion of the problems raised by the students and from this short meeting did you form any general conclusions about Kennedy's relationships with student and intellectual groups and his capacity to deal with complicated substantive issues? Or was this the type of meeting that concentrated chiefly on formalities and pleasantries?

CAMPOS: No, it was a rather informal affair. The students were received on the lawn of the White House. Kennedy made a short address, was greeted by one of the students, and then agreed to answer questions, and I think he handled himself extremely well. His personality was at its best at that time. He was human and lively, quick in repartees, and I think he was quite a hit with the students. Some of the questions were sharp, perhaps even indelicate, to the President. One student, for instance, asked why was the United States talking so much about war, why were the radios talking all the time about missiles and security and armed forces. Was not this a Nazi sort of posture? Kennedy handled the acidity of the questions very well. Another question was whether or not the United States was dominated by big business and whether or not it was true that the foreign policy was deeply influenced by the interests of American companies. Still another question as to whether the United States had any opposition to the implantation of socialism in Brazil. Kennedy handled all of those questions I think extremely well, in a witty and clever fashion, quick on the repartee and patient in a rather charming mood, as was also Bob Kennedy [Robert F. Kennedy]. Both the Kennedys, Jack Kennedy and Bob Kennedy, were quite a hit with the students. Bob Kennedy was hit by questions on monopolies and trusts, et cetera, and took time to explain to the students that the United States had invented, as it were, the anti-trust legislation, and that there was some amount of bitterness between the bits business and the government on the issue of trusts, et cetera. But

he was not as warm a personality as Jack Kennedy was and didn't have the halo of the presidency. I would say that the mark was very positive at that particular meeting and some of the students left the White House deeply shaken in their convictions, although some of them continued to be leftists. Part of the selection of students had been deliberate, to bring to the United States leftist students in order to expose them to the influence and contamination of a different civilization. But all of them did suffer a major psychological impact, and I think it was one of the high marks of Kennedy's performance as a public speaker that I saw in Washington.

REILLY: Moving along in this same year, 1962, the most important event of that year and possibly of the Kennedy presidency was of course the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba in October of 1962. Could you tell us something about the official response of the Brazilian government to this, and secondly the more general response of the various sectors of public opinion in Brazil as they were reported to you at that time?

CAMPOS: Those were really difficult days. The events were rather sudden, and Brazil was still under the illusion that there was not really an armed build-up in Cuba and that the Cuban posture was purely defensive. There was a great deal of sympathy for the underdog and there was quite a bit of sympathy for the socialist experiment in Cuba. When the confrontation arose and evidences were produced of implantation of missiles, it was a major psychological shock.

When the security aspect of the case became involved, the reaction in Brazil was rather positive. It was an evidence of betrayal by both the Cubans and the Russians on this question of installation of missiles. But again our policy had been so much and to such an

[-37-]

extent one of defending self-determination and protecting the principle of non-intervention that the reorientation of policy was a difficult one. I recall that Goulart called me about 2 or 2:30 in the morning the day that the existence of missiles was revealed through the famous Kennedy speech. He talked about the quarantine, which was previously the subject of a briefing in the State Department to the ambassadors, and asked me what was my assessment of the situation. First, would the United States go to war? Would they retreat if the Russians should proceed to Cuba? I told him that to my mind the United States could not retreat on that particular issue and would be prepared for a nuclear confrontation, if that were the case, because otherwise the entire structure of defense of the Western World would collapse and the possibilities of further nuclear blackmail would be tremendous.

I immediately added that to my mind the Russians would retreat because all the evidence seemed to be of a substantial margin of nuclear superiority of the United States and that Khrushchev was from all indications very much of a realist and therefore probably the Russian ships would be ordered to come back and the United States would win temporarily. The cause of my apprehension was a different one, that the United States might then proceed to an invasion, so that the graduated response of the blockade might be followed by a more violent sort of action. My recommendation concerning the position of the Brazilian government would be to accept and support the blockade as being a rational and reasonable response to the threat, but perhaps not to approve indiscriminately further measures, which might create a difficult situation, because even if the Russians were willing to lose face before a blockade they might be forced to a different reaction in the case of an invasion. Goulart asked what kind of reaction the Russians might have. I said well they might invade Iran or they might invade Berlin. I don't think that they would

[-38-]

react to an invasion of Cuba directly, but they had a number of indirect ways of acting. Then Goulart asked if it was my considered opinion that the Russians would retreat. I said yes, that it was my considered opinion that the Russians would retreat, because I thought the nuclear facts are just stacked up against them. He said, "Well, I will transmit instructions to you on this question." I said, "No, we have here our delegate to the Organization of American States, so instructions should be sent to him."

I didn't talk to Goulart for a day and the next day instructions came to our delegate in the Organization of American States. The instructions were a bit confused and quite hesitant on the whole thing, but they did authorize us to vote for the blockade provided there was unanimity. This set some sort of vicious circle because we couldn't know whether there would be unanimity without being ourselves prepared to state our position fairly clearly. There was an intensive exchange of cables and finally the position taken was largely my own responsibility and that of the delegate to the OAS, and was that we would accept the explicitly invoked authorization to establish the blockade. We would abstain on the section of the resolution which dealt with further measures, non-specified measures, our view being that those non-specified measures might include invasion and invasion might be a remedy but should be preceded by an international investigation of the presence of the missiles and not by unilateral evidence produced by the United States. The question then became whether we should vote for the resolution as a whole. Our delegate voted in favor of the blockade, abstained on the vote on non-specified other measures, but voted for the resolution as a whole and the Foreign Office believed that we had abused our instructions: that we should have voted for the blockade, should have abstained on the issue of other non-specified measures, and should have abstained on the resolution as a whole, as a couple of other countries did—I believe, Chile and Mexico. This created some difficulties for our delegate in the OAS and for myself, but when the Russians really

[-39-]

retreated and it became clear that it had been a major victory for the U.S., as it were, and the reception in Brazil public opinion was very favorable to the turn of events we were both saved. There was no dismissal.

REILLY: Did this incident have the effect of raising the stature of Kennedy in Goulart's mind?

CAMPOS: Very definitely, I think so, and the reception of public opinion was quite favorable to that.

REILLY: We were discussing the reaction of President Goulart to President Kennedy's performance during the Cuban Missile Crisis and you said that the overall result definitely had the effect of raising his stature in the eyes of President Goulart. Was this true generally in Brazilian government?

CAMPOS: I think so. It was a major positive mark.

REILLY: Before continuing on to a later event of that year 1962, I would like to go back for just a minute and touch upon the second Punta del Este conference, the political conference which met in January 1962. Would you care to tell us something about the role of the Brazilian government in that conference and your assessment of the result?

CAMPOS: Both the preparation and the aftermath of that conference were for a long while a cause of great worry to me personally in Washington because of my inability to convey the Brazilian viewpoint which was really much more severe to Cuba than appeared on the surface. But I found that Saxons are not as rational as they claim to be. In this particular instance of Cuba they were extremely emotional and quite irrational. Dantas was to my mind very unfairly judged throughout. His posture, which I think valid, was that the Brazilian position in the Punta del Este conference was the only realistic one. We proceeded to recognizing, without liking it, the fact that there was a communist regime in Cuba and that short of in-

[-40-]

vasion it would stay for a long while. So there was a practical coexistence and the American refusal to accept that fact was not logical, it was purely emotional. There was a certain inconsistency in the reluctance to accept and admit the fact of coexistence and the continuous protestations that there was no desire to invade Cuba. Those things did not jibe together. Our position was that one should recognize the fact of coexistence and then proceed to impose on Cuba what we called a "statute of limitations." We would tell the Cubans that we would recognize the coexistence between the two regimes provided they were to abide by a statute of negative obligations which involved refusal to enter into an armed pact with the Soviet group, discontinuation of the practice of demoralization of governments in Latin America, subversive activities, and propaganda, et cetera. Now once these negative obligations were clearly defined, then one would have a basis for application of sanctions.

REILLY: You discontinued your discussion of the failure of the U.S. to respond to the Brazilian position, to realize the implications of the position.

CAMPOS: Yes, I said the Brazilian position was lot sterner than it appeared on the surface. But somehow this never got through and the issue was handled in the U.S. both at the government level and at the press level and congressional level in a sort of extremely emotional way. That has been one of my frustrations in Washington. As the event turned out now, the United States has come to recognize after the initial crisis the fact of coexistence and in fact earlier than the Missile Crisis, one month earlier, Kennedy made the positive recognition of coexistence, and restated the policy of the United States which was to give a conditional guaranty of non-invasion provided Cuba would abide by a certain number of rules. This could have been done a year earlier, more than a year earlier at Punta del Este, had the Brazilian position

[-41-]

been accepted, and it would have been stated in much more favorable conditions to the U.S., through the device of imposing on Cuba a statute of negative obligations.

REILLY: Was there any profound reaction in the Brazilian government to the rejection of this proposal by the United States? What was the response within the

Brazilian government to this rejection of the Brazilian proposal at Punta del Este by the United States?

CAMPOS: There was some feeling of disappointment and a bit of bitterness over what was thought to be quite an unrealistic position. Dantas, who was later on in the U.S., had the impression that Dean Rusk personally understood the position. But Rusk recognized the persistence in the States of what we call a "Monroeist" mentality, so that there was a peculiar sensitiveness to the acceptance or admission of the interest of any other power in the Western Hemisphere, even when the facts were there to prove that that interest existed. Dantas was willing to go to quite some extent in order to quiet American fears that he was really underestimating the danger of communist influence. I recall having once visited with him the CIA on one of his trips to Washington to see what technical assistance could be obtained to control communist infiltration and subversion. Unfortunately our meeting with CIA was quite disappointing. Their comments were quite general and the information they had or cared to transmit was very superficial on the extent of communist infiltration in Brazil. They did offer to train some people from the Brazilian security services on communist techniques of infiltration, but all in all my contacts with them were rather poor. I thought either that their information was very superficial or they did not care to transmit the information they had.

REILLY: On the subject of communism, was it your impres-

[-42-]

sion that President Kennedy correctly assessed a) the attraction of communism for certain groups in Brazil and in Latin America generally, and secondly did he overestimate the influence and importance of communism in Brazil and Latin America?

CAMPOS: I think that he correctly assessed the attraction that communism might exert in Brazil and other Latin American countries. I equally think that he overestimated at times the importance of communism in Brazil. It was not he personally as much as the general context of Congress and perhaps the U.S. bureaucracy and the press also. I always thought that there was an altogether hasty assimilation of several brands of the left with the communists, but I think that Kennedy had a sufficiently lucid understanding of the problem, so that he did not underestimate the attraction of communism to the intelligentsia, the disgruntled frustrated bureaucracy, and some of the working masses of Latin America. He did overestimate however the importance of these phenomena in Brazil. I think intellectually at least one should differentiate very clearly between the several brands of left in Brazil and communism—the nationalist left, the Catholic left, the socialist left, the ultra nationalist left, and finally the communist left. What might be said in favor of the U.S. position is that in practice the non-communist left tends to adopt a contradictory and non-viable economic development theory that might lead to stagnation, and economic stagnation might then provide a fertile ground for communism. But this sort of a roundabout result and one should clearly differentiate between the ideology of the non-communist left

and the communist ideology, even though, as we found to be the case in Brazil, even though, the non-communist left adopts economic theories that are non-viable and so inefficient that they might unwillingly, and without paying heed to Moscow, unwillingly abet the communist cause.

[-43-]

REILLY: Moving back now to the end of 1962, President Kennedy's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, visited Brazil in mid December of that year. Would you tell something about the background of that visit from the Brazilian point of view and some assessment of the significance of the visit?

CAMPOS: I was not really informed of Kennedy's trip except at the very last moment. It was one of my resentments in Washington. His trip was sort of improvised. It was a suggestion of Gordon to Goulart. There was an accumulated wave of suspicion in the U.S., a great deal of discontentment, as it were, over assistance and financing, et cetera, supposedly on the ground that there was doubt as to the Brazilian capacity to resist leftist infiltration. Robert Kennedy was getting ready to go to Panama and it was conveyed to Goulart that his trip might be extended to Latin America. I knew of the fact that the U.S. government was trying to send a high-level personality to Brazil to express directly the worries of the U.S. government to Goulart, but I didn't know that Kennedy might be chosen. In fact I think his choice was thoroughly accidental, but the embassy in Washington was not informed of that. It came as a bit of a surprise to me. I learned that at a luncheon at the embassy practically on the eve of Kennedy's departure, and I told people in the State Department that in my view the timing was poor for that particular trip. Their reaction was that they wanted in some measure to influence the composition of the future Goulart cabinet, in a way that would make possible continuing cooperation between Brazil and the U.S., since it was taken for granted that he would win the plebiscite. I said, "Well, in the first place, it's quite inappropriate to try to influence the composition of the cabinet, and secondly I don't think that Goulart will say anything relevant to you right now. You ought to wait for him to win the plebiscite and then if his government choices are such that a working arrangement would be difficult to establish, then to

[-44-]

bring the case to him. Right now I think you would only complicate matters. In order to keep his posture in the public opinion he would have to react very negatively on the main points of the visit. It might be described by his opponent as an ultimatum and that might embitter him, so all in all I don't think it's well timed."

Goulart subsequently told me that Kennedy's visit was really directed to two points: a) to defend interests of the American companies, American Foreign Power, et cetera, and this irritated him a bit. Secondly he claimed that Bob Kennedy vastly overrated the degree of communist infiltration in his government and in fact it was if he was told that he had no capacity to judge the men that he was surrounded with.

Goulart always believed that he was capable of riding the tiger, and he claims to have said to Bob Kennedy, "Look here, I am in full control of the situation in Brazil. After the Cuban confrontation, we changed our policies and we didn't have strikes, we didn't have killings in the streets; in fact it was much less of a bloody issue than it proved to be in Colombia or Venezuela where they had riots and people killed over the Cuban issue. We demonstrated to have much better control over the internal situation, including the Brazilian left, than those staunch allies of the United States." All in all, therefore, I think that the planning of the visit was rather poor and there was a lack of coordination between the two embassies, the American Embassy in Rio and the Brazilian Embassy in Washington. Our advice was not sought on that, and the results I think were negligible, if not negative.

REILLY: Was there anything particularly significant about the U.S. response to the outcome of the plebiscite which took place in January of '63?

CAMPOS: I think the results of the plebiscite were a surprise even in Brazil. One expected that Goulart would win but

[-45-]

not by such a wide margin. The comments in the U.S. press were generally constructive and it pleased Goulart very much to have that reaction.

REILLY: It was just several months after the plebiscite had been held that Minister of Finance San Tiago Dantas went to Washington for a series of negotiations which were culminated in the agreement known as the Bell-Dantas agreement. Can you tell us something about any important background factors leading up to this mission and then your assessment of the results of the mission itself.

CAMPOS: The mission was politically a very difficult one. It might either make Dantas or break him. It turned out that it broke him. He hesitated very much before going and cabled me a number of times to try to get in advance from the U.S. government some idea of the magnitudes of assistance that they were prepared to give; but the position of the U.S. government was that this could not be settled beforehand, that a concrete risk had to be taken, and that they would like to see the results of several of the measures.

The pressure of impending exchange commitments was such that Dantas had really no leeway to decide and Ambassador Gordon also advised him to go. He came to Washington however with a heavy heart. He thought that if he had some more time for taking some measures of economic restoration, et cetera, he might be better equipped to deal with the problem. But the choice was not there. We were running the risk of defaulting on some foreign exchange obligations and the visit was needed. When we started the negotiations in Washington, we had to contend with the unfavorable background created for Dantas by the misinterpretation of his role in the January Punta del Este political conference, in which his position was described as pro-Castro [Fidel Castro], when in fact it was really a balanced and realistic position.

The U.S. posture was one of the limited and cautious cooperation. It

[-46-]

was one of my sharp points of disagreement with Ambassador Gordon. I thought that the U.S. attitude and answer were not forthcoming. I thought they were extremely cautious. I tried to persuade them that even though the disbursements might be graduated and geared to performance—in fact Dantas himself insisted on having the disbursements tied to performance—the commitments should be generous and forthcoming, for the political impact in Brazil would be exercised by the commitments much more than the disbursements. In effect, a generous commitment would have so reinforced the hands of those who wanted a decent program of stabilization and financial recovery that the performance would be positively affected. Conversely a very cautious and limited commitment would negatively affect performance, because it would create an unfavorable political environment for the implementation of the measures.

I tried my best and Dantas tried his best in Washington to convince people of the fact that in the early stages of a stabilization program there are a number of unavoidable negative effects. You have to eliminate subsidies, you have to let certain market prices rise so there appears that during the period which we call “corrective inflation,” the situation gets worse rather than better. This is a very crucial period in which you have all of the disappointments of fighting inflation and none of the advantages in terms of price stability. At that time you need either an internal victory or an external victory. The internal victory was by definition impossible because we had to traverse a period of corrective inflation in which certain prices still had to rise, rather sensitive prices at that. We needed then an external victory, a demonstration of foreign confidence, of foreign support and assistance, that would strengthen politically the hand of those that were seeking stabilization. We really had none. Dantas had not an internal victory and had not an external victory.

[-47-]

The commitments of the U.S. [were] very, very cautious, very reticent, very rigid, and there was an insistence for internal political reasons to demonstrate to the U.S. Congress that the administration had been tough. Perhaps it was an internal political condition in the U.S. to have in any aid program for Brazil the condition of toughness. From the viewpoint of Brazilian internal politics it was disastrous and it weakened very considerably both Dantas and myself, myself as ambassador and Dantas as Minister of Finance, to such an extent that I myself considered seriously recommending to him not to sign any agreement at all and to come back declaring simply that it had been impossible to reach an agreement because the conditions which the U.S. offered were unacceptable for the relatively meager amount of aid that was involved. We argued this point at great length. I advised Dantas not to sign it and he was inclined to take that advice but our only doubt was that we probably could not get, due to the great degree of opposition to Goulart’s government, enough nationalist solidification of views to really force an austerity program and cut loose from foreign assistance altogether, and try to do the job merely by a unilateral sort of moratorium, cutting of imports, freezing of salaries, and a number of rather bitter measures.

We thought that perhaps it would be too dangerous a medicine in the sense that this would only be possible through such an exacerbation of nationalist feelings that might lead to not only a cooling off of relations with the U.S. but possibly a break, because in order to cause the acceptance of the sacrifices that were needed we had really to carry nationalist emotion to a very high pitch and the genius might get out of the bottle and out of hand. That's what caused us to sign the agreement with a very heavy hand.

I thought that it was really disastrous from the viewpoint of striking the hands of those who want to propose U.S. Brazil cooper-

[-48-]

ation and had an understanding of the financial program. It turned out precisely that way. Goulart never accepted that agreement as a victory, or even as a reasonable understanding. On the contrary he took that as a proof of U.S. mistrust and that embittered him and further deviated him from the road of cooperation. I think it was a major mistake and I look back on that with some feeling of anxiety. Dantas also felt some amount of bitterness since we were both in all good faith fighting the good cause of financial recovery, fighting against terrible odds for U.S.-Brazil cooperation, and we had a very reticent response based on the idea that they had to be tough with Brazil in order to get the matter through the U.S. Congress, et cetera. My view was that if the U.S. Congress was not willing to understand that Brazil is a sufficiently large risk to justify major financial effort, then there was no hope for salvation in Latin America.

REILLY: So when President Goulart fired Dantas in, I believe, June of that year, this was just consistent with a judgment Goulart had already made at the time the agreement was signed, or had some important factors intervened in the interval?

CAMPOS: I think his firing of Dantas was not related exclusively to that, although he really considered that the agreement was more of a handicap to him than of a blessing. It was not sufficiently important to clarify the Brazilian foreign exchange position and was sufficiently humiliating to make it politically unattractive, but it certainly was a major factor in the whole issue, particularly because one of the conditions which were exacted by the U.S. government at that time was the fulfillment of the negotiations on American Foreign Power. But the political environment in Brazil had been poisoned by Brizola's propaganda, so that when Dantas took upon himself, in order to permit disbursements under the agreement, to conclude the negotiations with American Foreign Power—which were decent negotiations and useful for Brazil, but which were con-

[-49-]

ducted in a rather explosive political environment—he took a tremendous risk and Goulart seized on this the pretext of the congressional campaign against the agreement on public utilities to fire both Dantas and the Minister of War. Indifference to the committed word was one of the least attractive features of Goulart's personality; in this particular case, the

understanding for the purchase of utilities was reached by him with Kennedy. As Goulart's political position worsened at home he tried to disassociate himself from the agreement and he acted rather cowardly. Only Dantas and myself were left in the fight as if we had any personal interest in that, when we were merely fulfilling a policy decision which had been taken after mature consideration of alternatives.

REILLY: After the breakdown of the Bell-Dantas agreement during the early summer of '63 until the assassination of President Kennedy in November, relations between the U.S. and Brazil continued to deteriorate, did they not, as was indicated once again at the meeting of the Inter American Economic and Social Council in November in São Paulo when the position of the Brazilian government certainly appeared to represent a radical rejection of the whole U.S. position, if not of the Alliance for Progress itself. Do you have any comment about the period from June until November? Were there any particularly important episodes that stand out?

CAMPOS: I think your description of the turn of events is correct. There was a continuous and sharp deterioration in the U.S.-Brazil relationship. Dantas was in the Goulart government the only really articulate minister and the only one with a broad understanding of the usefulness of cooperation between Brazil and the U.S., even though he had to cater to the left in Brazil and even though he believed sincerely that the only viable long-run policy in Brazil was the left-of-the-center policy. He may have exaggerated and I think he did overestimate the power of the left in Brazil,

[-50-]

and he made quite a few concessions which were extremely dangerous because they resulted in a pattern of economic inefficiency; but by and large he was devoted to the cause of collaboration with the West. After his departure the succeeding cabinet was much weaker, much more fearful of the leftist influence, and much more willing to accept leftist blackmail. The leftists in Brazil have had throughout an enormous ability to overplay their strength and create a false impression of popular acceptance.

The deterioration of Brazil-U.S. relations was rapid. On the financial side, the drawings were suspended, the loans from the Alliance for Progress were reduced to a bare minimum, practically the Northeast, the promised assistance of the Alliance did not materialize on the ground that Brazil had ceased to combat inflation and didn't carry through its negotiations with the Monetary Fund so that frustration and bitterness developed on both sides despite Ambassador Gordon's efforts in Brazil and my own efforts in Washington. I think that there was both an overestimation of the communist influence in Brazil and an underestimation of the performance of the Brazilian economy. By and large the Washington administration was paralyzed by what they call the "Passmanite" fever and the fear of Congress cutting down appropriations. The Brazilian image in Congress was rather unfavorable, first because of the misinterpretation of our posture on Cuban issue and secondly because of the negative impression of some American companies that felt mistreated in Brazil and impressed some of the U.S. Congressmen.

Be that as it may, this was a very difficult period and it reached a climax at the Inter American Economic and Social Council conference in São Paulo which, as you said, marked a rather sharp cleavage between the U.S. and the Brazil positions. I think our position was wrong and a bit unfair in November in São Paulo but by that time the bitterness and mutual suspicion was such that nothing could be done.

[-51-]

Some of the crucial positions, that of main advisor to the Goulart government and that of Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs of the Foreign Office, were all taken over by leftists and extreme nationalists, who rather relished the idea of baiting the U.S.

It was one of my sharp disagreements with the Goulart administration. I sent a very strong cable saying that in my mind the position was quite wrong, that we had a good case in relation to international trade but we were presenting it in a rather hysterical way, and in appraising the Alliance one ought to be balanced and judged not only U.S. bureaucracy but also the Brazilian lack of planning and administrative disorganization, which had rendered it almost impossible to plan for development and almost impossible to fight inflation. I pleaded for a much more balanced position and advanced the judgment that far from getting the leadership of Latin America by such an emotional position, we would in the end alienate quite a few of the Latin American countries that were having a much more favorable experience with the Alliance for Progress.

REILLY: Before giving your personal assessment of Kennedy as a personality, as a leader, as a statesman, would you care to make any comments about the reaction in Brazil to the assassination of Kennedy which fell just a little over a week after the Inter American Economic and Social Council in São Paulo?

CAMPOS: I was not here when the assassination happened. I had flown to Rio at my own insistence to get a decision on my resignation which had been submitted since August but which had not been acted on. My disagreement with Goulart's policies had reached a rather acute point and I wanted to force a decision on the resignation. I was caught then in Rio. I had just arrived when the assassination took place and had to rush back to Washington for the funeral. I was amazed and surprised at the degree of popular emotion that one

[-52-]

felt in Rio, probably an emotion as strong as one could notice anywhere in the United States if not stronger, since the Latins are more demonstrative, or at least supposed to be so. There was a feeling of deep personal loss. I saw people crying in the streets. It was a major shock but transmitted to me for the first time the impression that we are really getting somewhere near a world community because this amount of personal feeling would be impossible to justify were it not for the fact that there is beneath the surface of turmoil and conflicts some deep feeling of human solidarity.

Both the death of the Pope, John XXIII, and of President Kennedy gave me this impression that we have the beginnings of a world community because in both cases there was a deep popular emotion which in Brazil reached the level which I did not suspect it could reach.

This demonstrated by and large the antagonism towards the U.S. was more of a superficial political phenomenon and had not really contaminated the masses and there was this reservoir of good will about which people have talked so often in the past. I rushed back to Washington for the funeral, together with our Foreign Minister, and conveyed to people in the administration my impression that in a way this was a turning point in the Brazilian-U.S. relations, by bringing out in the open that the prevalent feeling of coolness and hostility was not really a deeply shared feeling and Kennedy's death had brought out the potentialities of a quick reconstruction of good relations between the two countries.

REILLY: Now would you care to say something about Kennedy as a leader and as a statesman, as a personality, as you knew him, as you viewed him during your period as ambassador in Washington?

CAMPOS: I had always a great respect for Kennedy and, as I say, quite a bit of affection. I thought him to be a very

[-53-]

agile and extremely sharp mind. He had the will for power, which is the mark of a statesman; at the same time he had an extraordinary ability to see things in perspective. Perhaps his long training in history, his interest in historical subjects gave him a range of perspective that is not usually found. In practical relations with Brazil and Latin America I thought his idealism went well beyond his executive command of the machinery. He often stated rather generous intentions and exhibited a rather understanding posture on financial matters at the same time that the administration under him was getting more and more conservative. I once described this as being the resurrection of neo-Republicanism in the U.S. administration.

When I first met him, in presenting my credentials, he had been shortly before visited by Kubitschek who complained very bitterly on the rigidity of the International Monetary Fund, and Kennedy was very critical when he talked to me about the International Monetary fund. I even had to put up a mild word of defense of the IMF by recalling that after all Brazil had had a persistent inflationary debauchery. I regretted later on this defense of the Fund, because although when he talked to me he professed a great deal of idealism and a willingness to help, et cetera, he didn't quite have a command of the administrative machinery which got more and more conservative, as Kennedy himself got more and more worried about the lack of responsiveness of the U.S. Congress to Latin American problems and the basic conservatism which predominated in the U.S. Congress. As he felt increasing difficulty in his relation to Congress, he seemed to lose his grasp of the administration, and the Alliance for Progress became highly bureaucratized, extremely timid, and overly conservative in their appraisal of economic and political phenomena in Latin America.

Certainly, despite his obvious interest in Brazil, and his realization of the Brazilian potential, and perhaps his af-

[-54-]

fection for Brazil, Brazil got actually very little from the Alliance during the years I was there. There was a gap between the generous intention and the rather reticent performance of the administrative machinery.

But this does not detract from his personality. Perhaps to a certain extent some of the changes in the machinery of the State Department worked in that direction. For instance, I never thought that the replacement of Dick Goodwin was a good move. Goodwin, although not a specialist on Latin America in the past, had learned very quickly and was very imaginative while the more traditional State Department minds were extremely cautious on Latin America and possessed with a rather conservative bent. Moscoso was outward looking and generous, but somehow he was much less articulate than others in the administration, and he always felt that he couldn't carry through his ideas. He was not a very good debater and was much less forceful and articulate and some more conservative elements in the administration, and his good intentions fell off the void.

My personal experience with Kennedy was always very pleasant. He was an extremely charming human being, really a battery of human sympathy, and the Brazilians also whom I took to visit him—governors or students—were all captivated by his very great personal charm and warmth.

REILLY: One related question, it is thought that at least in the last year that you served as ambassador in Washington you were serving a government with whose policies you really didn't agree. (a) To what extent was this true, and (b) what was your own reaction to being in that situation?

CAMPOS: Well I think by and large it was true, and my reaction was one of attrition. It was really a very difficult role. Towards the end and I had really to survive on the basis of

[-55-]

close personal relationships that I had developed in Washington with the press, with Congress, with the administration. I was accepted as a person but I had always this uneasy feeling that people did not think that I had the government behind me. In fact the Washington environment can be very cruel. I always had a feeling of uneasiness since there appeared definitely to be in the administration a preoccupation to differentiate between my personal standing, which was good, and my lack of representativeness, which they could barely conceal. That was a rather depressing experience for an ambassador to have, from the other side, an ill-disguised differentiation between their acceptance of you as a friend, as a human being, and their complete skepticism as to your representativeness in terms of political power.

I became convinced after my experience in Washington that the ambassador must have some political power of his own. The judgment of foreign governments on ambassadors is often very cynical. They pat him on the back but they are always inquiring as to whether he has independent political power behind him and political substance behind him. This convinced me that, upon coming back to Brazil, I should try to enter politics and acquire an independent political personality of my own this for several reasons, not least of which was my experience as a representative in Washington, where I managed to make good friends but I didn't impress anybody as having sufficient power to influence Brazilian events so that basically I think I was somewhat underrated.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

[-56-]

Roberto de Oliveira Campos Oral History Transcript
Name Index

B

Berle, Adolf A., Jr., 15, 16
Brizola, Lionel, 24, 49

C

Castro, Fidel, 46

D

Dantas, San Tiago, 17, 18, 19, 35, 40, 42, 46, 47,
48, 49, 50

F

Fronzizi, Arturo, 24, 30

G

Galbraith, John Kenneth, 28, 29
Goodwin, Richard N., 21, 23, 28, 55
Gordon, Lincoln, 28, 29, 44, 46, 47, 51
Goulart, João, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26,
27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39,
40, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52
Goulart, Maria Teresa Fontela, 34, 35
Guevarra, Che, 13

H

Humphrey, Hubert H., 1

K

Kennedy, Jacqueline Bouvier, 34
Kennedy, John Fitzgerald, 1, 4, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19,
21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34,
35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 50, 52,
53, 54, 55
Kennedy, Robert F., 36, 44
Khrushchev, Nikita Sergeevich, 15, 38
Kubitschek de Oliveira, Juscelino, 1, 2, 5, 8, 19,
32, 54

L

Lacerda, Carlos, 11, 12, 21, 22, 23, 32

Linder, Harold F., 27
Lopes Lucas, 1
Lott, Henrique Texeira, 12

M

Mariani, Clemente, 9
McNamara, Robert S., 28
Moreira Salles, Walter, 4
Moscoso, Toedoro, 19, 20, 55

N

Neves, Tancredo, 17, 19, 19

P

Pope John XXIII, 53

Q

Quadros, Jânio da Silva, 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12,
13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29

R

Rostow, Walt Whitman, 28
Rusk, Dean, 42

S

Schlesinger, Arthur M, Jr., 28
Shriver, R. Sargent, Jr., 28
Sorensen, Theodore C., 28

V

Vargas, Getulio Dornelles, 12, 32