

Os 40 Anos da Fundação Ford no Brasil

❁ uma parceria para a mudança social

The Ford Foundation's 40 Years in Brazil

❁ a partnership for social change



FORD FOUNDATION



Os 40 Anos da Fundação Ford no Brasil

❁ uma parceria para a mudança social

The Ford Foundation's 40 Years in Brazil

❁ a partnership for social change



FORD FOUNDATION



Nigel Brooke
Mary Witoshynsky
(organizadores)

FROM SOCIAL ANALYSIS TO HUMAN RIGHTS

by Sérgio Adorno and Nancy Cardia

The goal of this chapter is to examine the contribution of the Ford Foundation's Brazil Office to the development of human rights in this country over the last forty years. Throughout this period, the Foundation's philanthropic activities played a major role in Brazil's transition to democracy and in the process of democratic consolidation.

The principal objective of the Foundation's Human Rights program is to promote access to justice and to extend the full range of rights to all members of society. It seeks to achieve this goal through the promotion and application of human rights protections, with special focus on the elimination of rights violations endured by vulnerable peoples. Since 1990, these focus communities have included women, African Brazilians and indigenous peoples within the broader framework of "expanding access to justice and democratic citizenship to all Brazilians" (Telles, 2000).

These objectives are currently being pursued through two lines of work: 1) the development of a human rights infrastructure to broaden access to information and understanding of legal protections; and, 2) work to eliminate race and gender discrimination by developing strategies to reduce inequalities and promote justice under the law (Dora, 2002).

Although there was no formally defined human rights program either in the Brazil Office or in its New York headquarters during the 1960s and 1970s, the Foundation has worked in the field since opening its doors in this country in the early 1960s. Between 1962 and 2001, the Foundation invested US\$34,277,302 in Human Rights programming in Brazil, accounting for 9.89% of all resources disbursed during the 40-year period.

A general framework for the role of Human Rights within the Foundation has emerged over the course of these four decades, showing up as different tendencies: to promote the development of the field, problem intervention, development of human resources, and various action strategies. Each of these tendencies has undergone changes of direction that have not always occurred at the same pace nor produced the same results. These changes have taken place for a number of different reasons: changes in medium- and long-term strategies; institutional evaluations of program goals and accomplishments; attention to problems posed by international, national and regional events; and the changing relations between the Foun-

dation and its grantees whose proposals at times shape internal program priorities and help set new courses of action and investment. Each of these tendencies has varied over time having gone through both profound changes as well as subtle variations that only show up in a long-term analysis, such as this one on the occasion of the Foundation's 40th anniversary. In a very general way, the tendencies described can be classified into four different phases, the first from 1961 to 1964, the second from 1965 to 1979, the third from 1980 to 1992 and, lastly, the fourth, from 1992 up to the present.

The Foundation came to Brazil during a period of sharp economic, social and political turbulence that had forced the resignation of President Jânio Quadros in 1961. Macroeconomic indicators signaled a downward trajectory towards crippling economic stagnation. High inflation jeopardized the implementation of government initiatives and contributed to the impoverishment of both urban and rural laborers. In the countryside, the struggle for agrarian reform provoked uncertainty over the future of private property ownership. In the cities, strikes by major industrial sectors and civil servants led to public rallies and mass demonstrations often called by populist government leaders. In legislative circles, heated debates deteriorated into ideological battles between representatives of both conservative and leftist parties that spanned the range from Liberal Democrat to Communist (The Communist Party was declared illegal in 1947, forcing members to go underground). Amidst all this, an increasingly disgruntled military emerged between the suicide of President Getúlio Vargas in 1954 and the administration of President Juscelino Kubitschek (1956-1960). Increasingly polarized political ideologies fueled international suspicions as well as those of a broad cross-section of Brazilian society – private industry, the Church, the press, middle-class professionals, the military – that the country was on an inexorable path toward socialism under the government of President João “Jango” Goulart (1961-1964). This national scenario foreshadowed the 1964 military *coup d'état*.

From the Human Rights perspective, the initial phase of the Foundation's Brazil operations from 1961-1964 can be considered a sort of pre-history. As discussed in previous publications, such as Sérgio Miceli's¹ historical review to mark the Foundation's 30th anniversary in Brazil, the early years were marked by the concern to stimulate socio-economic modernization, thereby explaining the emphasis on education problems and on human resources as well as the difficulties associated with industry and the market. In this context, the question of human rights was in evidence from the Foundation's first steps in Brazil. By commissioning a study in 1960 on how the Brazilian University might play a role in the country's economic devel-

1. See Miceli, 1993.

opment, the Foundation identified food security as a one of its funding targets. It thus launched a tradition that would become a hallmark of its institutional trajectory: the understanding that the struggle for socio-economic development is a prerequisite for the expansion of fundamental social rights and full citizenship.

The second phase (1965-1979) begins with the shift in the political and institutional regime after 1964 and coincides with the harshest years of the dictatorship and the stirrings of democratic revival. The military regime imposed a new order on the relationship between the government and the populace, characterized by the expansion of state intervention into the most diverse sectors of civil life and by a marked centralization of the decision-making process. To secure its position, the authoritarian regime repressed any and all organized political opposition. Between 1968-1974, bureaucratic and authoritarian administrations instituted a system of repression that integrated the police and paramilitary units into a force that was given devastating power. Throughout the country, death squads were created, at times with the support of the private sector that feared the possibility of a socialist revolution, such as in the case of Operation Bandeirantes (OBAN) in São Paulo. This network of repression was responsible for censorship, arbitrary incarceration, the sacking of public officials, torture, killing, psychological warfare against popular and leftist organizations, limitations to legislative and judicial authority, disbandment of opposition parties, restrictions on civil and political liberties, intellectual purges at leading universities and centers of scientific and critical thought, and for the subjugation or exile of political opposition leaders. In a word, the regime was responsible for profound human rights violations.

The Foundation played a crucial role during this period in preserving critical thinking with regards the socio-political context through strategic investments to develop a community of researchers and social scientists. Although there was no clear direction in the strict sense of promoting human rights, this remained at the heart of proposals to stimulate the training of scholars to carry out the analysis of Brazilian social problems, including the consequences of social inequality, as well as projects to improve education through teacher training and instructional reform at the secondary school level. These investments contributed to the Foundation's role in the rebuilding of the rule of law and of democratic society towards the end of this period. This was in effect the point of entry for the definitive incorporation of Human Rights as a funding priority in its own right.

After 21 years of authoritarian rule (1964-1985), Brazilian society returned to a state of constitutionally-mandated civilian government. Redemocratization and the new political regime made for significant changes, introduced with the promulgation of the new Constitution in 1988: the broadening of channels for civil society political participation and representation; expansion of rights to include

civil, social and political rights; opening of communications between society and the State; recognition of civil and public liberties; abolition of paramilitary units; greater transparency in the decision- and policymaking processes; submission of public authority to the rule of democratically-formulated legislation; and free elections. Within the realm of basic human rights, the right to life became inviolable together with the guarantee of physical and moral integrity. At the same time, racism and torture became unbailable offenses with no time limit.

Despite these democratic advances, the rule of law has yet to be fully established. Emerging authority has failed to establish its legitimate monopoly of physical violence within the limits of the law and serious human rights violations persist. This scenario has become even more complex with the rise in urban crime and the exacerbation of a collective sense of fear and insecurity with the increasing publicity on the fatal results of social conflict.

Throughout the 1980s, the Foundation deepened its contribution to the redemocratization process. The Brazil Office supported groups at the margins of the new agreements, anticipated events that would later take place, and understood the nature of the challenges faced by a society emerging from the grasp of authoritarianism. In this context, it adeptly predicted the social demands that would accompany the country's return to the rule of law as well as the need to re-establish mechanisms of democratic participation for a society that had been kept under control by an authoritarian regime.

This third phase (1980-1992) saw the formal definition of a distinct Human Rights Program – to be funded under its own portfolio, as opposed to drawing upon the resources of related Foundation programs – in pursuit of the following objectives: to broaden social justice and to defend human rights, especially those of disadvantaged minority groups. One of the goals was to help reduce inequality by promoting the social inclusion of traditionally disadvantaged communities. At the same time, it supported research and analysis aimed at the effective removal of all vestiges of authoritarianism as well as the adaptation of institutions to the democratic models of society and the State.

The fourth and current phase of this evolution focuses on the continuing development of these initiatives, now approached from a specific angle. Not only do the social development goals include the participation of organized civil society groups in the articulation of social demands but also the institutionalization of relations between civil society and government, for example through public accountability and access to justice. The program also calls for the strengthening of public sector capacity for effective management, implementation and innovation. Questions of citizenship have not been completely abandoned, but instead have taken on a new meaning and significance allied with the concept of governability

which is understood as the rational management of public resources and in which government agencies and NGOs jointly participate. This addresses the fact that professional and managerial capacities must very often be developed alongside the projects themselves.

This phase takes place at a new juncture in the development of human rights in Brazil. During his first term (1995-1998), the government of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso instituted the National Human Rights Plan (PNDH, 1996) in fulfillment of a commitment made at the 1994 UN Human Rights Summit in Vienna. Brazil is the first country in Latin America to exercise this initiative, and only the third country in the world to do so. The Plan espouses the principle of the indivisibility of human rights, that is, the union between civil rights, social rights and political rights. It expresses the fact that in just over two decades, the human rights movement has broadened its areas of intervention from the classic defense of civil rights, in particular the right to life and to freedom of expression and organization, to include social rights, and, above all, third and fourth generation rights. The Plan incorporates the demands of women, of African Brazilians, of children, of homosexuals, of the physically disabled and of the old. As will be illustrated, the Ford Foundation, together with other funding agencies, played a decisive role in compiling these demands.

Human Rights in the National and Global Historical Context

The global objective of the Ford Foundation's Human Rights program – to promote access to justice and human rights in the fullest sense – is in keeping with the socio-political context of the post-World War II era. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was approved by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The Declaration establishes that humanity – all humanity – shares some basic common values, considered to be the inspiration and orientation for the growth and development of the international community, understood to be comprised not only of independent nation states but also of free and equal individuals².

Since World War I, the socio-political world has witnessed events, processes and trends characterized by historian Eric Hobsbawm as the Age of Extremes (Hobsbawm, 1994). Along with a deepening of the inequalities between colonizing

2. Human rights are here understood as a set of principles of a universal and universalizing nature formalized in a liberal-democratic context as developed in western Europe during the 19th century that proclaimed the rights to life and to civil liberties as inalienable. Their implementation requires government action in terms of protection against any type of violation or abuse. They are comprised principally of civil rights but also include social and political rights. See: A. Cassese, 1991.

and colonized countries, between the developed and the underdeveloped, between the rich and the poor, there has also been a marked trend towards the polarization of military forces³. The end of World War II placed renewed emphasis on human rights as a prerequisite to reconstruction and lasting peace. The United States had emerged victorious and assumed leadership by virtue of its association with the values of liberty and freedom. At the same time, however, the globe was undergoing polarization along a new ideological divide between capitalism and communism, between the western world and the Soviet bloc, between liberal democracies and democratic statehood, all forcing nations to form into strategic political alliances at one pole or the other.

This polarization did not, however, stall the international human rights movement but instead resulted in the establishment of numerous national and international organizations dedicated to the defense of human rights and, above all, the condemnation of Nazi atrocities and the formulation of the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights in which former US First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt played such a decisive role. Her contribution is recognized as the crucial intervention that rescued the Declaration from becoming a minor statement on cultural and political rights and transformed it into a universal proposition of unconditional human rights.

The Declaration not only reaffirmed civil and political rights, but also the right to work, education and health. Today, years later, the more specific elaboration of the concept of rights and their protection continues to unfold in three major areas: 1) the protection of resource rights, 2) titular rights, such as of family, minority, ethnic, religious, natural, environmental and animal rights; and, 3) the consideration of the human individual not only as a living organism, but also as a historical, transitory being endowed with singularities that mandate full consideration for all personal conditions including, but not limited to, womanhood, childhood, race, old age, sexual preference, and mental or physical disability (Bobbio, 1992).

The history of the defense of human rights in Brazil prior to the 1964 coup remains to be written. Little is known of the possible existence of such movements during the period of republican rule. If in fact they did exist, what is certain is that they gained visibility in the resistance struggle against the violence and despotism of the military regime. At the close of the 1970s, the democratic transition process

3. Beginning with World War I, the violence of warfare reached previously unknown levels. Wars of the former two centuries were fought among combatants and the victims were primarily soldiers. The incorporation of technology into warfare not only prompted extreme changes in military strategy but also breached the traditional separation of soldiers from civilians, significantly augmenting the number of civilian deaths. If before civilians suffered the consequences of combat, these were generally limited to civil rights violations such as curfews and boundary limits, food and energy rationing and forced labor by both adults and children. The horrors of modern warfare, however, turned civilians into direct targets. World War II consolidated this trend. See: Arendt, 1987.

was taking its first steps. Within the realm of human rights, the list of demands was not to be taken lightly and included the inviolability of the home, prohibition of illegal incarceration, the institution of *habeas corpus*, the right to legal representation, and the elimination of secret or special tribunals in cases of abuse of political power. Among other objectives, it envisaged the containment of repressive paramilitary units as well as of agencies charged with security and justice. In this area, the challenges were enormous because the legacy of authoritarianism continued active and powerful.

The growth of the human rights movement in Latin America cannot be understood without mentioning the human rights policy of former US President Jimmy Carter (1976-1980). Aware that persistent political violence and grave human rights violations threatened to lead to civil war in countries under dictatorship in the Andes, Central America and the Caribbean, the Carter administration developed a sort of crusade for the defense of human rights. This included tying the horse of US financial aid to the wagon of developing economies across the region once they had shown signs of the necessary political will to curb and control authoritarian regimes. Not all the human rights movements that were born or consolidated during this period subscribed to the Carter policy, but it nevertheless presented a strategic opportunity to broaden the resistance struggle against dictatorship in favor of re-establishing the rule of law in the shortest possible time span.

It was this context that influenced the Foundation's decision to invest in human rights where previously there had been no formally defined program.

The Decisionmaking Process

In the broadest sense, the mission of the Foundation is to: 1) to strengthen democratic values; 2) reduce poverty and social inequity; 3) promote international cooperation; and, 4) advance human achievement. Therefore, in sorting out the historical twists and turns that have driven the Brazil Office agenda, apart from the socio-political context that provided the reason to fund a Human Rights portfolio, other key issues need to be considered. These include: 1) the general objectives of the Ford Foundation; 2) the macro-institutional guidelines disseminated by the Peace and Social Justice Program of the New York headquarters, to which Human Rights belongs as one of its four different fields of activity; 3) adjustment of overall program objectives to meet the specific criteria of the field office context, in this case Brazil; and, 4) the ability of organized civil society mobilize and formulate demands.

These objectives and their corresponding programs are carried out in accordance with each field office setting. Working within this framework and in accor-

dance with field analyses of local priorities, the regional offices define their goals and action strategies for a specified period of time and for this reason not all offices carry the same programs. The formulation of local program policies is a complex process involving various contexts, data sets, budgets, agents and regional agencies, relations with society and institutional networks including scientific communities, practitioners, representatives of NGOs, social movements and civil society organizations and government contacts. The development of the Human Rights program has followed this same path.

The Emergence and Consolidation of the Human Rights Program in the Brazil Office

As mentioned, the Brazil Office did not operate a specific human rights program during its first two decades in Brazil. During that period, the human rights agenda was in direct confrontation with the authoritarian regime that, if necessary, could constrain or create obstacles to the execution of any Office plan of that nature. The question of human rights was subsumed under the explicit concern with matters of social, political and economic development. Studies on the development and modernization of the market, on urban infrastructure, political participation and governmental structures for education and culture were nonetheless about the need to safeguard the human rights of the majority of the country's citizens. Thus, in 1966, the Foundation supported the establishment of the State University of Rio de Janeiro's Legal Studies Center when the government's Institutional Acts that would have such an impact on the production of knowledge in the university began to take effect. Meanwhile, urban studies could not overlook the serious violations to social, economic and civil rights. Along with difficulties in the labor market with its structural forms of un- and underemployment, police brutality against poor *favela* dwellers was a growing concern.

With the approaching demise of authoritarian rule and the first insights regarding the democratic transition, Brazil staff were confronted with the emergence of human rights as an issue that would shape democratic policymaking. It is significant that, since the beginning of the 1980s, the Brazil Office had appointed staff specifically to manage what had become the Human Rights portfolio, with Patricia S. Sellers being the first Program Officer to fill this role, one that she would share for two years with J. Michael Turner. In the process of recruitment the Foundation gave an indication of the program's character by its requirement for candidates experienced in legal service, public interest law and rural and urban community organization. In 1981, the program was known as Human Rights and Governance and ranked third in the allocation of Office funds. By the following year, the program

name changed again to Human Rights and Social Justice, a title that would endure 10 years until it became Rights and Opportunities. In 1993, with a new name change it became Rights and Social Justice. The position was shared by Peter Fry and Joan Dassin until Rebecca Reichmann was named the first Program Officer to manage the Rights and Social Justice portfolio. Reichmann was followed by Sonia Álvarez, with Edward Telles taking over the portfolio in 1996. Toward the end of 2000, responsibility for the Program passed to the current program officer, Denise Dora.

Upon its establishment, the Brazil Office Human Rights Program aimed to: strengthen recognition and defense of minority rights; assure access of poor and disadvantaged groups to legal protection and social benefits; and, to raise the level of awareness on the effects of race and gender discrimination on access to justice and the reduction of inequalities. These indicate the presupposition that a reduction in inequality and rights violations can be achieved through broader social justice and that this demands the defense of minority rights. Defense of minority rights, in turn, amplifies awareness of the most vulnerable groups, who, at that time, included political refugees arriving from neighboring countries. The program did not, however, neglect local problems and in 1981 the Center for the Defense of Human Rights (CDDH) received its first Foundation grant for legal support and education and implementation of human rights committees in rural areas. Also during that year, the Brazilian Association for Agrarian Reform (ABRA) received support to help reduce violence associated with rural land conflicts. It is important to remember that human rights and agrarian reform continue to provoke adverse reactions on the part of conservative sectors of society.

These objectives have endured throughout the decades with few substantive changes as they correspond to the core of the Foundation's mission. Nevertheless, during the 1980s-1990s, several changes were introduced, some more visible than others, some broad-ranging, others more subtle, change coexisting with the forces and processes of permanence. From one perspective, little seems to have changed given the need to maintain medium-term commitments and to consolidating experiences and projects that, at first sight, appear to offer great promise. Therefore the perception of new factors, on the one hand, and the taking of action, on the other, are not necessarily simultaneous. At times, the Foundation has seemed to anticipate events; at others, it appears to react to the pressure of strong civil society demands.

Nevertheless, from another perspective, there are clear breaks in the line of continuity. These are moments of experimentation and learning that can result in the incorporation of new themes and concepts such as the adoption of new directions and action strategies. All of this translates into the Foundation's institutional interest in innovation. Yet beyond this, it is a continuing effort to avoid repetition,

bureaucracy and above all to avoid becoming a charitable donor rather than a promoter of rights and access to justice and an agent of knowledge transfer required to engender full citizenship for all for the Brazilians. This type of dialectic – between permanence and change, consolidation and renovation – explains in large part the *modus operandi* with which Human Rights initiatives are carried out by the Foundation. The distribution of grants in the Human Rights field over the Foundation's 40-year history in Brazil (see Table 1) reveals some of these nuances.

Table 1. DONATIONS BY PERIOD – HUMAN RIGHTS, 1966-2001 (in 2001 dollars)

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>%</i> |
|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 1966-1979 | 2 571 132 | 7.50 |
| 1980-1984 | 6 842 875 | 19.90 |
| 1985-1989 | 4 740 728 | 13.83 |
| 1990-1994 | 5 938 316 | 17.32 |
| 1995-1999 | 9 364 994 | 27.32 |
| 2000-2001 | 4 819 254 | 14.06 |
| Total | 34 277 301 | 100.00 |

Source: Ford Foundation.

In its early phase of activity, Brazil Office investments in Human Rights represented a small portion of the overall budget at 7.5%. Once the actual Program was established, this tripled to 19.96%. After this initial impetus, it retracted somewhat to 13.83% but rose again at the beginning of the 1990s. During the second half of the previous decade, the growth in investment in this field nearly doubled to 27.32%.

Throughout its institutional history, the Human Rights Program in Brazil has operated on the two fronts of social rights and civil rights with the two following largely independent trajectories. As observed, the concern for social rights is fundamental to all Brazil Office programs. With the country's democratic transition, these concerns have not diminished. There had been indications that the socio-economic crisis of the 1980s would continue to aggravate social problems and provoke tensions and social conflict of all sorts. The Foundation, along with other support agencies, clearly saw this as a challenge to work on two allied trajectories that did not necessarily coincide: to finance income-generation projects in order to reduce social inequality; and/or to support organizations seeking to strengthen the role of

civil society thereby enabling various sectors of society to satisfy their right to participate in the formulation, decisionmaking and implementation of meaningful public policies. The Foundation's first impulse, at the start of the 1980s, was in large part dedicated to the task of strengthening civil society organizations, a focus it believed would, in the medium and long term, lead to a positive change in the profile of social inequality.

The Foundation's prediction of what would take place in Brazilian society during the democratic transition began to prove correct. In 1982⁴ the Brazil Office felt that in two or three years the field of Governance and Public Policy would grow along with the democratic opening and popular participation in political processes at all levels of government. Added to this, a strengthened opposition would result in increased emphasis on socio-economic rights. The Foundation believed that social justice and poverty alleviation in both the rural and urban sectors would have a mobilizing effect throughout society. This mobilization, therefore, needed to be well informed in order to be effective and this implied legal training and empowerment for organized groups. Not only should the academy be prepared to formulate and evaluate public policy, but organized civil society, labor movements and community groups in general. The year 1982 also marked the moment that the Foundation made its first major grant for applied research to integrate community education with human rights and social justice.

The following year found the Brazil Office highly optimistic. The first nationwide gubernatorial elections signaled the vitality of civil society and enabled the program staff to make a positive evaluation of the possibility of being able to reduce the Human Rights budget. It appeared that Brazilian social investment would begin to rise and thus reduce the social deficit and keep rights violations under control. There was in those days a strong expectation that the return to the rule of law would mean broad respect for human rights that would also spell a reduction in social inequality and a strengthening of democratic institutions. The 1983 Program Review⁵ nevertheless recognized that political violence was ongoing, especially in the poorest communities. This report, while generally optimistic, also revealed a perception that existing social problems could in fact become much more complex. This assessment was based on a dual social process: the decline in political repression and the growing economic inequality creating a sense of social injustice based on deprivation. These two elements were considered conducive to generalized violence, in particular violence associated with the law and with police brutality.

4. 1983 Program Review.

5. 1984 Program Review.

In subsequent years, the magnitude and depth of the questions addressed by the Human Rights Program increased considerably. Where it once postulated that the return to democracy would in itself guarantee a reduction in social inequality, starting in the mid-80s one question continued to nag: at what stage of the redemocratization process would the protection of rights be extended to the entire population? Strengthening NGOs in support of the most vulnerable social groups – women, African-Brazilians, indigenous peoples and the poor – was one response. Supporting research for the analysis and documentation of the living conditions and rights violations of these groups was another. Beyond this, the data compiled would need to be translated into proposals for change that could spark dialogue and enhance information exchange between activists and researchers. This also meant training to enable traditionally excluded groups to participate in data analysis, especially social analysis data, in a manner that could guide their advocacy for social change⁶. The concern over information access, education and support for these groups was significant during this period. One particular funding focus was on the university-based development of African-Brazilian studies centers and graduate studies programs on culture, history and other African-Brazilian contributions to society. Oddly, the documents of that time do not indicate any support for graduate studies in feminist issues.

By the end of the decade, and with its 30th anniversary approaching, a new program review was undertaken. Little had changed in terms of the support for successful projects, but much had changed with regard to the shift in grantees from academic institutions to NGOs. The report revealed that, with regard to strengthening civil society via such organizations, many gains had been made between 1980 and 1989. The thirty groups active in the human rights field had blossomed to 100 by the close of the decade. This knowledge helped to shape a new funding approach and to promote strategic alliances between groups working toward the same goals in order to strengthen their participation and enhance their capacity to innovate in response to crisis. Rather than support the emergence of new NGOs, the Brazil Office worked to consolidate existing organizations. In meeting this objective, the Foundation encouraged collaboration among international donors in a manner that could help guarantee that funds would be well spent.

The 1990s saw greater emphasis on racial and gender inequalities. A point of departure was the evaluations and observations contained in two documents by Rebecca Reichmann (Reichmann, 1990 and 1991). These documents presented an account of the general state of civil and human rights both from the perspective of available knowledge as well as of the advances achieved and the lacunae yet to be

6. 1986 Program Review.

filled. They highlighted a major concern of the period: that the advance of Brazilian democracy – from the 1988 Constitution to the ongoing process of institution building – was largely founded on political rights that ignored the task of consolidating civil rights and social democracy to its fullest extent, as if this were possible. This separation between political rights on one hand, and civil and social rights on the other, was creating obstacles to the consolidation of democracy, especially in its grounding in civil society, in civic culture and in the institutionalization of public mechanisms for conflict resolution.

The evaluation focused on the absence of the necessary data and analysis for an objective understanding of the social scenarios of racial and gender discrimination. It was vital, therefore, to invest in the creation of professional expertise in this area of a type that could quickly produce a body of researchers that would enable NGOs to read, interpret and debate public policy as well as intervene in the decisionmaking processes that could shape the human rights future of groups traditionally excluded from access to these rights. This concern is now embedded in Foundation culture. The question of gender and racial inequality was then a vanguard area that, during the course of the decade, would receive critical evaluations, diagnoses and investments as a human rights issue. This perspective has been consistently reinforced, at times with different emphasis, in successive yearly reports and evaluations and appears especially prominent in the documents of Sonia Álvarez (1996). Indeed, papers prepared by Edward Telles (1996 and 2000) who focused on social discrimination, were in turn backed up by the writings of the current Human Rights Program Officer Denise Dora (2002).

The other area of consolidation was in civil rights. Since the end of the 1970s, the Foundation demonstrated concern over the rights violations of ordinary citizens, above all in the poorer social sectors, commonly known in Brazil as the popular classes. The end of the authoritarian regime did not signal the end of institutional violence. Across the country, but particularly in cities such as Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, police agencies, specifically the military police uniformed and responsible for ostensive policing, crowd-control, etc., not only maintained a conflictive relationship with those they should have been protecting, but employed uncontrolled and excessive force in executing their functions. The first investments were justifiably directed toward the identification of cases with characteristics of institutional violence, including inside the prison system, on the streets, in poor neighborhoods and in rural areas. Toward the end of the 1980s, Foundation-sponsored studies on the relationship between the police and the community, conducted in Recife by the Legal Council for Popular Movements (GAJOP), resulted in an important publication that has stood the test of time and remains a seminal work in the field (Oliveira, 1987).

Due to the increasing complexity and growth in crime and its associated problems – in large part stimulated by the rapid expansion of drug trafficking in poor urban neighborhoods – the Foundation's interest in this area became more focused. The persistence of institutional violence, of profound human rights violations, and violence within society itself was reasserted in Foundation reports year after year. What was changing over time was the method by which these problems were being perceived and diagnosed. If the early studies were concerned just to confirm the existence of routine civil rights violations, later evaluations and diagnoses attempted to root these problems within the realm of specific institutions. Almost always, the problems appeared to be embedded in social inequality, race and gender discrimination and the lack of adequate public policy. Throughout the 1990s, there was increasing recognition that these problems were related to the poor performance of government bodies with responsibility for rights protection and the negligible results achieved by the policy measures that were being implemented for public security. This stimulated investment in research into the role of policing agencies, on the one hand, and into the strengthening of civil society capacity to demand accountability of the public authorities with authority to exercise repression for the purpose of social control.

Investments in this area were made in part by the Governance and Civil Society Program. The fundamental problem was no longer the understanding of the causes and dynamics of violence but the reform of the institutions of social control. Over the last decade, the Foundation has focused heavily on police reform, on the incorporation of innovative experience in the professionalization of policing, and in enhancing capacities for administrative, operational and technical management of police agencies. It has been a period of intensified international cooperation leading to the involvement of external researchers (principally from the US and Canada), research institutions and government agencies in the formulation and promotion of public security policies. As well as these exchanges, the Foundation has also supported national and international seminars and broadened the range of organizations to receive funding.

Themes and Outlooks

The Foundation has been a pioneer in approaching human rights from a broad based perspective that, since the establishment of the Program has incorporated, not only civil and political rights, but also social and economic rights, as well as environmental rights. The Foundation has been at the forefront of research funding agencies and ahead of other international grantmakers, both regarding the themes as well as how these themes have been dealt with.

At the end of the 1970s, projects that were labeled Human Rights to receive more funding: these were projects that analyzed penal policies and aimed to sensitize lawyers to the idea of defending the social interests supported by the Foundation. At first, this action was more concentrated in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, but was then gradually expanded both territorially and with regards the diversity of topics addressed. Several themes concerning access to human rights were supported indirectly through studies on urban poverty, work on maternal health, projects targeting increased education access for children from *favelas* and projects to create study centers in the Amazon and to stimulate rural extension. All of these projects entailed increasing access to human rights.

These new fronts constituted the expansion of work that was already underway within the Urban Poverty and Rural Poverty and Resources programs targeting disadvantaged populations and included improved access for *favela* children to kindergartens and pre-schools. They also included interventions that sought to understand and increase the examples of community organization that were emerging in the *favelas*. In 1980 alone, nine projects of this type received Foundation support. These projects addressed urban violence, labor union membership for workers, land ownership of urban invasion areas, and dealt with themes such as citizenship and participation. The aim of these projects was social change through increasing access to justice for vulnerable groups: poor children, rural workers, indigenous populations, women and blacks. Another aim was the empowerment of these groups through greater access to information and capacity-building of advocacy groups. In 1980, the Foundation also invested resources to establish the field of African-Brazilian studies and research.

Table 2. GRANTMAKING IN HUMAN RIGHTS BY THEME, 1966-2001 (in 2001 dollars)

| <i>Theme</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>%</i> |
|------------------------|--------------|----------|
| Racial inequality | 12 080 464 | 35.21 |
| Gender inequality | 8 046 708 | 23.48 |
| Indigenous populations | 1 055 310 | 3.08 |
| Human rights – general | 11 199 298 | 32.67 |
| Other projects | 1 905 609 | 5.56 |
| Total | 34 277 301 | 100 |

Source: Ford Foundation.

As can be seen in Table 2, grantmaking in Human Rights has focused significantly more on studies and intervention projects concerning racial issues (35.21%), than projects addressing gender-related matters (23.48%). Both themes together have received 58.69% of the total resources allocated to this program. Investments in racial issues have been even greater than in themes more traditionally identified as belonging to human rights, like those targeting the defense of life and safety for an increasing number of citizens (32.67%). Indigenous populations and their problems have received less (3.08%). Other projects concerning human rights have been granted 5.56% of total investments. This distribution reveals not only an institutional assessment regarding the magnitude of the problems to be tackled, but also a costs-benefit analysis. In the Foundation's view, the huge social debt to blacks and women, as integral parts of Brazilian society, has justified these priorities. Similarly, acknowledgement that institutional changes within the sphere of law enforcement agencies would take a long time to produce results and would demand political intervention beyond the aims proposed by the Foundation also affected these decisions. The conclusion to be drawn from repeated observations in diverse documents is that the problems related to violence and security public have remained almost the same, despite all the effort made, including with Ford Foundation support.

The issue of inequality in socio-economic opportunities has always been given special attention since the beginning of Brazil Office activities. It is widely acknowledged that large segments of Brazilian society are disadvantaged regarding income distribution, access to welfare services and the distribution of justice. However, these inequalities do not affect Brazilian citizens indiscriminately. Inequality is color and gender biased, that is, its effects are intensified and worsened when the situation of white men within the social structure is compared to the situation of non-white and afro-descendant men or when the situation of women is compared to that of men. According to Reichmann, color makes even more difference than gender, so that the most discriminated groups are comprised of black women. This evaluation led to a concentration of funding in the human rights area on two issues: blacks and women.

The evaluation pointed out several gaps. As previously stated, the main one concerned the quality of the official statistical data that was available and the lack of information from primary empirical research for more precise and detailed analysis of these aspects of social reality. Consequently, at the beginning of the last decade, the Office commissioned Thomas Skidmore to evaluate Brazilian studies in the area of race relations and other aspects of Afro-Brazilian social life (Skidmore, 1991). It also sponsored two seminars organized by the Carlos Chagas Foundation to carry out a similar task within the sphere of women's studies. Everything pointed to the need to invest in improving available data and information through the training of

specialized human resources. To do so, qualified personnel had to be trained to produce reliable data, to evaluate their consistency and to adequately incorporate the data into the analyses and evaluations that could guide public policymaking. The Foundation played a key role in this initiative as it was convinced that computerized databases would be crucial in the social struggle to increase rights. It was also a pioneer in this regard.

There were many important initiatives in this area, including a seminar which the Foundation jointly promoted with the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) to discuss the possibility of producing disaggregated data that could evaluate gender and race profiles better, within the context of the preparatory studies for the 2000 census. Technical training programs were encouraged in this area, including innovative research in women's reproductive health and a comparative analysis of the situation of poverty in diverse metropolitan regions across the country. More recently, support has been given to courses held at the Federal University of Minas Gerais on quantitative methods applied to the analysis of social phenomena aimed at continuing the training of specialized personnel.

There were good reasons for establishing the human rights field as the right place to deal with gender and racial discrimination. During the transitional process into democracy, as the tasks of consolidating public liberties and rights to social and political participation became amalgamated, the huge debt society owed these two groups emerged. Although it may appear paradoxical, while the 90s saw a decline in new social movements, the struggles of women and blacks that had emerged in the midst of the struggles for the reconstruction of democracy at the end of the 70s, have been revitalized and have made an impact on public opinion. These movements, from varied political tendencies and political-social orientations, have supplied much insight and advice. Their opinions are constantly listened to, they are invited to academic and non-academic forums, and invited to participate in world conferences promoted by the United Nations. In the mid 90s, the Foundation sponsored the production of documents and feminist participation at the Beijing Conference (1995) and it did the same for the World Conference against Racism, Race Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Forms of Intolerance (Durban, 2000).

Racial issues have always figured prominently in the Human Rights Program. As a rule, annual reports have sought to establish links between social and racial inequalities. In this way, wide gaps and social deficits have been identified regarding the workplace, education access, access to the institutions of social welfare, and access to justice and rights protections. Problems related to institutional violence have also been highlighted. Blacks generally seem to be more vulnerable to violence, especially institutional violence. The police and the justice system tend to mete out excessive punishment to black suspects and defendants, according to the findings of

a study carried out in the middle of the decade by the Nucleus for Black Studies which was largely responsible for the debate on racial motivations in social control (Adorno, 1999). Similarly, large investments were made in the image of blacks in Brazilian society. The persistence of prejudice, despite the cordiality which appears to characterize Brazilian society, pointed to the need to intervene in processes of behavioral change. That is why, for example, studies of the image and social representation of blacks in different spheres of social life, more specifically in the media and the arts, were supported. At the end of the 1990s, the Office funded studies on the presence, participation and image of blacks in Brazilian soap operas. As well as investing in the Center for the Creation of Popular Images, Afro-Brazilian studies continued to be a priority area for support, aiming not only to record the living conditions of these groups but mainly to train researchers in this area. The identification of barriers for the education of black children is another issue that has acquired priority and deals with answering questions about how to change the school curriculum, how to give teachers better training to reduce discrimination against black children in the classroom, and how to disseminate findings. More recently, themes related to access to higher education for young black people have gained ground.

As shown in Table 2, a substantial part of the resources were invested in studies and projects on gender relations, particularly on women's rights in contemporary Brazilian society. The annual reports of diverse Program Officers acknowledged the huge inequalities in income, employment opportunities and political participation and in access to education, health care (specially reproductive) and even culture. Staff also acknowledged that women were not only the victims of inequality but, due to asymmetrical power and gender relations, were also potential victims of domestic violence. Therefore significant effort has gone into increasing knowledge on inequality as well as promoting and strengthening the struggle against all discrimination that undermines social democracy in Brazil. Women's programming, as sponsored by the Ford Foundation reflects these concerns. It dates back to the 1980s, more precisely to 1982, when a grant was made to the Union of Domestic Workers. Nevertheless, in the following decade there was a significant change of discourse. The problems of inequality experienced by women from diverse social classes came to be seen as human rights issues, thereby emphasising the unequal distribution of these rights in Brazilian society. This could appear to have been a semantic change, but it was not. It meant a new approach through which gender differences were affirmed as the basis of democratic co-existence and one of the fundamental pillars of human rights rather than an obstacle. From then on, the movement took on strategies of difference and identity, which allowed not only for the advance of the movement itself, but also a dialogue between feminists and other social movements such as the black movement.

A substantial part of the 32.67% of program resources invested in more general human rights themes (see Table 2) was spent on the issue of violence, particularly police brutality. This issue was addressed by groups from São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, Pernambuco, Ceará and Rio Grande do Sul. In 1982, the continuation of police brutality had already been attributed to the impunity of the policemen involved given that they only stood trial in military courts. During the same period, the Office's annual report made reference to growing urban violence. The interpretation of this violence was that it was associated with the living conditions of poor workers, which continued to be characterized by the lack of a right to housing, to work and to health care, to which subjection to police brutality was being added. Thus, social violence and police brutality were interpreted as being associated phenomena, which led the Foundation to support the training of para-legal assistants/lay defenders to act in cases of violence and intimidation by the police.

The increase in criminal violence in urban areas was one of the new foci of the Human Rights Program in 1985, which also continued to concentrate efforts on providing legal aid for vulnerable populations and the strengthening of civil society organizations. The challenge of the urban poor had been made worse by growing violence. The expectation was that, in the future, this increase in violence would lead the Foundation to invest resources in training government agents in crime prevention. It would also require a collaboration between social scientists who studied crime and criminal justice and the police and improved relations between the police and the community. Everything pointed to the issue of public security playing a more important role in future Brazil Office actions. This would be an interface to be developed with the Governance Program, something which began in a tentative way with the co-funding of a program aimed at improving relations between police and civil society in Recife. In this same year, and for the first time, the Office report indicates the role that the increase in access to justice for vulnerable groups can play not only in the consolidation of rights but also in reducing violence.

Notably, the Nucleus for the Study of Violence of the University of São Paulo (NEV-USP), created in 1987 with Ford Foundation support, developed an innovative outlook that had national repercussions and became a model for innumerable studies. The NEV-USP had observed that the tradition of violence in Brazilian society could be explained not only through the authoritarian roots of the national State but also as due to the violence rooted in the relations among citizens, within the sphere of civil society itself. It developed a concept of socially-implanted authoritarianism that suggested three ways of addressing the issue of violence: a) State violence against citizens; b) citizens' violence against the State and society,

expressed in the growth of crime, especially in its organized and ever more aggressive varieties; c) the endemic violence among citizens, which was mostly represented by the increase in violence in inter-subjective relations, especially among adolescents and young adults. The Institute for Studies of Religion (ISER), was also outstanding for its enormous capacity to influence public opinion and political authorities. Its campaigns contributed to effectively establishing violence and crime as matters of national concern, and to incorporating them permanently into political agendas.

At the time of the promulgation of the new Constitution (1988), the issue that drew most attention was how to reduce crime and violence and promote respect for human rights. This issue continued throughout the 90s as a task for human rights activists not only in Brazil but in other countries as well. Responding to this issue did not mean giving up previously funded projects, but rather the addition of new fronts. This new mandate led the Foundation to finance research into attitudes regarding human rights carried out by the São Paulo Justice and Peace Commission and to fund a human rights news network to support the investigation and documentation of human rights violations.

The steady increase in urban violence was regarded as a great challenge for human rights, even more so because the question of why precisely the poor and disadvantaged groups were both the victims and the perpetrators of violence could not be explained. This new issue highlighted more clearly than in the past the role of the criminal justice system, particularly the capacity of this system to respond to the new challenges posed by the changes taking place in the conventional patterns of violence and urban crime.

Other issues concerning the institutional dimensions of violence were concentrated in the Governance Program. The Foundation continued to call attention to the persistence of grave human rights violations along with the impact of increasing crime on the quality of urban life, especially among populations in situations of risk who are more vulnerable to the effects of inequality. The Foundation played a decisive role in identifying the characteristics of violence in Brazil, especially in cities like Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and, on a lesser scale, in Recife. These characteristics included not only a detailed description of events, including their morphology and dynamics, but also the tense relations between citizens and institutions charged with the control of public security, most specifically the police. Initial investments in the study of the judiciary were also announced, albeit modestly at the beginning of the period and more substantially at the end.

Other themes concerning the classic issues of human rights are also covered by the Program. In the mid 1980s, preparations for the new Constitution that had been foreseen in the negotiations for the return to democracy mobilized discus-

sion of institutional reform and power relations in society. The opportunity created by the reform of the Constitution brought human rights back again to center stage. In that year, the main themes addressed by the program included education, access to human rights, raising awareness of these rights and the promotion of information exchange among NGOs. Human rights activists and researchers were encouraged to work with government representatives in order to elaborate important social and economic reforms to be included in the new Constitution. However, these were not the only themes that the Program supported: institutional violence, police and society relations, the criminal justice system, land dispute issues in urban areas, legal aid for poor youth and the experimentation with the creation of public defense offices all continued to receive support.

The Agrarian Reform issue gained importance with the approaching Constitutional Reform. The Foundation financed seminars on Agrarian Reform in several capitals gathering together jurists, government representatives, rural workers and academic researchers. It maintained its support to the Brazilian Association for Agrarian Reform so that this institution could disseminate information, give legal aid to local governments and rural workers and advocate for constitutional reform.

From what has been said, it can be concluded that human rights have never been totally contained within the sphere of just one program. Given the nature of the themes addressed, the scope and reach of public debates and the multiplicity of rights that cross over into different institutional fields, the frontiers between programs cannot always be strictly demarcated. Human rights issues can often be found in programs women's health, education, sustainable development and, principally, governance. The Human Rights Program as such is relatively recent. In a way, it operated in permanent exchange with other themes, issues and proposals. At times, it seemed to rehearse solo flights. This can be seen especially during the period of constitutional reform, while the census was being prepared and, from the mid-90s onwards, at UN conferences. But, these appear to represent exceptional occasions. This is why it is never really clear when or why projects are sometimes sent to the Human Rights Program and at other times sent to other programs, like Governance. Recently, the decision to invest in the creation of a human rights infrastructure points to the program's need to have its own identity, as this initiative displays not only greater focus but also the need for new methods and instruments, like the first discussions on creating postgraduate courses in human rights or on giving Foundation support to legal aid programs aimed at increasing citizen access to human rights institutions.

Action Strategies

As the institutional changes regarding the overall conception of the human rights program and its themes have taken place over long periods, discontinuities are more visible in the choice of action strategy. In the first phases (1962-1979), investment strategies focused on producing knowledge and human resources for research (in the sense of providing these resources with professional training). Producing knowledge was comprised of giving courses, promoting events, research, studies, documentation, databases, training in methodology, producing specific methodologies (evaluation), producing indices and producing images. In subsequent phases, concern shifted to the dissemination and exchange of knowledge, the impact of projects on public opinion, the change of behavior and attitudes, as well as how research findings were being used in public debate and in formulating public policies. This repertory was gradually increased by encouraging other strategies, including: training (professional training, education, capacity-building); innovation (management of resources, monitoring and accountability); advocacy (the promotion and public defense of rights); transfer of knowledge through international cooperation; strengthening of institutionals (by constituting networks); social participation (awareness, social struggles, changes in behavior); and technical and legal assistance. In the current phase, there have not been any significant changes in this range of strategies, except for the incorporation of affirmative action policies (also known as positive discriminative policies).

The data contained in the table above show the trends in resource distribution, by themes, throughout the period analyzed. The predominant trend has been the reduction of funds for themes related to human rights per se. In return, support given to projects on racial and gender inequalities has grown. All three themes received substantial grants between 1980 and 2001. At the beginning of the period, there was more investment in human rights in general than the other themes, but by the end of the period these general projects had lost ground to racial and gender discrimination. Over the period, racial inequality has shown a sevenfold increase in resources while annual funding for projects related to gender inequality has grown by 357%. In contrast, there was a significant reduction of funds for human rights projects.

This profile reveals a considerable change in the Ford Foundation's portfolio of action strategies. At the beginning of the period, projects that invested in knowledge production through studies and research predominated. During the period, the purely academic production of knowledge began to give way to applied research projects, thereby strengthening the ties between knowledge and intervention. This trend seems to have become even more prominent in the field of racial discrimina-

tion studies where there was a strong tendency to support affirmative action. In a similar way, in the field of gender discrimination there was a trend towards income generating projects.

Table 3. GRANTMAKING BY THEME AND PERIOD, 1966-2001
(in 2001 dollars)

| <i>Period</i> | <i>Theme</i> | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | <i>Racial inequality</i> | <i>Gender inequality</i> | <i>Indigenous populations</i> | <i>Human rights general</i> |
| 1966-1979 | – | – | – | 2 571 133 |
| 1980-1984 | 809 575 | 723 550 | 130 194 | 3 799 767 |
| 1985-1989 | 1 166 648 | 651 983 | 657 430 | 2 067 798 |
| 1990-1994 | 3 077 099 | 1 946 037 | 267 687 | 843 251 |
| 1995-1999 | 4 521 569 | 3 401 351 | – | 1 034 350 |
| 2000-2001 | 2 496 574 | 1 323 787 | – | 882 910 |
| Total | 12 070 465 | 8 046 708 | 1 055 311 | 11 199 209 |

Source: Ford Foundation.

These trends seem to have been confirmed by historical facts. During the Office's first years in Brazil (1965-1979), the concern to train human resources is clear. Ford Foundation interventions seem in this period to stem from a single diagnosis: the need for expertise to develop investment programs in areas considered to be strategic. That is why it made such a decisive contribution to training and increasing the social science community, an objective that was greatly facilitated when the first Brazilian doctoral researchers returned from abroad, especially from US universities, in the mid 1960s. These pioneers were not only more familiar with the academic, scientific and public debates regarding the tasks that were required of a capitalist society in development, but also exhibited consensus on how to go about them. Thus, the bases of the partnership between the Foundation and Brazilian researchers were laid. Grants given to the Rio de Janeiro University Institute of Research (IUPERJ) and the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP) are especially noteworthy.

Therefore, this period is characterized by support for the development of critical thinking. However, foreseeing trends that would be consolidated in subsequent periods, it dealt with promoting a type of critical thought that was different from the European tradition that had predominated since the 19th century. Until that time, the prevailing style of social science had been imbued with humanism and academicism and was totally uninterested in the general pressures facing society. There was little professional training as this type of social science was sustained by intellectual vocation and the idea that it was a handcrafted and individualized activity *par excellence*. However, as previously stated, these trends had been undergoing changes in the United States and Europe, since the 1950s. There were signs of change in Brazil too, with the surveys and studies on race relations sponsored by UNESCO and carried out in Salvador, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. In 1969, the Ford Foundation supported the Columbia University Institute of Latin American Studies to publish in English Florestan Fernandes' classic book on racism in Brazil that had been first published in 1965. This publication is a good example of the role the Foundation had started playing in the progressive professionalization and institutionalization of Brazilian social science research in a broad sense, as well as in its dissemination abroad. It also shows that the Office focused on motivating joint and comparative research, the organization of scientific work, establishing alliances between researchers and society and the intervention of researchers in public debate.

The Foundation began to gradually withdraw from the academic field, claiming that the duties of funding research and post-graduate studies should be undertaken by official (State) agencies. However, even in this phase the first initiatives of investing in applied research and intervention projects had already emerged. In the third phase, the duties of constituting a community of social scientists were considered as having been fulfilled. From then on, the Foundation started investing in strengthening the organizations of civil society, and in so doing showed it was concerned not only with funding an adequate infrastructure for the constitution of research and intervention groups, but above all with the creation of non-governmental organizations. The focus of training was also shifted at that time and instead of promoting the training of researchers (and, as a result, the process of replicating and increasing research resources), interest centered on the capacity-building of NGO management, by training people to shape social demands and turn them into public policies by developing strategies to implement them as pilot projects in order to later influence the decision-makers. In the fourth phase, this trend was emphasized, and concern about intervening in the training of future public decision-makers was further added. The following table illustrates these trends:

Table 4. HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTS PER TYPE OF ORGANIZATION AND PERIOD (in 2001 dollars)

| Type of Organization | Period | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|
| | Total | % | 1966-1979 | 1980-1984 | 1985-1989 | 1990-1994 | 1995-1999 | 2000-2001 | | |
| Brazilian academic | 10 477 050 | 31% | 2 566 427 | 1 676 717 | 1 296 869 | 2 429 134 | 1 872 641 | 635 262 | | |
| Brazilian NGO | 20 125 278 | 59% | 4 706 | 3 511 676 | 2 851 795 | 3 253 592 | 6 988 452 | 3 515 057 | | |
| Brazilian government | 98 039 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 039 | 0 | 0 | | |
| FAP/Individual grants | 1 227 338 | 4% | 0 | 1 100 830 | 36 508 | 0 | 0 | 90 000 | | |
| Latin american NGO | 542 388 | 2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 461 | 157 468 | 342 459 | | |
| US academic | 259 433 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 901 | 98 532 | 100 000 | | |
| US NGO | 438 566 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 189 | 247 902 | 136 475 | | |
| Other | 1 109 209 | 3% | 0 | 553 653 | 555 556 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total | 34 277 302 | 100% | 2 571 133 | 6 842 875 | 4 740 728 | 5 938 316 | 9 364 995 | 4 819 254 | | |

Source: Ford Foundation.

The data contained in Table 4 shows that a bigger proportion of resources have gone to NGOs (62%) than to academic institutions (32%) and that throughout the period the rate of increase in funding for NGOs has been greater than for academic institutions. The reduced but continued funding for academic institutions shows the Foundation's strategic move away from more academic projects towards applied or intervention projects. Due to the increase in the scientific community, and especially in the number of social scientists who had received Ford Foundation funding⁷, the university jobs that had previously had an exclusively humanities and academic profile were professionalized in such a way that the universities and research centers began to focus on the immediate problems of Brazilian society. In the competition for resources, academic institutions adapted the ways in which intellectual work was organized. There was a significant increase in research groups, the number of centres and laboratories, in university outreach and, as a consequence, in the consolidation of more formal and bureaucratic academic standards, inclusively of the entrepreneurial type. There were therefore two convergent movements: on the one hand, the growth and strengthening of NGOs disputing space and resources; on the other hand, the changes within academic institutions that remained in the competition. The human rights area seems to have been paradigmatic of these processes and trends.

The course of action taken to strengthen NGOs was multifaceted and does not seem to respond to a clearly defined strategic plan. The Foundation encouraged applied research on social movements as a way to make them socially and symbolically more effective. In so doing, it continued to strengthen social science, highlighting the roles of social justice and human rights. At the same time, the Foundation also strengthened capacity to draw up and evaluate social policies, as well as invest in alternative programs aimed at increasing social and distributive justice. This led the Foundation to prioritize the training of groups to formulate and assess public policies, besides continuing its investments in training civil society to put pressure on public agents to take action. Thus, it was taking action on two fronts: by training the population to apply pressure and by training public agents to respond to demands. Even so, the expectation that the social deficit would be reduced began to fade. At that moment, the issue of inequality became a priority for the Office and the Urban Poverty and Rural Poverty and Resources Programs gained in importance. The Human Rights and Social Justice Program budget that had been allotted considerable resources in previous years lost ground to the fight against poverty. As a result, a decision was made to reduce resources

7. This occurred particularly in the case of the National Association for Post-graduate Research and Training in the Social Sciences – ANPOCS, among others. See Miceli, 1993.

for legal aid and concentrate investments in increasing the ability of social organizations to put pressure on public agents responsible for drawing up public policies.

In this way, the Human Rights Program suffered a setback, the results of which may not have been predicted. It now had to deal with trying to reduce the dependency of civil society organizations, maintaining legal aid resources for only the more vulnerable groups, while supporting Indian populations, people living in *favelas* (in Recife), women victims of domestic violence and victims of police violence (in Salvador). Even so, the Program began pioneering: support for an initiative of the Justice Secretariat of the Government of Rio de Janeiro to set up public defense offices in low income areas in the state capital. A powerful tool in the realm of race relations was being inaugurated and concerned the training of black defenders and lawyers. It was thought that inequalities in the exercise of justice were related to the small number of black lawyers and other black representatives in the formal spaces of our civil and penal codes. It is not enough to merely denounce disgraceful cases of discrimination that are quite often backed by technical decisions of the courts. It was believed that only through daily co-existence in these institutional spaces would whites and blacks learn to overcome prejudice. Thus, the Ford Foundation was also a pioneer in drawing up examples of affirmative action or positive discrimination policies long before these emerged in public debate in the second half of the last decade.

Advocacy has undoubtedly been one of the initiatives to attract the most investment and attention. This may be seen through the grants given to the Center for Coordination of Marginalized Populations (CEAP), to organize legal aid to defend victims of racial discrimination, and to the Society for Black Studies and Citizenship in the State of Sergipe (SACI), for a program that provides legal counseling for cases related to racial discrimination in the Northeast. In the same way, support has been given to Geledés–Institute of Black Women to develop, diffuse and promote anti-racist legislation, to the Brazilian Anthropological Association (ABA), to develop methodology for data gathering on themes concerning the old “quilombos” – hiding places for runaway slaves – to strengthen ownership rights of land that has been traditionally inherited by black populations, and for the creation of the Nucleus for Black Studies, of Florianópolis, to provide information on racism and racial inequality for state school teachers. Regarding behavioral changes, funds were given to the Queiroz Filho Brazilian Institute for Community Studies and Support to carry out educational work with trade unionists to reduce racial prejudice in the workplace.

In the same vein, several of the basic concepts that would contribute to the success of the democratization process were introduced through the Human Rights

and Governance Programs, and even before the formal transition took place: civil society empowerment; accountability of public agents and institutions; and responsiveness of public agents and institutions. Innovation in social movement practices and in public action was another concept introduced by the Foundation through its actions in this period. At the beginning of the 1980s, the Foundation started investing resources in Human Rights education aimed not only at increasing awareness of these rights among the authorities in charge of formulating and implementing social policies, but also at reducing resistance against human rights, often thought of as “bandits’ rights” applying only to lawbreakers and not to the normal, honest, working citizen. It was with this spirit that the following projects were supported: land ownership and the right to work (Recife), projects that addressed themes like police brutality in poor communities and violence against detainees (abuse in prison) as well as domestic violence. Legal aid for vulnerable groups, like people who live in poor areas and *favelas*, was maintained. The list of vulnerable groups was lengthened, the living conditions of blacks, women and Indian populations were still documented, and abandoned children were added to the list. Even programs in the health area now have a strong human rights component. These programs aim at informing women of their rights, documenting violence against women, whether domestic or not, and understanding early pregnancy and sterilization processes.

Grantees and their Projects

The following table identifies the main grantees and the total of donations received.

*Table 5. HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTEES RECEIVING MORE THAN \$ 100,000
FORD FOUNDATION, BRAZIL OFFICE, 1966-2001 (in 2001 dollars)*

| | | <i>Total</i> |
|-----------|--|--------------|
| 1978-2001 | Brazilian Society for Instruction | 2 697 235 |
| 1966 | State University of Rio de Janeiro | 2 552 632 |
| 1990-2001 | Geledés - Institute of Black Women | 2 175 271 |
| 1992-2001 | Feminist Studies and Assistance Center | 1 646 933 |

| | | <i>Total</i> |
|-----------|--|--------------|
| 1980-1991 | Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo | 1 535 935 |
| 1987-1998 | University of São Paulo | 1 344 691 |
| 1980-1985 | Center for Studies of Contemporary Culture | 1 342 834 |
| 1980-1985 | Foundation-Administered Project | 1 137 338 |
| 1982-1989 | Luiz Freire Cultural Center | 1 058 981 |
| 1981-1985 | Caritas Arquidiocesand of Rio de Janeiro | 1 051 919 |
| 1998-2001 | Center for Studies on Relations and Inequality in the Workplace | 986 582 |
| 1982-1997 | Carlos Chagas Foundation | 922 366 |
| 1981-1988 | Center for the Defense of Human Rights | 712 326 |
| 1996-1999 | Center for Coordination of Marginalized Populations | 655 538 |
| 1982-1991 | São Paulo Pro-Indian Commission | 617 532 |
| 1994-1998 | Themis – Feminist Legal Studies and Assistance Nucleus | 598 980 |
| 1987-1999 | Jose Bonifacio University Foundation | 585 379 |
| 1992-1996 | The Queiroz Filho Brazilian Institute for Community Studies and Support | 558 745 |
| 1981-1991 | Union of Domestic Workers | 543 809 |
| 1991-1999 | Citizenship, Studies, Research, Information and Action | 541 483 |
| 1995-2001 | The Nucleus for Black Studies | 458 065 |
| 1996-2001 | Afro-Reggae Cultural Group | 442 973 |
| 1991-1997 | Federal University of Bahia | 405 945 |

| | | <i>Total</i> |
|-----------|---|--------------|
| 2000 | National Office for Black Issues-Zumbi dos Palmares | 403 689 |
| 1994-1997 | Institute of Economic, Social and Political Studies | 385 423 |
| 1994-2001 | Executive Secretariat for Articulation of Brazilian Women For Beijing | 332 011 |
| 1988 | Cultural Association for Contemporary Studies | 327 066 |
| 1998-2001 | Inter-American Institute of Human Rights | 326 558 |
| 1984-1987 | Mulherio Communications Center | 309 883 |
| 1988-1992 | Institute for Popular Legal Aid | 281 065 |
| 1988-2001 | Human Rights Society of Maranhão | 268 866 |
| 1994-2000 | North and Northeast Gender Studies Regional Network | 264 951 |
| 1987-1997 | SOS Corpo Gender and Citizenship | 258 370 |
| 1983 | Brazilian Association for Agrarian Reform | 244 024 |
| 1986-1990 | Nucleus for Indigenous Rights | 237 787 |
| 1984-1995 | Women's Information Center | 236 734 |
| 1991-1999 | Interdisciplinary Nucleus for Research and Social Action | 229 348 |
| 1990-1992 | Cultural Association for Contemporary Studies | 217 613 |
| 1999 | Education Action – Consultancy, Research And Information | 215 385 |
| 1995-1998 | Women's Health and Sexuality Collective | 194 789 |
| 1989-1995 | Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning | 185 003 |
| 1990 | Center of Support for Informal Activities | 156 863 |

| | | <i>Total</i> |
|-----------|---|--------------|
| 1996-2001 | Institute for the Advancement of Equity | 155 346 |
| 1998-2001 | Society for Black Studies and Citizenship in the State of Sergipe | 149 701 |
| 2000-2001 | Global Justice Center | 142 459 |
| 1994-1998 | Federal University of Santa Catarina | 138 390 |
| 1997-2001 | Center for Justice and International Law | 137 270 |
| 1987-1994 | Institute for Studies of Religion | 135 165 |
| 1986-1996 | Brazilian Anthropological Association | 121 342 |
| 1998-2001 | Center for the Creation of Popular Images | 115 930 |
| 2000 | State University of Campinas | 111 039 |
| 1999 | Federation of Agencies of Social and Educational Assistance | 102 564 |
| 2000 | Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo | 102 459 |

Source: Ford Foundation.

Beyond revealing the greater or lesser capacity of groups in obtaining Foundation support for their projects – which depends on their ability to mobilize support and the impact of their results on the public in general and on public policy in particular – the table identifies the network of institutions that has been forged throughout the period.

In the field of race discrimination, several groups were created or strengthened. Some are more focused on identifying and characterizing racial discrimination in Brazil. Others have the aim of combating racism in the most diverse areas of social life, be it at work, at school, in leisure, in cultural production areas and within activities of social control. These should be listed: the Center for Studies on Relations and Inequality in the Workplace with projects addressing discrimination through the production of documentaries and images; the Federal University of

Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) with its affirmative action research projects; the Brazilian Anthropological Association (ABA) with projects that document afro-descendant lands; the National Office for Black Issues—Zumbi Dos Palmares that elaborated preparatory reports for the World Conference Against Racism, Race Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Forms of Intolerance (Durban, 2000) and the Center for the Creation of Popular Images. This is a network that tries to intervene in the production of images and values regarding the country's black identity, as well as in advocacy work.

Once more, the importance given to gender discrimination issues throughout the period is noteworthy. The support that the Foundation has been giving to Geledés—Institute of Black Women, is undoubtedly one of the best examples of this trend, especially because Geledés faces two kinds of struggles: gender and race discrimination. However, this is not the only group to stand out. The Carlos Chagas Foundation carried out one of its most important initiatives with Ford Foundation support. The Ford-Carlos Chagas Foundation competition to fund research studies on women, is an experience that has established itself over the years and has produced results all over the country. The highly competitive nature of this contest reveals its importance. Even more revealing, however, is the fact that the Foundation no longer gives its support to the research thesis and dissertation competition sponsored by the Brazilian Association of Post-Graduate Research and Training in Social Science (ANPOCS). The important funding of the Union of Domestic Workers and the non-governmental organization Citizenship, Studies, Research, Information and Action (CEPIA), located in Rio de Janeiro, should also be pointed out. The latter, like others, is a group that produces knowledge that can influence public debate and public policymaking. Their studies on laws that protect women, from a comparative viewpoint, has influenced programs such as the specialized women's police stations and the struggle against discrimination in court cases where women are either victims or the main protagonists. Furthermore, the support given to Themis-Female Legal Studies and Assistance Nucleus from Rio Grande do Sul, to consolidate an innovative program among low-income women trained to be human rights agents and which has won numerous prizes, among which the University of São Paulo Human Rights Awards in 2000, should also be highlighted. Equally noteworthy is support given to the Brazilian Institute of Municipal Administration (IBAM), aimed at training low-income women from Rio de Janeiro and strengthening the State Councils for Women's Rights, and the support given to the Latin American Committee for the Defense of Women's Rights (CLADEM), to hold regional and international meetings, as well as produce specialized documentation on violence. ISER, with its feminist leadership training to deal with gender issues should also be pointed out.

Problems of violence in society, grave human rights violations and the promotion of civil and social rights were, as a rule, dealt with by groups from universities and other research centers. It was in this context that the Foundation gave its support to the creation of the University of São Paulo Nucleus for the Study of Violence, which a few years later became a national model for research and innovation in the promotion of human rights, particularly with regards the role of state institutions in the democratic control of violence. With the same aim, support was given to the Institute for Studies of Religion (ISER) which began to play a similar role in Rio de Janeiro. As a result of these partnerships, others with similar profiles ended up being created over the following decade. The Foundation began supporting research groups in the Institutes of Philosophy and Human Sciences of the Federal Universities of Rio Grande do Sul, Minas Gerais and Ceará. The creation of the Center for Criminology and Public Security in Minas Gerais, in a partnership between the Federal University and the João Pinheiro Foundation, should be specially highlighted. Likewise, the support for studies on the professional training and activities of the police and of public prosecutors and judges, undertaken by the Institute of Economic, Social and Political Studies (IDESP), should be mentioned. Grants were also given to NGOs like the Global Justice Center (RJ) and the Legal Assistance Office for Popular Organizations (GAJOP/PE). The first grants were also made to the recently created United Nations Latin-American Institute (ILANUD), for studies on community policing. Simultaneously, the Foundation started funding an extensive study of the Judiciary coordinated by Idesp to help focus the debate on Judicial reform. This study was not restricted to criminal justice. It was far more wide-ranging and included civil justice in all its circuits and instances. It investigated not only structural and organizational problems but also the possibilities of reform given the changes that had been announced during President Fernando Henrique Cardoso's two terms of office. Along the same lines, funding was provided for the Getúlio Vargas Foundation to evaluate programs of access to justice for low-income populations in the state of Rio de Janeiro. Substantial grants given to the Brazilian Society for Instruction of the Candido Mendes University to study civilian oversight of police activities in five Brazilian states, are also noteworthy.

The Foundation also supported the setting up of the Centres for Indigenous Studies for the training of indigenous leaders in the rights field and the preparation of cases to go before courts. It similarly helped in the huge effort of the Missionary Council for Indigenous People to identify indigenous areas which was later rewarded with the demarcation of indigenous territories.

Results and Impact

It is not easy to show the results and impact of projects that were funded by the Ford Foundation in the human rights area. On the whole, the documents that were examined said very little about this. The evaluations of results, normally carried out by external consultants, were restricted to checking to see if goals had been achieved and if, in general terms, investments had produced expected outcomes. However, there are no systematic evaluations nor the use of any methodology that would allow results to be measured (notwithstanding the limitations of this type of proposal in the area of humanities), despite recent attempts by the Foundation to introduce this kind of policy. This difficulty is further increased by external factors that do not derive from the Foundation. In the human rights sphere, there are no evaluations – not even subjective ones – of the size of the social debt, as are available for other areas such as employment, health and schooling. This lack of knowledge, as well as not having a support network able to overcome problems and difficulties, prevents us from being able to gauge the weight and importance of the support offered by the Foundation with all its financial, technical and institutional backing. To do this, it would be necessary to have reliable statistics on serious human rights violations, including cases of discrimination and police brutality, that permitted an evaluation of the existing gap between the need for justice and the access provided by public services. More often than not, evaluations are no more than estimates and frequently only very rough ones.

Therefore, it is not possible to make an objective evaluation that is free from personal considerations. Nevertheless, even with such limitations, it is possible to identify some results. Within the human rights sphere, the impact may be indirectly assessed. As previously shown, Foundation initiatives have focused on improving the quality of information and contributing to the training of human resources to formulate and implement public policies and exercise advocacy. The Foundation has been responsible for training specialized human resources to work in this area, creating the network of institutions previously mentioned and fostering a culture in support of human rights. In this respect, the Foundation's participation throughout the period under study in setting a positive human rights agenda is undeniable. The formulation and implementation of a National Human Rights Plan (1996) by the Fernando Henrique Cardoso government was not only a governmental initiative but undoubtedly also a civil society demand. It was this because the agenda had already become a public issue that could then be transformed into a political issue. And it was precisely from this moment onwards that human rights started to be viewed differently. Nowadays, it is increasingly less respectable to criticize human rights as being the privilege of criminals. The human rights

agenda is increasingly increasingly recognized as belonging to everyone and identified, above all, with the struggle for social rights, the struggle against discrimination and the struggle against the arbitrary acts of the institutions of law and order enforcement. Had it not been for all the Foundation's initiatives in this area since the opening of its Office in Brazil the scenario of disrespect for human rights could possibly be even more tragic than it is.

An evaluation of which initiatives were more successful requires going beyond the documents. Even so, it is possible to list some of them, including legal aid for vulnerable groups and the documentation of the living conditions of these groups. The progress made in treating issues that concern women, blacks, indigenous populations and the poor is undeniable. On the whole, the balance is more positive than negative, although challenges remain. Regarding women, there are many positive signs: women's police stations, the centers for the defense of women, the state Councils, the national Council, the broadening of access to social services and, finally, great progress in the communication between feminist groups. With regards the situation of Afro-Brazilians, everything indicates that the challenges are still there and that, by and large, discrimination is still pervasive and strong and that the black population continues to be the prime target of grave human rights violations, be they civil or social. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the different initiatives have not disturbed the traditional complacency and silence towards the problems faced by blacks in Brazilian society. A change in behavior and attitudes is underway, images produced by the print and electronic media no longer go unheeded. Progress has been made in the advocacy field in promoting the defense of rights. The recent debate on affirmative action, however polemical it may be, shows that the issue of racial discrimination is changing into a field of dispute and social competition which raises hopes for negotiations, the exchange of values and, in the future, even the possibility of a peaceful co-existence of difference.

Tasks have been launched for the future. Throughout the world, the Vienna Conference (1994) has resulted in large scale mobilization of various groups to incorporate their demands into the agenda of human rights protection and promotion. This is not the place to list these. However, the range of demands has been greatly broadened with the incorporation of wider-ranging problems concerning inter-ethnic and religious conflicts as well as the incorporation of new issues, such as international and intra-national migrations. Although these greatly affect the social rights of national migrants, the Foundation has not tried to get ahead of these events, as in previous periods, by following, for example, the initiatives of organized groups of civil society such as the Pastoral of Immigrants.

When the Fernando Henrique government edited the First National Human Rights Plan (1996) it used the Vienna Conference guidelines and was oriented by

the principle of the indivisibility of human rights. It required a large dose of innovation to produce an articulated and integrated approach to the problems of civil rights when these were associated with extreme social deficits of which inequality is the most blatant sign. The plan covers not only traditional obstacles, like institutional violence, but also focuses on reforming the police and the practices of traditional public oversight (something that the Foundation has also pioneered, as previously shown), and, above all, problems regarding urban reform, education and democratic participation. Also noteworthy is the Plan's focus on problems concerning other vulnerable social groups – such as indigenous populations, the elderly, people with special needs and, more recently, homosexuals – and the special attention given to children, young people and adolescents, all groups that in its time in Brazil the Foundation has paid little attention to, offering only timid funding here and there to isolated projects or for parts of projects on specific issues. Investments could have been made to a Center for Studies on Youth to promote an innovative understanding of contemporary problems and, above all, encourage the introduction of innovative programs and actions.

It would be unfair if we did not acknowledge that on the whole the purposes of the Human Rights Program include these wider-ranging human rights issues. The main aims are worth pointing out once more: to promote human rights, strengthen non-governmental organizations to defend these rights and contribute to the consolidation of national legislation to reduce inequalities. It is also important to highlight that the current Program Officer (as from 2000) acknowledges that the task of consolidating human rights in Brazil is an unfinished one, the gaps between legislation and reality are still huge and that there is still much to be done. The current decision to invest in the creation of a human rights infrastructure would seem to be a timely one therefore. Time will tell.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- ADORNO, Sérgio. (1999). "Racial Discrimination and Criminal Justice in São Paulo". In REICHMANN, R. (ed.). *Race in Contemporary Brazil*. Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania University Press.
- ÁLVAREZ, Sonia. (1996). "Overview Thoughts on the Brazil Office's Rights and Social Justice Program, September 1993-September 1996". The Ford Foundation, Inter-Office Memorandum, 24 jul.
- ARENDT, H. (1987). *As Origens do Totalitarismo*. São Paulo, Companhia das Letras.
- BOBBIO, N. (1992). *A Era dos Direitos*. Rio de Janeiro, Campus.
- CASSESE, A. (1991). *Los Derechos Humanos en el Mundo Contemporáneo*. Barcelona, Ariel.
- DORA, Denise. (2002). "Program Officer Memorandum". abr.
- FORD FOUNDATION. (1985). *Developing Country Programs*. FY 1986 Program Review, Ford Foundation, 30 set.-5 out.

- HOBBSAWM, Eric. (1994). *The Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914–1991*. New York, Pantheon Books.
- MICELI, Sergio. (1993). *A Fundação Ford no Brasil*. São Paulo, Sumaré/Fapesp.
- OLIVEIRA, L. (1987). “A Polícia na Boca do Povo”. *Symposium*, Recife, Universidade Católica de Pernambuco, vol. 29, n. 2.
- REICHMANN, Rebecca. (1990). “Empowering Disadvantaged Groups: Rights and Opportunities for Women and Blacks in Brazil”. The Ford Foundation, Inter-Office Memorandum, 12 nov.
- _____. (1991). “Civil Rights and Economic Opportunities Statement”. Rio de Janeiro, Ford Foundation.
- SKIDMORE, Thomas. (1991). “Fato e Mito: Descobrindo um Problema Racial no Brasil”. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, São Paulo, Fundação Carlos Chagas, n. 79, pp. 5-16.
- TELLES, Edward. (1996). “Promoting and Integrating Race/Ethnic Diversity in Brazil: A Consultancy for the Ford Foundation”. 19 mar.
- _____. (2000). “Program Officer Memorandum”. 28 fev.