STANLEY E. HILTON'S REPLY*

I am delighted that my article created an opportunity for Frank McCann to clarify his previously published arguments. Naturally he seeks in his letter of rebuttal to downplay or explain away the strained, exaggerated or manifestly incorrect statements and conclusions that abound in his book, at the same time that he politely deprecates much of my criticism. This is as it invariably is. McCann knows the spirit in which my critique was made—I discussed the broad outlines of it with him in Rio de Janeiro in 1977—and I accept his response as being made in the same spirit.

In reply to his critique, let me say that I read accurately that the two outside readers of my article and the editorial staff of the HAHR agreed that what I had to say was sufficiently accurate to merit publication, and that interested readers can easily verify whether or not I did justice to McCann's thesis and its conceptual fuzziness. He now concedes that he was hazy and/or incorrect in regard to major points and that one of his two major conclusions was "too extreme." Presumably, then, the cause of scholarship has been advanced a little by this exchange. One does note sadly that McCann's habit of jumping to sweeping conclusions on the basis of inadequate or misread data still plagues him: "To Hilton Brazilian–American relations from the mid-1930s onward were all sweetness and light" is patently unjustified by my article or by anything else that I have written. But then, perhaps he did not mean "sweetness".

* The author is Associate Professor of History at Louisiana State University.