

Since Imperial Viscounts until Republican Barons: "region" at the conservative diplomatic lineage at Itamaraty (1840s to 1930s)

João Catraio Aguiar

Vínculo Institucional: Universidade Católica de Petrópolis – UCP

Resumo:

Pretende-se realizar um esboço de investigação, neste trabalho, focado em como a linhagens conservadora da política/diplomacia brasileira mobilizou o conceito de "região". Para tanto, serão analisados principais aspectos desse grupo – associado aos "saquaremas" do Segundo Reinado, e aos antiliberais da Primeira República. A análise anseia demonstrar que há adaptações das "preferências regionais" durante o período oligárquico. Pode-se dizer que, ação e o pensamento conservadores estavam embebidos do viés centralizador, realista e "iberista", nesse período, no que se refere à "região".

Palavras-chave:

Política externa brasileira – Pensamento político-diplomático brasileiro – Regionalismo

Abstract:

A draft of research is intended to be done in this paper, focused on how the Brazilian political/diplomatic conservative lineage has mobilized the concept of "region". For that, an analysis will be made on the main aspects of this group – associated with the "saquaremas" of the Second Reign, and the illiberal ones of the First Republic. This analysis longs to demonstrate that there are adaptations of "regional preferences" during the oligarchic period. It is possible to say that conservative action and thought were embedded with the centralizing, realist, and "iberist" bias, when it comes to "region".

Key words:

Brazilian foreign policy – Brazilian political-diplomatic thought – Regionalism

Since Imperial Viscounts...

The period of the Imperial Viscounts was of the Pax Britannica. At that time we can highlight: the Britannic hegemony, presence of the Holy Alliance, international waves of contestation (1820s; 1830s; 1848); free trade experiences and protectionism; and Eurocentric economy/politics (LESSA, 2005). Brazilian national identity, embedded with monarchy and slavery, acclaimed certain distance from its continent, in order to reassure itself as an island of civilization surrounded by barbarism (PREUSS, 2011); in a certain way this made Brazil get closer to Europe than to the Americas. Brazil did not mobilize the concept of "Latin America" as France did, instead, it considered itself as "Atlantic" and "Iberoamerican". The "Americanism" – including variations as "Latin-America" and "Pan-Americanism" – will gain ground only at the end of the XIXth century and at the beginning of the following one (BETHELL, 2009).

Academics between the XIXth and the XXth centuries understood America as a continent in two ways: attached to the West, having bridges with non-western identities, or as a place of "americanidade", diverse from western identity, diversity came as western was internalized (DOMINGUES, 2003). Thus, some views of the "region" resembled the cosmopolitan political position, while others were more prone to communitarian political scope. The last one had been more close to the conservative lineage of Brazilian diplomacy. "Statecentrism" could be seen as a vital part of the latter group, as well as neutrality until 1840s and a certain dose of interventionism since then at the "Prata" (Plate) region, plus some sort of approximation with traditional European partners. "Iberism" is the root of this kind of conservatism, close to the Iberian political model as well as European conservatisms.

It was opposed to the liberal model, focused on the radical and liberal ideas from Western Europe and the

"new world". Since the building of a Brazilian political culture, "iberistas" were pro: State above civil society; land concentration; communitarian and collective ideas/acts against individualism; defence of the bureaucracy (VIANNA, 2004). Against this group, "americanistas" defended: economic freedom; free and strong civil society; decentralization; reforms mainly based on the USA's patterns. Despite rivalries at the Imperial Congress of the Second Reign, prevailed an idea that the European region was stronger. Thus International Law appeared to be vital as a way to dissuade the use of European power in Americas; while in the South American region, the effort was dual. On the one hand, towards the consolidation of frontiers without intervention. On the other hand, balance of power and intervention (CERVO, 1981).

The "patient neutrality" (between the abdication of Dom Pedro I and the conservative ascension of the 1850's) occurred at the same time of Brazilian regional insurrections; afterwards, there was an interventionist turn. National sovereignty; territorial unity; establishment of frontiers; balance of power: these were the basis of the "Saquarema" Foreign Policy. The catholic religion was the official one at the Union, although the last had prerogatives towards the first; the State ambioned free navigation on the rivers Paraná, Paranaguá, Uruguay, but not on the Amazonas; Brazil had drafted at that moment with Pacific Republics an approximation to establish limits; lastly, the country was present at the American Conferences and Universal Expositions (BETHELL, 2012). The Empire did use economic power and gigantic extension in its favour; at the American region, the deeper relations had been with countries from the Plate basin, amongst Europeans, England was the most strategic partnership (Silva, 2009). "Saquaremas" (conservatives) led Imperial politics at its apogee.

At "saquarema times" the group that defended the triad State-Authority-Order – against House-Liberty-Liberalism; and against Street-Equality-Revolution – had

seen the past influencing the present through the institutions and the State; and by those it would be possible to forge the imagined civilization, monarchic transmigration towards other land, other times (MATTOS, 2004). Period of hegemony from conservatives politicians since the Cabinet Araújo Lima (the Viscount of Olinda) in 1848, to the end of the Cabinet Lima e Silva (the Duke of Caxias) in 1862; and after from 1868 to 1878, between the beginning of Cabinet Rodrigues Torres (the Viscount of Itaboraí) and the end of the third Cabinet of the Duke of Caxias.

There was a cohesive elite, whose members included high bureaucrats, politicians and powerful landlords, compromised with plantation and slavery; nevertheless, competition and regionalisms were part of the political game, in which the State could conduct transformations, but the maintenance of socio-political structures were also conducted by the State, therefore, it is possible to name it as “dialectic of ambiguity” (CARVALHO, 2008). Amongst conservative leaders, the “saquarema trinity” – Paulino Soares de Sousa (the Viscount of Uruguay); Joaquim José Rodrigues Torres, and Eusébio de Queirós – had primacy. They aimed centralization, and a strong Executive power. Soares de Sousa would assume the ministry of “Foreign Affairs” in two occasions: 1843-1844; and 1849-1853. At the second moment, the missions at the Andean countries had the presence of Duarte da Ponte Ribeiro; at the Plate basin, Honório Hermeto Carneiro Leão was the conductor of what was established by the ministry, having José Maria da Silva Paranhos in an ancillary role.

Between 1851 and 1852, with Urquiza aid, from Entre-rios, Brazil will wage war on Oribe and Rosas, intervening in Uruguay and Argentina. Having had support from industrial, journalistic, and intellectual means, as well as the Court, the Viscount of Uruguay, as heir of the Portuguese diplomatic practice with frontiers, will mobilize also Baron of Mauá to quell the “farrapos” at the Plate

basin and to maintain sovereignty at the Amazon; the legacy of Soares de Sousa would involve territorial consolidation, and the exam to select diplomats (Torres, 2011). At the thought of Viscount of Uruguay, centralization will be the basis of politics and administration, the latter would be apolitical, and would conduct the progress, maintaining institutions; power would emanate from the Moderator power towards the Executive, and then towards the administrative power (MATTOS, 2012).

Besides, the Legislative saw the region as space subject to Brazilian national sovereignty, therefore outside the influence of European powers; which has compelled the centralized Foreign Service towards the system of treaties and the use of the doctrine *uti possidetis ita possideatis* (FERREIRA, 2013). Other conservative statesmen gained ground at the Second Reign, such as: José Maria da Silva Paranhos; Honório Hermeto Carneiro Leão (Marquis of Paraná); Nabuco de Araújo; and others. Paranhos, also known as Viscount of Rio Branco, had occupied the leading position of the Foreign Affairs Ministry in five Cabinets (1855-1857; 1858-1859; 1861; 1868-1870), as well as had been president of the most long-lasting Cabinet of Brazilian Empire (1871-1875); having had during his life good relations with the Freemasonry and the Military. He had written the “Letters to the absent friend” in 1850/51, attracting attention from the Marquis of Paraná. The latter is responsible for the initiation of Paranhos in the diplomacy, under the supervision of Viscount of Uruguay.

In his writings, the author defends national business; argue in favour of national union and interests, stating that those should be above political conflicts; understanding the country material progress as associated with interventionist action, he criticizes the anarchy of Hispanic-American republics (PARANHOS, 2008). Rio Branco, the father, thought the country as a “player”/“trader” with prominence in the region, and the consequence would be dominance of the Rio de la Plata

Basin. Paranhos spoke against the Britannic presence in Brazilian ports and waters; but would defend a transition towards the end of slavery; having seriously studied international law and frontiers, he would associate “reason” with “national interest”; praising alliances for solving regional issues, mainly at the “Prata” (Franco, 2005).

... until Republican Barons:

While the transition from Parliamentary Monarchy to Presidential Republic occurred, the glimmering light of conservatism was kept, embodied in centralization, national-statism, and tendency of acting in the American continent without being contrary to leading powers. The weight of the central power at the political relation was confirmed by the Union, strong enough to deal with regionalist forces; consequentially, the frontier problem would be decided by agents of national power, and not by power from the district or the province, either from private ones. Having this in mind, it is possible to see some kind of continuity among the Viscount of Rio Branco administration and the role of his son, the Baron of Rio Branco. The tradition of Brazilian diplomacy is invented and revived through the discourse associated to the “character Rio Branco”, father and son, and remains as a means to build the ethos of Brazilian diplomats (MOURA, 2000).

Juca Paranhos will act at the consolidation of Brazilian frontiers – Acre (with Bolivia); Missiones (with Argentina); Guyanas (with France, Netherlands, England); with Colombia; with Ecuador; with Peru; with Venezuela; with Uruguay – using his historical-geographical knowledge and retaking diplomatic practices from the Empire period (TEIXEIRA SOARES, 1975). A certain change occurred at the negotiation with central powers, as a way of avoiding damages on the national sovereignty. It is the

beginning of the phase of “Pragmatic Americanism” (PINHEIRO, 2004), not so global, neither very ideological, thus not detached to the USA. A logic constantly reaffirmed as it follows: Elihu Root visit to Brazil in 1906; support to Pan-Americanism; elevation of the legation to the condition of Embassy; naval modernization with USA mission at Brazil; activities at USA newspapers’; election of Yankees as referees at South America (NAPOLEÃO, 1999). The argument is that Paranhos Júnior’s bargaining was gaming with the protection of the USA in order to avoid European attacks to national sovereignty.

The strategy is sophisticated with: the proposition of the ABC pact (with Argentina and Chile) in 1909, German military mission in Brazil, military officers training in Germany; purchase of English warships in 1910; maintaining approximation between diplomacy and military aiming the defence of national interest. The Imperial paradigm has changed as divergences happened during the saquarema supremacy. The overwhelming coffee, rubber and cocoa exportation to the USA at that time will be a catalyst of transformation, rendering the Coffee Barons’ elite favourable to the Yankee State. Therefore, the founding fathers of the Republic resort to several funding loans.

Baron of Rio Branco’s thought will be embedded with pragmatism – mainly when it comes to rivalries, seen either as “of occasion”, or as “permanent” – and *uti possidetis*; also conceiving equality and reciprocity as associated; thus, the perceived similarity with the USA, more than with Hispanic-Americans, pushed the country towards Pan-Americanism (RICUPERO, 2013). The Baron’s profile was of a moderate nationalist, as his father used to be, and would kept the defence of territorial unity (mainly through the frontiers) and the national sovereignty (at alliances, mainly with the USA). He has seen the international projection of the country as *primus inter pares* as crucial; harmonizing otherness with a common American identity, being and interlocutor/intermediary

between USA and Latin America, sustaining pacifism and pacific relations with neighbours, etc.; the success of his thought has launched him into the national pantheon of heroes (SANTOS, 2010). Paranhos Júnior will resort to several types of power. The culture was conceived through prestige, cultural diffusion of nationalist ideology, and centralization of action at the State (SUPPO, 2012) conforming the realist paradigm of conservative “Viscounts” and “Barons”.

Cultural Diplomacy had been developed during the term of Paranhos Júnior. Before the Republic Declaration, “Le Brésil en 1889” would be a monarchist propaganda; organized by Baron of Santa Anna Néry, with contributions from the following: Eduardo Prado; Barão do Rio Branco; André Rebouças; amongst others. At this work of art, Brazil would be located beyond the American region. Félix Pacheco (1922-1926) will keep this guideline. At the 1922 Commemoration of Independence, Brazil had experienced the cultural projection and national propaganda, at the same time Brazilian diplomacy was acting in the League of Nations, through the International Commission of Intellectual Cooperation (LESSA, 2001). At the 1922/1923 Exposition, 13 countries were presents, the majority from Europe, and only 3 from the Americas (the USA, Mexico, Argentina); a statement to the world that regionalist/American alliances were surpassed by the diplomatic effort in Europe. Brazil acclaimed itself, mainly its capital, as the “Paris of Americas”, self-regarding as different from Latin-Americans. The otherness in this case resembled the Saquarema narrative, whose main characteristics – monarchist, “European”, “steady”, etc. – compelled the power elite to retain distance from the perceived unstable caudillism and republicanism from Americas.

Nevertheless, between 1909 and 1919, the “Revista Americana”, an important periodical, will discuss the idea of region, associated with reflections on peace, sovereignty, hegemony, and, mainly, Pan-Americanism

(CASTRO, 2012). In 1922, had happened the “Semana de Arte Moderna”, occurred the first activities of “Tenentismo” (Lieutenant uprising), Brazilian Communist Party, and Dom Vital Centre (a Catholic; in general, several members of these movements were critical of either the “Europeism” or the “Americanism”). To be a partner of “America”, the USA, would be an “illusion”, according to Eduardo Prado, for whom American fraternity could not be more than a lie, and the inter-American situation should be understood as similar to the (problematic) situation of Iberian countries (PRADO, 1980). Latin-American countries had faced several interventions, “larcenies”, etc., by the USA, while England would have aided independences. Curiously, the 1893 book – The American Illusion – was prohibited by the government; while the book “Annals of the Military Dictatorship in Brazil”, from 1890; which outspokenly criticized the republican regime; was freely commercialized. Continuity prevailed over dissonance, although opposition voices shouted at that time.

Between 1912 and 1917, there was Lauro Müller as the minister of Foreign Affairs. He stated that he was “succeeding”, but not substituting Baron of Rio Branco. With him ahead: Brazil recognizes the Republic of China (1913) and the Russian government of Kerensky (1917); Lauro Müller travels to the USA (1913); Lisbon Legation turns into Embassy (1914); the country declares itself as neutral on the I World War (1914); the Pact of ABC, proposed in 1909, is signed in 1915. Müller thought that it was necessary to have international support from the USA; keeping the state profile of mediator/intermediary – as it was seen in negotiations between the USA and Mexico, in which Brazil was a mediator –; despite of being pro-Americanist experiences, he defended neutrality (BARRETO, 2001); as it was defended at the Imperial Times. Suffering strong pressure from pro-Entente liberals, as Rui Barbosa, Müller would resign.

Brazil participates on the American Conferences, and acts accordingly to the republican ideal of (Pan)

American solidarity; but will get closer to Europe at the League of Nations, international commerce, and military operations; in general the Brazilian diplomatic thought oscillated between the “America” dimension and the “Europe” dimension, inside the “Atlantic Triangle” (GARCIA, 2006). Conservatives would be linked to South American balance and good relations with the USA, in the American axis; and, when it comes to Europe, the aim involved military modernization, prestige in the League of Nations, etc. Floriano Peixoto and Hermes da Fonseca were icons for conservatism at this period. For them, Brazilian international action would be entangled from defence of national interests, from security, from intelligence. National sovereignty should be considered when treating some specific national problems, according to their argument, what, in some way, could lead to isolationism. For the “Tenentistas”, as well as the authoritarian group, rural, agricultural, agrarian issues were vital. Bachelors conformed considerable part of the last group.

Some wings of the conservative thought will flirt with authoritarianism. Many of them will be influent at the 1930s civil-military movement, some will be influent in 1937 and in 1964. One of the *topoi* was: military would create the specialists’ government, of civilians attached to the State; against “casacas” oligarchy, the corrupt non-military. Among the ones with more distinction there are Juarez Távora and Alberto Torres. Távora’s thought is filled with illiberal and anti-representative ideas, with reformist desire, and nationalization/centralization of politics (CARVALHO, 2006); besides, he has approached himself to the Christian-Democrat ideology, and in 1955 reached the second place at the presidential dispute, with almost 31% of votes.

Alberto Torres was one of the greatest names of authoritarian nationalism, shielded the cosmopolitanism suppression and foreign models of organization, criticizing intellectuals and scientists, defending politicians and managers (TORRES, 1938). In his argument, national order

and sovereignty are irreplaceable, and the American region should protect its resources, because it was colonized in its past, but has a great potential. The thinker, though, when analyzing the war as a world problem, sees the necessity of pacific solutions to conflicts, considering patriotism and peace as linked, exemplifying this through the Monroe Doctrine and the Drago Doctrine (TORRES, 1913). He stated that the Americas embodied the maintenance of European ideals such as democracy and peace, but this should be sought through a global multilateralism.

Having the “war problem” in mind, Epitácio Pessoa administration with José Manuel de Azevedo Marques as minister (1919-1922), and Artur Bernardes administration with Felix Pacheco (1922-1926), would try to achieve the ideal of conciliating security and peace. Another ambition was the permanent seat at the League of Nations Council – lead mainly by pragmatic realists such as Domício da Gama, Felix Pacheco, et al. – but the strategy of representing the Americas was not successful and it got out the League days before Germany got into it (GARCIA, 2005).

... the region at the diplomatic-political thought.

Conclusion.

Some conservative parameters of the First Republic and the Second Reign were elucidated at this papers’ plain approach with the diplomatic practice/thought from the period. Now we will see what pushed apart and what pulled together this group. The majority of conservative thinkers and guides of diplomacy was composed by: literati (mainly journalists, poets, writers, etc.); statesmen; bachelors (jurists, engineers, and people with medical degree); and professors. Ergo, they were not Foreign Service Officers; their jobs and degrees were not directly linked to diplomacy.

They acted in a moment of transitions in several fields. From the monarchic representation centered at the Crown, it transformed into an oligarchic representation (against political pluralism); the participation was reduced, prevailed anti-democratic and demophobic theories, what was reinforced by the suffrage restriction, federalism with a liberal face, etc. (LYNCH, 2012). Also the internationalist thought was transformed as times went by. In relation to sovereignty, has given great prominence to the relation with great powers; in relation to the system of states, has given a great distinction to multilateralism and modernization (FELDMAN, 2009). The perception on the region has changed as the thought had changed.

Hurrell (2007) comments four types of region: as difference/diversity; as power pole; as one level at the global multilevel governance; as harbinger of change at the international society. Through this analysis, conservatives will emphasize the two previous notions; at the first moment, at the Empire, doing interstate cooperation and afterwards regional consolidation, that will have more prominence as from Pan-Americanism the experiences begin gravitating round regional organizations. In this sense it is possible to understand how Brazilian relation with the Plate countries and with the USA has changed. Moniz Bandeira (2010) highlights the weight of the Brazilian-Argentine relations at the configuration of foreign policies of both countries; from the potential hegemony rivalry at sub-region to collaborative spirit that permeates the second half of the XXth century onwards, cum granus salis, whose major intervenient factor were the main Anglophone countries.

On the one hand, the perception of the Yankee, French, and English “new times” thrived on some sectors of society; on the other hand, there was the perception that the Iberian-American roots, the past, should be retaken. The liberal society spread on the world, with industrialization, with democracy, via new narratives and social practices; the European equilibrium dwindled as international alliances and enmities had arisen, sharing the burden of the limits of expansion of capitalism (FALCON; MOURA, 1981). In general, science and culture were transformed, deepening the secularization, generating the time acceleration; that, together with emancipation and progress composed modern dimensions (KOSELLECK, 2003). Changes in cognition, perception, will produce effects.

Internationalists’ ideas and diplomatic practices were, several times, implemented in Brazil under the vision that more modern countries should provide patterns of guidance. The liberals defended that. Nevertheless, the conservatives “read” those proposals as a way to produce “modernization” of traditions, thus progress is associated with order. It was expected the amplification of international participation, gaining autonomy; and the “region” turns into a key-concept, because it gives to conservatives the argument to elevate Brazil to the condition of great power located in some space. Regionalism served to oligarchic and national interests, at the same time, and has built a concept of nation, of State, and of diplomatic acting/thinking that could be kept, even when the “Old Republic” perished. New moment, of a New State, blessed by Lieutenants, would be the rebirth of the “modernization of conservation”.

BIBLIOGRAFIA

- BARRETO, Fernando de Melo (2001). *Os Sucessores do Barão: relações exteriores do Brasil (1912-1964)*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- BETHELL, Leslie (2009). O Brasil e a ideia de "América Latina" em perspectiva histórica. *Estudos Históricos*. Vol. 22, n. 44, p. 289-321.
- _____. O Brasil no mundo. CARVALHO, José Murilo de. (Org.) (2012). *História do Brasil nação: 1808-2010*. Vol. 2: A abertura para o mundo: 1830-1889. RJ: Objetiva.
- CARVALHO, José Murilo de (2006). *Forças Armadas e Política no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editora.
- _____. (2008). *A construção da ordem: a elite política imperial. Teatro das sombras: a política imperial*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- CASTRO, Fernando V. (2012). *Pensando um continente: a Revista Americana e a criação de um projeto cultural para a América do Sul*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, FAPERJ.
- CERVO, Amado Luiz (1981). *O Parlamento Brasileiro e as Relações Exteriores (1826-1889)*. Brasília, DF: UNB.
- DOMINGUES, José Maurício (2003). *Do ocidente à modernidade: intelectuais e mudança social*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- FALCON, Francisco; MOURA, Gerson (1981). *A formação do mundo contemporâneo*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus.
- FELDMAN, Luiz (2009). Soberania e modernização no Brasil: pensamento de política externa no Segundo Reinado e na Primeira República. *Contexto Internacional*. Vol. 31, N. 3, pp. 535-592.
- FERREIRA, Gabriela Nunes. Paulino José Soares de Souza (Visconde do Uruguai): a construção dos instrumentos da diplomacia brasileira. In: PIMENTEL, J. V. de S. (Org.) (2013). *Pensamento diplomático brasileiro: formuladores e agentes da política externa (1750-1964)*. Volume I. Brasília, DF: FUNAG. p. 123-158.
- GARCIA, Eugênio Vargas (2005). *O Brasil e a Liga das Nações (1919-1926)*. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.
- GARCIA, Eugênio Vargas (2006). *Entre América e Europa: a política externa brasileira na década de 1920*. Brasília, DF: Editora Universidade de Brasília, FUNAG.
- HURRELL, Andrew (2007). One World? Many Worlds? The place of regions in the study of international society. *International Affairs*. Vol. 83. N.1. pp.151-166.
- KOSELLECK, R. (2003). *Aceleración, prognosis y secularización*. Valencia: Pre-Textos.

- LESSA, Antônio Carlos (2005). *História das Relações Internacionais: A Pax Britannica e o mundo do século XIX*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- LESSA, Mônica Leite (2001). *A diplomacia cultural francesa e o centenário da independência do Brasil*. *Revista do SBPH*, N. 20, p. 55-64.
- LYNCH, Christian E. C. *Da monarquia à Oligarquia: a construção do Estado, as instituições e a representação política no Brasil (1822-1930)*. In: MAGALHÃES; Rejane M. de A.; PEREIRA, Soraia F. R. (Org.) (2012). *Campanha Civilista: correspondência e estudos*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa. pp. 117-247.
- MATTOS, Ilmar Rohloff de (2004). *O tempo saquarema*. São Paulo: Hucitec.
- _____. *Paulino José Soares de Souza (Visconde do Uruguay – 1807-1866): Ensaio sobre o direito administrativo*. In: PRADO, M. E. (org.) (2012). *Dicionário do pensamento brasileiro: obras políticas do Brasil Imperial*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan. pp. 213-221.
- MONIZ BANDEIRA, Luiz Alberto (2010). *Brasil, Argentina e Estados Unidos: conflito e integração na América do Sul (da Tríplice Aliança ao Mercosul)*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- MOURA, Cristina Patriota de (2000). *Herança e Metamorfose: a construção social de dois Rio Branco*. *Estudos Históricos*. Vol. 14. N. 25. pp. 81-101.
- NAPOLEÃO, Aluizio (1999). *Rio Branco e as relações entre o Brasil e os Estados Unidos*. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca do Exército.
- PARANHOS, José Maria da Silva (2008). *Cartas ao amigo ausente*. Rio de Janeiro: Academia Brasileira de Letras.
- PINHEIRO, Letícia (2004). *Política Externa Brasileira (1889-2002)*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- PRADO, Eduardo (1980). *A ilusão americana*. São Paulo: IBRASA.
- PREUSS, Ori (2011). *Bridging the island: Brazilians' views of Spanish America and themselves, 1865-1912*. Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- RICUPERO, Rubens. *José Maria da Silva Paranhos Júnior (Barão do Rio Branco): a fundação da política exterior da República*. In: PIMENTEL, José Vicente de Sá (Org.) (2013). *Pensamento diplomático brasileiro: formuladores e agentes da política externa (1750-1964)*. Volume II. Brasília, DF: FUNAG. pp. 405-440.
- SANTOS, Luís Cláudio Villafañe G. (2010). *O dia em que adiaram o carnaval: política externa e a construção do Brasil*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.
- SILVA, José Luiz Werneck da. I. *A inserção europeia e o equilíbrio platino*. In: SILVA, J. L. W. da; GONÇALVES, W. (orgs.) (2009). *Relações Exteriores do Brasil I (1808-1930): a política externa do sistema agroexportador*. Petrópolis: Vozes. pp. 31-98.
- SUPPO, Hugo R. *O papel da dimensão cultural nos principais paradigmas das Relações Internacionais*. LESSA, Mônica L.; SUPPO, H. R. (Org.) (2012). *A quarta dimensão das Relações Internacionais: a dimensão cultural*. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa. pp. 13-43.

TEIXEIRA SOARES, Álvaro (1975). *História da formação das fronteiras do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Conquista.

TORRES, Alberto (1913). *Le problème mondial*. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional.

_____ (1938). *Problema nacional brasileiro: introdução a um programa de Organização Nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Companhia Editora Nacional.

TORRES, Miguel Gustavo de Paiva (2011). *Visconde do Uruguai e sua atuação diplomática para a consolidação da política externa do Império*. Brasília, DF: FUNAG.

VIANNA, Luiz Werneck (2004). *A revolução passiva: iberismo e americanismo no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan.