

"LATINIZAR O MONROISMO": THE MONROE DOCTRINE BETWEEN "SPANISH-PORTUGUESE AMERICA" AND ENGLISH-SPEAKING AMERICA, 1890s–1910s

"Latinizar o monroísmo": la Doctrina Monroe entre la "América hispano-portuguesa" y la América anglófona, décadas de 1890 a 1910

DOI: 10.4067/S0718-090X2025000300103

VOLUMEN 45 / N° 3 / 2025 / 427-452

ISSN: 0718-090X

Revista de Ciencia Política
cienciapolitica.uc.cl



ORI PREUSS 

Tel Aviv University, Israel

ABSTRACT

This article revisits Latin American reactions to and reworkings of the Monroe Doctrine in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries through the lens of translation. It reconstructs neglected textual exchanges between Spanish-, Portuguese-, and English-speaking America, focusing on the Spanish translations of works by two Brazilians: intellectual Eduardo Prado and diplomat-historian Oliveira Lima. Much non-fiction circulated between Spanish and Portuguese without translation. Against this backdrop, the deliberate rendering of Brazilian texts into Spanish acquires particular significance, revealing Brazil's integration into anti-U.S. Latin Americanist trends often thought to exclude it. Thus, the Monroe Doctrine emerges not as a stable expression of U.S. dominance but as a contested and pluralized concept, shaped in part through a concerted effort by "Spanish-Portuguese America" to "latinizar o monroísmo." Theoretically, the article proposes a framework that bridges translation studies, language, and international relations, both in general and in peripheral areas in particular.

Keywords: Monroe Doctrine, translation, Latin Americanism, Brazil, anti-imperialism, inter-American relations, interlingual exchange

RESUMEN

Este artículo examina las reacciones latinoamericanas hacia la Doctrina Monroe y las reelaboraciones de la misma en los finales del siglo XIX y los principios del XX a través de la perspectiva de la traducción. Reconstruye intercambios textuales hasta ahora desatendidos entre las Américas de habla española, portuguesa e inglesa, con especial atención a las traducciones al español de obras de dos autores brasileños: el intelectual Eduardo Prado y el diplomático e historiador Oliveira Lima. Mientras que muchos textos de no ficción circulaban entre el español y el portugués sin mediación traductora, en este marco la traducción deliberada de textos brasileños al español adquiere una relevancia particular, al poner de relieve la integración de Brasil en corrientes latinoamericanistas de signo antiestadounidense de las que con frecuencia se lo ha considerado marginado. De este modo, la Doctrina Monroe se revela no como una expresión fija de la hegemonía estadounidense, sino como



un concepto disputado y pluralizado, configurado en parte por un esfuerzo concertado de la América hispano-portuguesa para “latinizar o monroismo.” Desde el plano teórico, el artículo propone un marco de análisis que articula los estudios de traducción, la reflexión sobre el lenguaje y las relaciones internacionales, tanto en términos generales como en lo relativo a los espacios periféricos en particular.

Palabras clave: Doctrina Monroe, traducción, latinoamericanismo, Brasil, antiimperialismo, relaciones interamericanas, intercambio interlingüístico

I. BRAZIL: MONROISTA OR NOT MONROISTA?

“I have been following with curiosity and interest the manifestations of your Monroism—or rather, your Rooseveltism [...] I did not think you capable of such North American Americanism. I cannot say that I applaud it without reservations, as my Monroism is less fervent, and my Rooseveltism much less so” (Gouvêa 1976: 690)¹. Thus wrote Brazil’s minister to Venezuela, on October 23, 1905, several months after his arrival in Caracas, to his friend Joaquim Nabuco, who had been recently appointed ambassador to Washington, DC. This was the opening shot of a deep personal and ideological feud between the two influential intellectuals and diplomats over Brazil’s hemispheric foreign policy and cultural orientation.

On December 19, 1905, Nabuco wrote worrisome words to Brazil’s powerful Foreign Minister (1902–1912) Baron of Rio Branco, with a view toward the approaching Third Pan-American Conference in Rio de Janeiro and visit of U.S. Secretary of State Elihu Root in 1906. “I do not believe that you are reading *The American Illusion*, the paradox of our dear Eduardo, who, were he alive today, would be the one best suited to write an apology against *The American Illusion*—and would certainly do so. In my opinion, never has a Brazilian borne as much responsibility for the destiny of our country as you now do, faced with the two paths that present themselves: the American one, and the other—which I do not know how to name, whether Latin American, independent, or solitary. As for me, I am frankly a Monroist, and it is a pity to be doing so much here, if I am working in vain, for nothing. I would not wish to deceive, but perhaps I am mistaken, or am being misled” (Nabuco 1949: 238).

The two letters concerning Western Hemisphere international relations, exchanged among Brazil’s three leading diplomats of the period—one stationed in the capital of Portuguese-speaking America, another in the capital of English-speaking America, and the third in one of the capitals of Spanish-speaking America—reveal some often-overlooked aspects of Latin America’s dealings with the Monroe Doctrine. Oliveira Lima’s lashing critique of Nabuco’s excessive North Americanism, and Nabuco’s evocation of *A ilusão americana*

¹ All translations are by the author unless otherwise indicated.

(Prado 1895)—a ferociously anti-Yankee book by São Paulo intellectual Eduardo Prado—followed by his tracing of two opposing foreign policy orientations, all suggest that Brazil had a complex history of engagement with the Monroe Doctrine. Moreover, the letters of these two diplomats and prolific thinkers also indicate that both “Monroist” and “anti-Monroist” positions, within and beyond Brazil, were intimately tied to the country’s interrelationships with Spanish America.

These details do not align with dominant depictions of Brazil as the most Monroist country in Latin America, to use the terminology of Lima and Nabuco. As E. Bradford Burns noted in his widely cited *The Unwritten Alliance: Rio Branco and Brazilian-American Relations*, Brazil consistently gave the Monroe Doctrine a cordial reception—an attitude that contrasted sharply with the generally unfavorable view held in Spanish America (Burns 1966: 146). Some more recent and extensive interpretations of Brazil’s inter-American relations reproduce this claim. In an influential historical overview, Leslie Bethell has similarly emphasized this contrast of attitudes, mobilizing it in support of his central argument that during a century after independence both Spanish American intellectuals and governments did not consider Brazil part of Latin America and vice versa (Bethell 2010: 464-74).

In recent years, international relations (IR) scholars and historians have offered alternative, less monolithic master narratives that capture the complexity of Brazil’s placement in Latin America—both in the strict realm of diplomacy and in the broader intersection of international relations, intellectual life, and ideas, a domain that was notably deep and expansive in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Latin America. Conceptualizations such as the “uneasy ‘well-placed’ state,” or “between the separation and integration paths,” to cite from the titles of two syntheses, have been formulated to convey a more nuanced understanding of the history of Brazilian–Spanish American relations (Briceño-Ruiz and Puntigliano 2017; Guimarães 2020).² However, these general interpretations touch on the Monroe Doctrine only in passing, relying on traditional diplomatic histories for evidence, which in turn dedicate little attention to the intellectual dimension (Smith 1991: 35–67).³ Still missing is what this article offers: a yet untold, connected history of the reception and recreation of the Monroe Doctrine—understood both as a principle of international relations and as a synecdoche for U.S. views and policies—in and in between Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking America. Put differently, following the methodological proposal of Carbó-Catalan and Roig-Sanz (2022: 4–7) to combine the interest of IR in state-actors and cultural organizations, with the focus of intellectual history and translation studies in non-state actors, this article reconstructs and analyzes a reciprocal process involving the transfer of ideas and

² For a direct detailed engagement with Bethell’s thesis, see Preuss and Rodrigues (2025). For an earlier complex interpretation by a senior Brazilian law scholar and ex-foreign minister, see Lafer (2000: 214–19).

³ Although cited by Bethell, Smith’s diplomatic history is much more nuanced, as will be discussed ahead. Even more nuanced is Ricupero (2013: 333–35).

foreign policies, historical knowledge and diplomacy, intellectuals and statesmen, across the two linguistic blocs, while also considering their interactions with the English-speaking bloc.

The chronological focus is on the period between the 1890s and the 1910s, when the United States emerged as a dominant and aggressive regional power, a trend dramatically manifested in the so-called Spanish-American War of 1898 and the occupation of Cuba and Puerto Rico. This was followed by the takeover of the Panama Canal Zone in 1903 and the announcement of the Roosevelt Corollary to the doctrine in 1904, leading to armed interventions in the Caribbean and Mexico in subsequent years; all in parallel with the promotion of North-South trade and cultural ties under the umbrella of Pan-Americanism. In Latin America this period saw increasing levels of state formation and economic growth, especially in southern South America as manifested in the *Ordem e progresso* positivist motto on the flag of the Brazilian first republic (1889–1930), and the slogan of *Paz y administración* coined by Argentine President Julio Roca (1880–1886, 1898–1904). Intensifying anxieties over European and especially North American imperialism, mixed with rising self-confidence and cooperation, gave rise in this part of the continent to “a zone of peace [...] an institutionalized balance of power” between Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, the so-called ABC powers, concretized in the diplomatic mediation of the three between the United States and Mexico in 1914 (Kacowicz 1998: 72–74). Alongside feelings of military weakness and racial inferiority, highlighted by scholars, emerged a sense of national and regional potency, which from a global perspective can be seen as the Latin American version of a general rise of pan-national movements and “new critical self-assertiveness” outside the West (Osterhammel 2014: 65).

In this new hemispheric setting, the Monroe Doctrine’s hegemonic and aggressive character attracted greater attention, generating various forms of Latin Americanist discourses, policies, and knowledges—beyond the well-studied idealist tradition associated with Cuban José Martí and Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó, and their celebrated essays *Nuestra América* (1891) and *Ariel* (1900), respectively. This article shifts attention instead to lesser-explored figures and their more pragmatic, international-relations-oriented projects. It thus contributes to an emerging body of scholarship that emphasizes the heterogeneity, creativity, and effectiveness of Latin American engagements with the Monroe Doctrine and U.S. foreign policy (Maíz and Fernández-Bravo 2009; Gobat 2013; Preuss 2016; Degiovanni 2018: 30–41; Scarfi 2020), enriching this small corpus empirically through the inclusion of Brazil, and theoretically by harnessing insights from translation studies for the analysis of international relations. By analyzing the forgotten Spanish translations of Prado’s and Lima’s texts, alongside other linguistic and diplomatic exchanges, the article reveals and highlights the central—both voluntary and involuntary—role of Brazilians in the public, triangular and trilingual discussions about the Monroe Doctrine since the 1890s, particularly through their production of pioneering diplomatic and cultural knowledge.

II. A NOTE ABOUT THE HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND TRANSLATION

Before moving on, a few words are in order about the largely unfulfilled potential of an interdisciplinary conversation between international relations and translation studies—particularly in the context of exchanges between Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking America. Despite the so-called historical and cultural turn in IR, and the self-evident fact that international relations are deeply interlingual, the field has remained largely aloof from translation studies. Conversely, translation studies have tended to neglect transnational linguistic exchanges within the Global South (Wigen 2015; Lima 2021). As a result, the history of translation between Brazil and Spanish America during the period of interest here has been largely overlooked, not only by IR but also by translation scholars.⁴ This scholarly neglect may be partly attributed to the relatively balanced power dynamics and linguistic proximity in which these exchanges unfolded. In the terminology of world literature theory, these were interactions between two neighboring peripheral literatures—what polysystem theory might call a “peripheral subsystem”—rather than asymmetrical exchanges between center and periphery (Even-Zohar 2010: 47; Roig-Sanz 2022). For Latin American *letrados* of the period, there was no obvious hierarchy of prestige between New World Spanish and Portuguese, or between their respective literatures—unlike the perceived hierarchy between these languages and French. This sense of relative equality in what Pascale Casanova (2004: 17–19, 32) calls “literariness,” combined with a shared sense of inferiority vis-à-vis the European center,⁵ may explain why the corpus of translations between Brazil and Spanish America from the 1890s to the 1910s consists mainly of non-fiction, with relatively few belletristic works.⁶

Yet this was far from negligible. The translation of non-fiction between Portuguese and Spanish, and the frequent blending of the two languages within the same texts—a practice I call “non-translation”—was widespread in the Brazilian and Argentine *press* and played a meaningful role in international relations between the two countries at the turn of the century (Preuss 2019). The translation of non-fiction *books*, however, was relatively rare, likely due to the high costs and professional efforts involved, on the one hand, and the grammatical and lexical proximity between the two languages, which facilitated mutual intelligibility and enabled the practice of linguistic intersection, on the other. It is precisely against this background of commonplace and meaningful cross-linguistic exchanges that did not require translation that the deliberate translation of Brazilian intellectuals’ works into Spanish acquires significance. What we

⁴ Two exceptions are Sorá (2003); Preuss (2019).

⁵ On the status of French in Latin America, see also Candido (1995: 127–30).

⁶ For a concise inventory concerning Spanish America, see Tenorio-Trillo (2020: 67–68). Concerning Argentina, see Sorá (2003), especially chapter 2.

observe, in other words, is the coexistence of non-translation and translation, a simultaneity that underscores the importance of the latter.

As translation studies' scholar Anthony Pym has observed, his discipline can assist the social sciences in identifying cultural frontiers by "defining the limits of a culture as the points where transferred texts have had to be translated. That is, if a text can adequately be transferred without translation, there is cultural continuity. And if a text has been translated, it represents distance between at least two cultures." At the same time, Pym recognizes that "between the two extremes—extensive monocultures revealed by non-translation; cultural frontiers revealed by translation—there are bicultural communities where it is difficult to decide if translation crosses a cultural frontier or not [...] In this case, translation not only crossed a frontier but also symbolized a bridging of the same frontier" (Pym 2010: 25-26, italics in the original). To this we may add IR specialist Einar Wigen's (2015: 437) observation that "language hierarchies" shape linguistic entanglements in the realm of international relations, and that the main European languages are relatively equal, with a high degree of conceptual compatibility. As we shall see, this offers a fitting conceptual framework for the case at hand, which Oliveria Lima described with the self-created term: "Spanish-Portuguese America" (Lima 1914a: 58, 112).

III. FROM AN "AMERICAN" TO A "YANKEE" ILLUSION

In 1918, the Madrid-based Editorial América—"the first-ever commercial publishing house entirely devoted to the promotion of a Latin Americanist discourse" (Degiovanni 2018: 31)—founded and directed by Venezuelan Rufino Blanco Fombona, published a Spanish translation of *A ilusão americana* (Prado 1918). This short book was a critical historical account of U.S.-Latin American relations by Brazilian monarchist intellectual Eduardo Prado. It first appeared in Brazil in 1893 in the context of the transformation from Monarchy to Republic in November 1889, which went hand in hand with a diplomatic and cultural reorientation from Europe to the United States.⁷

Remarkably, the translated version of the book's title went through a minor yet meaningful modification. In the preliminary note he authored, the translator, Mexican historian Carlos Pereyra, provided an ideological explanation for the change: "The author titled his book *The American Illusion*. We have translated it differently: *The Yankee Illusion*—not out of disrespect for the author, but because we seek, as much as possible, to challenge the appropriation of the words America and American by the United States [...]" (Prado 1918: 11). Clearly, the substitution of "American" with "Yankee" reinforces the otherness of the United States vis-à-vis Portuguese and Spanish America, thereby stressing the

⁷ The first edition was confiscated by order of the Brazilian government. We use here the second edition, (Prado 1895), which circulated in Brazil.

latter's communality, as can be gleaned from Pereyra's further discussion of nomenclature. He rules out the adjective "Latin," only to replace it with "Ibero," with a clear purpose: "What are we? Without saying what we are, we can very provisionally call ourselves Latin Americans in times of need, and so the translation does. If we exclude Brazil, there's no difficulty: we are Hispanic Americans. And with Brazil, Ibero-Americans" (Prado 1918: 11). Here is a proclamation of translation tactics—replacing "Latin" with "Ibero"—harnessed to a translation strategy: namely, reinforcing Brazilian and Spanish American togetherness.

What may account for this move? Prado passed away in 1901, seventeen years before the publication of his book in Spanish. This rules out the role of social connections, which often contributed to the translation of non-fiction works of this kind. The answer lies elsewhere; it lies in the work's contents and its earlier reception. *A ilusão americana* was a pioneering anti-U.S. diatribe both at the national Brazilian level and at the continental Latin American level, in combining criticism of U.S. foreign policy and cultural influence. Prado, a prominent spokesman of the monarchist camp, focused his attack on the First Republic's North American orientation. Significantly though, he framed the discussion continentally rather than bilaterally, condemning the political, economic, and moral influence of an egotistical, expansionist United States, not only over Brazil, but over Spanish America as well. And although the treatise started with a strong refutation of the idea of affinity both between Brazil and the "Anglo-Saxon republic," and between Brazil and the "Iberian countries of America" (Prado 1895: 7–11), Prado used repeatedly the term *América Latina* to designate a group of nations which had been historically, culturally, and racially different from Anglo-Saxon America, and victims of its foreign policy.

IV. "THERE IT IS, THE FAMOUS DOCTRINE!"

The Monroe Doctrine occupied a central place throughout the text. Right in the first pages Prado cited a passage from President Monroe's famous 1823 message, arguing for a common misinterpretation of it by Latin Americans: "There it is, the famous doctrine! The never-sufficiently duped and mocked South American naïveté saw in this declaration a formal, solemn, and definitive commitment to an alliance with the United States—an alliance as sensible, indeed, as that of the pot of hay with the pot of clay" (Prado 1895: 21). In other instances, he would evoke historical facts that refuted the commitment of the United States to protect Latin America from European aggression, such as the British takeover of the Malvinas, or hostile and degrading rhetoric of U.S. leaders towards Latin America that betrayed the imperialistic face of the Doctrine.

Prado mixed up international relations and culture throughout the book. For instance, he lumped together an anti-imperialist statement by Mexican poet Ignacio Manuel Altamirano—"The disloyal and corrupting foreigner has shack-

led him, and still considers himself his benefactor, claiming that the chains with which he subjugates him are made of gold!" (Prado 1895: 61)—with a public address by former Secretary of State William Maxwell Evarts at a banquet in New York, which brought together American dignitaries and notable Mexicans. The Brazilian intellectual quoted both figures in Portuguese translation, turning his essay into a meeting place between America's three linguistic blocks, of which one was the aggressor, and the other two its victims. The citation from Evans speech, probably based on a news item, clarified that: "The Monroe Doctrine is [...] summed up in this phrase: America for the Americans. I would gladly propose an addendum: For the Americans of the North (applause). Let's start with our dear neighbor, Mexico, of which we already had a mouthful in 1848. Let's take it (hilarity). Central America will come next, whetting our appetite for when it's South America's turn" (Prado 1895: 61–63).

Prado contrasted not only the ideological positions of the Mexican poet and the U.S. statesman, but also what he described as the illustrious voice of Altamirano versus the vulgarity of Evarts. In another instance, he argued that by installing the Republic, Brazil repeated the error that Spanish America had committed after independence; the error of "implementing in Latin America the institutions of a strange race" (Prado 1895: 57). Moreover, he maintained that the United States was inferior to Brazil, since its spirit was violent, whereas "the Latin spirit, transmitted to Brazilians through the centuries and the diverse amalgams of Iberianism, is a legal spirit that [...] always maintains a certain respect for human life and freedom" (Prado 1895: 214). Prado's essay featured a very early version of what Quijada Mauriño (1997) has designated "the inversion of dichotomies", that is, the interpretation of Latin America as morally superior to Anglo-Saxon America instead of biologically inferior, a formula which would become central in post-1898 anti-imperialist discourses of Spanish American intellectuals.

V. THE ILLUSION'S AFTERLIFE

Republished in 1895 in Paris, and in 1902 and 1917 in São Paulo, *A ilusão americana* had a lasting presence in public discussions about Brazil's hemispheric international relations and national identity. It acquired the status of a foundational text and an essential reference point for both supporters and opponents of U.S.-Brazilian rapprochement. For instance, top jurist Rui Barbosa, author of the 1891 republican constitution who had become a fierce critic of the regime, evoked Prado's treatise in his own attack on the new republic's tightening relationships with the United States: "There are nativists among us who project statues of Monroe and believe they are carrying out a republican act, calling for the United States to protect Brazil. If these enthusiasts wish to reflect, I recommend to them the precious pamphlet with which Mr. Eduardo Prado has just enriched Brazilian literature: *The American Illusion*" (Barbosa 1896: 39–41).

Significantly, Barbosa also referenced in his article one of the very first anti-U.S. tracts to emerge from Spanish America during this new phase of hemispheric

politics: *Los Estados Unidos y la América del Sur: los yankees pintados por sí mismos* (1893), by Vicente Quesada, Argentina's former minister to both Brazil and the United States, and a forerunner of Latin American international law.⁸ Barbosa mentioned having read the book while in exile in Buenos Aires, quoting in Spanish Quesada's warning against U.S. intentions to occupy entire South America. If Prado's book constituted a Latin American intertextual space where the history of inter-American relations met culture, Barbosa's essay expanded and enriched that space.

The relevance of *A ilusão americana* increased after the Spanish-American War, which influenced Brazilian diplomatic and intellectual circles in ways similar to its impact on Spanish America—though this is rarely acknowledged by historians. "Unfortunately, I am among those who are convinced that our national decline has begun; that we have entered the American orbit, like Cuba or the Philippines, Mexico or Nicaragua; that our development will proceed in the same direction as that of the other satellites of Washington" (Nabuco 1899: 5), confided Joaquim Nabuco to a friend in early 1899, shortly before joining Brazil's diplomatic service. That same year, Rui Barbosa—then a senator and newspaper editor—engaged with the issue in a series of articles, citing, among other sources, *El continente enfermo* (1899) by Venezuelan intellectual César Zumeta. Borrowing the pamphlet's diagnostic title for one of his own pieces, Barbosa echoed its alarm about Latin America's unpreparedness in the face of U.S. aggression (Barbosa 1899a; 1899b; 1899c; 1899d; 1899e; 1899f; 1899g; 1899h; 1899i). In two other articles titled "Vã confiança – A Doutrina de Monroe: Sua origem" (1899h) and "Vã confiança – A ilusão americana" (1899i), Rui Barbosa argued that the doctrine had always reflected selfish calculations, with the recent occupation of Cuba being no exception to this historical pattern. He reinforced his position with both translated and untranslated excerpts from the writings of Colombian José María Samper and Argentines Juan Bautista Alberdi and Bartolomé Mitre, encouraging Brazilians still clinging to the American illusion to finally grasp what their Spanish-speaking neighbors had long understood (1899h: 161; Barbosa 1899i: 152). By aligning Prado's ideas with those of key Spanish American publicists, Barbosa significantly propelled the formation of an integrative Luso-Hispanic American anti-Monroist discourse.

In October 1913, Rio de Janeiro's *O Paíz* published on its front page an article in English entitled "Brazil and the United States," by Dunshee de Abranches, a recently deceased member of congress and close ally of the Baron of Rio Branco. It was an extraordinary homage by the Portuguese-language newspaper in honor of former U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, who had just begun his celebrated visit to Brazil. The article opened with an evocation and refutation of *A ilusão americana*. "The famous book [...] created a deep impression throughout the country." Its author had not only fought the system of government adapted from the United States, but had also proposed that "in the great Repu-

⁸ About the importance of Quesada and his book, see Scarfi (2014: 91).

blic of the North, the evils and perils for other nations on the continent resided fully as much in the institutions themselves as in the men who directed them; he had endeavored thus to incite the patriotic sentiments of the Brazilians, by proclaiming that American imperialism was far more pernicious and voracious than European imperialism" (Abranches 1913: 1). Reprinted two years later as an introduction to Dunshee de Abranches' pro-U.S. dissertation *Brazil and the Monroe Doctrine* submitted to the Second Pan American Scientific Congress in Washington, DC, this article demonstrates the resilience of Prado's book through intertextual references, citations, and fragmentary translation in the three main languages of the Western Hemisphere (Abranches 1915).

This multilingual presence of *A ilusão americana* can also be gleaned from *Problems in Pan Americanism*, published in 1921 by U.S. educator Samuel Guy Inman, a cultural entrepreneur who promoted U.S.-Latin American solidarity. In a Chapter entitled "Pan Americanism vs. Pan Latinism," Inman mentioned Eduardo Prado in the same breath as the writers of what he called "the Pan Latinist school," whom he divided into "the ultra-radical Yankee haters like Manuel Ugarte, Rufino Blanco Fombona, Vargas Vila and Carlos Pereyra, and the more measured critics like García Calderón, José Enrique Rodó, Federico García Godoy, José Martí and Eugenio de Hostos." Inman cited at length from *A ilusão americana* in English, describing it as a book "which has continued until to-day to be a classic in Latin America [...] expressing the opinion that the rest of America should unite against the United States in order to protect themselves from the North American nation" (Inman 1925: 336–338).⁹

This background is essential for understanding why, in his prologue, Pereyra described Spanish American unawareness of Prado's book as "strange" and "embarrassing," noting that it had passed all tests, including the most decisive one: the test of time. "Let us not hesitate to venture," he envisioned, "that very soon this victorious pamphlet, after circulating through all Spanish-speaking countries, will be translated into German, English, and French" (Prado 1918: 7). That prediction did not come to pass. Yet it clarifies that, for the Mexican translator, the book remained timely, not as a manifesto of Brazilian isolationism, as Bethell and other modern historians have described it (Bethell 2010: 470), but as a declaration of Latin American unity in the face of a common threat.

⁹ Inman was described on his book's cover page as "Instructor in international relations in Columbia University, secretary of the Committee of Cooperation in Latin America, author of *Intervention in Mexico, Through Santo Domingo and Haiti, etc.*"

VI. OLIVEIRA LIMA AND "THE ULTRA-RADICAL YANKEE HATERS"

Equally important for understanding the incorporation of Brazilian literature into the corpus of anti-Yankee writing in Spanish is Pereyra's background. He settled in Madrid in 1916 after a short diplomatic career. There, he became a close collaborator of Blanco Fombona and published extensively on U.S. imperialism toward Latin America. Books such as *El mito de Monroe* (1916), *El crimen de Woodrow Wilson* (1917a), *Tejas. La primera desmembración de Méjico* (1917b), were not only critical of U.S. foreign policy but also depreciative of U.S. culture, owing to Pereyra's aristocratic inclinations (Kozel 2015: 64). It is for a reason that Inman included the Mexican scholar among "the ultra-radical Yankee haters," and that University of Chicago Latin American history professor J. Fred Rippey discussed his works as a central figure of "Literary Yankeeophobia in Hispanic America" (Rippy 1922: 524-52). In recent time, Scarfi has identified Pereyra as a main figure in a movement of "Latin American legal anti-imperialism," whose members aimed to "denaturalize the Monroe Doctrine," moving beyond the *legal habitus* to the intellectual and political realms, especially after the Mexican Revolution (Scarfi 2020: 546-49).

In the same year it published *La ilusión yanqui* (Prado 1918), Editorial América released another work by a Brazilian author, also translated and prefaced by Pereyra: *Formación histórica de la nacionalidad brasileña* by Oliveira Lima (1918a).¹⁰ In a lengthy introduction, the Mexican described the translation as part of Blanco Fombona's broader plan—already partially realized—"to systematize the promotion of rapprochement and mutual understanding." With the publication of this book in Spanish, he noted, Brazil would, for the first time in history, cease to be an unknown land to many in the Hispanic world (Lima 1918: 13). Blanco Fombona's editorial project has received some scholarly attention, though rarely within a broad spatial and historical context. The most relevant interpretation for our purposes has been recently provided by Fernando Degiovanni in a monograph that weaves together literary history, economic history, and the history of international relations. Since its foundation in 1915, Editorial América aimed at promoting Latin American unity and independence through a shared cultural and anti-imperialist vision. A commercial-ideological project, it mobilized the Spanish-language book market to foster a retrospective Latin American identity, counter U.S. influence, and revive Bolivarian ideals. To this purpose, Blanco Fombona curated and sometimes altered texts, often prioritizing ideological coherence over philological rigor. Seizing the World War I disruption of European publishing, the press published nearly five hundred titles between 1917 and 1922, organized in series on literature, politics, and history (Degiovanni 2018: 31).

¹⁰ Originally published in French (Lima 1911). Since a Portuguese edition appeared only later, it is quite safe to assume that Pereyra translated from French.

The incorporation of Oliveira Lima into this enterprise can be attributed, as in the case of Prado, to his public positions on hemispheric international relations—but not only. As we shall see, it also stemmed from his prestige as an independent-minded, high-ranking diplomat and prolific publicist; his international reputation as Brazil's foremost historian during the first two decades of the twentieth century; and his personal ties with Spanish American diplomats and intellectuals.

VII. OLIVEIRA LIMA IN THE UNITED STATES

In 1899, during his fourth year of service as first secretary of the Brazilian legation in Washington, DC, Lima published *Nos Estados Unidos: impressões políticas e sociaes* (1899), a mixture of travel impressions and socio-historical analysis. The book was a collection of articles previously published in Rio de Janeiro's prestigious *Revista Brasileira* and most respected newspaper *Jornal do Comércio*, many of them dedicated to assessing the consequences of the 1898 Cuban-Spanish-American War. Like his compatriots Nabuco, Rui Barbosa, and numerous Spanish American intellectuals, Oliveira Lima also saw in the occupation of Cuba and the Philippines the beginning of a higher stage of U.S. expansionism. Notwithstanding, he ruled out the possibility that it endangered Latin America. He also assigned a positive role to the Monroe Doctrine with the important condition that responsibility for its implementation would be shared among all the countries of the continent, respecting their sovereignty (Lima 1899: 435–58).

Although not alarmist about U.S. imperialism, *Nos Estados Unidos* can be defined as a Latin Americanist text, for constructing and being constructed on the paradigm of two different Americas. Conceptually, it treated Brazil-U.S. relations in a broader hemispheric context of “the Latin American nations,” or “the Latin nations of the continent,” or “Latin America,” versus “the Anglo-Saxon Republic,” which formed part of a more general ethno-racial, cultural, and historical divide between Latins and Anglo-Saxons. On various occasions, he noted, American governments had attempted to establish continental solidarity but failed, “either due to fears of subordination among the smaller and weaker nations, or because of hatreds between Latins and Anglo-Saxons” (Lima 1899: 381). The book's Latin Americanism was not only ideational but also intertextual, featuring references to Spanish American writers, among them Argentine intellectual Paul Groussac, a key voice in the construction of the United States as the *Calibanistic* Other of Latin America. Citing from Groussac's travel book *Del Plata al Niágara* (Buenos Aires, 1897), Lima endorsed the latter's diagnosis of U.S. civilization as a “mammoth, not only in terms of enormity, but also in terms of deformity, or rather abnormality” (Lima 1899: 404).¹¹

¹¹ Lima had already reviewed Groussac's book at length earlier (Lima 1898). Another Spanish American text referenced in Lima (1899: 454) was *El continente enfermo* by Zumeta (1899).

Nos Estados Unidos presented the notion of two distinct Americas, inhabited by different races—one deemed superior in terms of material progress and military power, though not necessarily in cultural production or moral values. This vision would go on to shape Oliveira Lima's later writings on continental affairs, gradually evolving into a broader political and cultural project. In 1903, he published a detailed article in *Diário de Pernambuco* on the Drago Doctrine—the Argentine response to the forcible coercion of Venezuela by England, Germany, and Italy in 1902, named after Foreign Minister Luis María Drago. In a note to the U.S. government, Drago argued that no public debt should be collected from a sovereign American state by means of armed force or territorial occupation. In fact, the Drago Doctrine functioned as a corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, but one that sought to reframe it as a Pan-American principle of intra-continental diplomacy, grounded in the idea of absolute non-intervention in the Americas (Scarfi 2016). Oliveira Lima stated that Argentine foreign policy had surpassed Brazil's in foresight and assertiveness. He credited Drago's principal achievement as having "Latinized the Monroe Doctrine" by removing its North American exclusivity and unpalatable protectionist tone. In doing so, Drago secured the backing not only of the leading Spanish-speaking nation but of all Latin America, "thus demonstrating that the great Republic [of the United States] is not the sole arbiter on this side of the Atlantic" (Lima 1907: 21).

This forceful endorsement of Drago's principle should be contemplated in light of Scarfi's claim that Latin American jurists managed to reshape the Monroe Doctrine into a "Pan-American principle of cooperation," thereby transforming it into a multilateral hemispheric norm within international law (Scarfi 2023: 741). While Oliveira Lima's interpretation of the North American doctrine has been thoroughly documented in Brazilian diplomatic historiography, the extent of his integration—both voluntary and involuntary—into the broader trend diagnosed by Scarfi, mainly associated with Spanish American figures, remains understudied and underappreciated in modern scholarship, although well-recognized by his contemporaries as we shall show ahead.

Before proceeding, it is important to highlight certain internal concerns, alongside the external ones, which underpinned Oliveira Lima's affirmation of Latin American unity under Argentine leadership. His writings from the period reveal deep anxieties about what he perceived as the region's racial inferiority and chronic political instability. Yet Argentina, where the white elite had effectively erased the presence of Black and Indigenous populations, and Chile, where the landed aristocracy had avoided racial mixing, appeared to him as exceptions to this ill fate, offering a path forward toward a vigorous and "civilized" Latin America (Lima 1953: 53–62; 105–106; 120–121)—a continental view that would gain complementary dimensions during his service as Brazil's minister in Caracas.

VIII. THE VENEZUELAN LESSONS OF OLIVIERA LIMA

Oliveira Lima's experience during 1905–1906 in a city and country that had not kept pace with the modernization of Latin America's neo-European areas, and whose dictator Cipriano Castro (1899–1908) was “one of the ‘little dark men’ who thumbed his nose at the United States” (Ewell 1996: 98), was marked by ambivalence. Caracas was, in his words, a “pestilent hell” from which he longed to escape, and Venezuelan politics and history appeared to him as the epitome of Spanish American *caudillismo* and backwardness (Cardozo 1953: 41). Still, Venezuela, in confronting North American and European imperialist encroachments, revealed to him a more complex lesson. “You, Sir, were right,” he confided to Joaquim Nabuco in the same letter cited at the beginning of this article, “when you once wrote to me that I should go to South America to become fully acquainted with the *mappa mundi* of our diplomacy [...] In Japan and in China I had the chance to learn how vulgar Europeans can be, and in Venezuela I now see how Europeans and Americans can also be thieves and speculators. I do not turn a blind eye to the flaws—even the crimes—of this country and its people. But the other side is by no means morally superior or more edifying” (Gouvêa 1976: 690).

While serving in Caracas, Lima wrote regularly to *O Estado de São Paulo*, a practice that exemplifies the modernization, commercialization, and expansion of Latin America's periodical press and the growing interconnections across national boundaries within it; a trend which went hand in hand with a tightening intersection between journalism, diplomacy, and international coverage.¹² Reflecting on his Venezuelan experience in one of his dispatches to the Brazilian newspaper, Lima described it as the most valuable chapter in his diplomatic education—more formative, he claimed, than his postings in Germany, the United States, England, or Japan. Each of these assignments had offered important lessons, yet only Venezuela, he wrote, had taught him “how the strong will-power of a single leader [i.e. Cipriano Castro], even if capricious, can overcome the most adverse circumstances” (Lima 1905: 138). This testimony is significant: it shows that, despite his often racist outlook, the Brazilian diplomat was capable of recognizing political virtue and strength in the non-white sectors of Latin America.

Equally important was the rich social and intellectual life Lima cultivated in the Venezuelan capital, where he regularly attended meetings of the National Academy of History and forged lasting ties with local statesmen and writers. As Nathalia Henrich has shown, Lima developed close relationships with prominent intellectuals such as Ángel César Rivas, Carlos A. Villanueva, and Blanco Fombona. The latter—alongside figures like César Zumeta, Adolfo Ernst, Lisandro Alvarado, and José Gil Fortoul—played a central role in promoting Hispanic-American unity and anti-imperialism, chiefly through their contributions to *El Cojo Ilustrado* (1892–1915), a pioneering Venezuelan magazine with positivist

¹² About these interrelated processes, see Rama (1983); Rodrigues (2017).

and modernist leanings. In short, the Venezuelan experience exposed Lima to the most radical wing of the Spanish American anti-Yankee movement (Henrich 2016: 173–93).

IX. BRAZILIAN PAN-AMERICANISM (MONROE-BOLÍVAR-ROOSEVELT)

Taken together, the Washington, DC, and Caracas diplomatic chapters, joined by a third one in Brussels (1907–1910), assisted Oliveira Lima in gaining world reputation as an expert on inter-American relations and on Spanish American history, alongside his authority on Brazilian history. His major contribution to the first field was *Pan-americanismo (Monroe-Bolívar-Roosevelt)*, a collection of newspaper articles—beginning with the one on the Drago Doctrine from 1903—published in book form in 1907. Early that year, Lima initiated a private correspondence with the Argentine statesman, first sending him some of his articles. In his response, in Spanish, Drago acknowledged Lima’s “reputation as a distinguished jurist and skilled writer,” and his interest in the articles about the Monroe Doctrine and “the doctrine you designate with my name” (Drago 1907)—a remark that suggests Lima may have been among the first to identify and frame it as such. In a subsequent letter, written in gratitude for receiving the published volume, Drago praised the work for demonstrating “perceptive and brilliant understanding of the most vital problems of our South America, formulating lessons and indicating solutions” (Drago 1908).

In the English-speaking part of the continent, Yale professor Hiram Bingham, a prominent critic of the Monroe Doctrine inside the United States, highlighted the book’s significance in a lecture about the Latin American attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine: “Dr. Oliveira Lima, who is favorably known in the United States as an eminent Brazilian historian, in his book on Pan Americanism, writes: ‘The Monroe Doctrine was invariably in its earlier stages a selfish policy,’ and while admitting that it was a useful instrument to the whole continent, so long as it did not undergo alterations, implies that it ceases to be useful when it becomes ‘an arm of guardianship,’ as so many American statesmen and editors seem to regard it at the present time” (Bingham 1914: 190). A decade later, Chilean jurist Alejandro Álvarez, a major voice for the Pan-Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine, included a substantial extract from Lima’s *Pan-americanismo* in a collected volume he edited in English in the context of the centenary of the Monroe Doctrine in the United States (Álvarez 1924: 281–85).

Indeed, *Pan-americanismo* was not merely an academic treatise. The ideas it advanced were in line with Rio Branco’s broad diplomatic vision of fostering a high-profile yet cautious rapprochement between Brazil and the United States—one aimed at securing Brazil’s leadership in South America without alienating the Spanish-speaking nations, and even fostering collaboration with them at times, particularly with Chile and Argentina. In the preface, Oliveira Lima des-

cribed the unifying theme of the essays as “the conviction that the Monroe Doctrine cannot, without danger, sustain the development recently imposed upon it [...], and the belief that the Drago Doctrine offers much that is both practical and elevated for the conduct of statesmen in the New World.” More specifically, the volume included “the cautions expressed in *Estado de S. Paulo* prior to the [Pan-American] Congress in Rio de Janeiro, along with an analysis of its outcomes [...] at a historical moment when the United States seeks to further expand its sphere of preponderance—already so considerable that it has disrupted the balance of the continent” (Lima 1907: 7–8). This statement aligns with other evidence presented here, as well as with historiographical interpretations that attenuate descriptions of the 1906 Conference—including the symbolic act of naming the building that hosted it *Monroe Palace*—as an expression of Brazil’s supposedly exceptional and unflinching adherence to U.S.-led Pan-Americanism (Burns 1966, 37–38, 52, 108–14; Smith 1991; Alonso 2013, 383–84).

In an interview with Uruguayan journalist Manuel Bernárdez, intended for a Spanish-speaking audience, Rio Branco spoke of “a South American doctrine, and not for merely Platonic purposes. The objective is to safeguard common possessions—territory, sovereignty, and dignity—against any emergency” (Bernárdez 1908: 165). The Brazilian foreign office promoted this vision through both the Brazilian and Spanish American press, which were eager to report on and debate international affairs during that era of intense nationalism and imperialism, reaching publics well beyond diplomatic and intellectual circles. For example, in 1911, when the United States deployed large military forces to its southern border amid the Mexican Revolution, Rio’s popular illustrated magazine *O Malho* published a cartoon titled “Let’s Look to Mexico!” depicting Rio Branco in conversation with an anonymous Brazilian who asks the foreign minister for his opinion on the development. The dialogue unfolds as follows:

- Ah... That’s another attempt at—
- At imperialism?
- You said it...
- And where does that leave the Monroe Doctrine then?
- It stays right where it is, as Eduardo Prado taught us: *America for the Americans... of the North.*

(*O Malho* 1911a)

O MALHO

VULTOS POLICIAES



Dr. Hugo Braga

Publicamos com muito prazer o retrato do Dr. Hugo Braga, Delegado Auxiliar, que tanto se tem distinguido pelo seu critério e actividade, e mormente na perseguição que tem movido ás cartomantes e outros que, áz exploradores da boa fé e justiça humanas...



Clovis Antonio de Souza (Macio) — Incarrapachamos-lhe o nome por extenso, exactamente para estranhar que um homem de nome tão bonito se atreva a pensar que nós somos convalhadores da vida alheia publicando desenhos de namorados que se beijam na rua (!) e pontalões por baixo os nomes...

E' preciso ter muita adapçada ou muita ingenuidade — o que, aliás, não admira, pois parece tratar-se não de um moralista das doutrinas, mas de um rival que levou de taboa e pretende vingar-se... calunniando.

FITA AMERICANA

Os Estados Unidos concentraram 20.000 homens do exercito na fronteira com o Mexico, promptos a intervirem na primeira oportunidade. — (Das Jornales)



America do Sul: — Bravo! a America já está pondo em execução a tal doutrina de Monroe, lá com o norte do meu continente, mas, quanto a mim, será mais difficil... se eu conseguir realizar o sonho do Barão, isto é, a alliança do A. B. C. Todavia, poshamos as barbas do molho!...

GOTTAS VIRTUOSAS DE ERNESTO DE SOUZA—Curam: hamorrhoides, males da uretra, ovarios, cistites e as proprias Cystites. —

Another cartoon exemplifying Brazilian opposition to the Monroe Doctrine both in public opinion and in foreign policy under Rio Branco. The upper caption reads: "American mess: The United States have concentrated 20,000 soldiers on the frontier with Mexico, ready to intervene at the first opportunity. — (From the newspapers)." The lower caption reads: "South America: Bravo! America is already putting into practice that so-called Monroe Doctrine, up there in the north of my continent. But with me, things will be more difficult... if I succeed in fulfilling the Baron's dream—that is, the A.B.C. alliance. Still, let us be on our guard!" (O Malho 1911b).

Brazilian cultural diplomacy, initiated under Rio Branco and continuing after his tenure, targeted both broad public opinion and Latin American intellectual circles. A main vehicle for these efforts was *Revista Americana*, launched by the Foreign Ministry in 1909, with the declared mission to promote "the circulation of sentiments and ideas between the peoples of America," and thus advance "political rapprochement and intellectual harmony between the American nations" (*Revista Americana* 1909, 5–8). In terms of authors, themes, and language, it was a Latin American publication, featuring contributions by prominent Brazilians and Spanish Americans in either Portuguese or Spanish, who expressed a range of views—both supportive and critical—on the Monroe Doctrine and U.S. foreign policy. Among the Spanish American contributors were some of the most notable men of letters of the period, including Nicaraguan Rubén Darío; Peruvians José Santos Chocano, and the brothers Francisco and Ventura García Calderón; Uruguayans Julio Herrera y Reissig, María Eugenia Vaz Fe-

reira, and José Enrique Rodó; Argentines Ernesto Quesada and José Ingenieros; and, most interestingly from our point of view, Carlos Pereyra, and Rufino Blanco Fombona. Representing varying degrees of anti-North American sentiment, their inclusion in this Brazilian-led print project reveals the creation of another intertextual contact zone between Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking America—one that wove together international relations, historical reflection, and cultural content on a much broader scale than the individual texts or the catalogue of Editorial América discussed so far (Fernández-Bravo 2004; Carvalho 2004; Vale Castro 2013). Interestingly, Oliveira Lima would soon become a bridge between Blanco Fombona's publishing house, *Revista Americana*, and U.S. academia.

X. FROM THE EVOLUTION OF BRAZIL TO THE EVOLUTION OF LATIN AMERICA

In 1913, *Revista Americana* published, in Portuguese, one of a series of lectures that Oliveira Lima had delivered the previous year at twelve leading U.S. universities. The title of the published lecture—"America latina e America inglesa, ou a evolução brasileira comparada com a hispano-americana e com a anglo-americana" (1913b)—was identical to the title of the volume containing all six lectures, *The Evolution of Brazil Compared With That of Spanish and Anglo-Saxon America* (1914a), published by Stanford University Press, except for the initial part. In other words, while the English title conveyed the notion of three Americas, the main title of the Brazilian publication emphasized the idea of two. Around the same time, *La Revista de América*, founded in Paris by the Peruvian historian Francisco García Calderón, also published one of the six lectures in Portuguese, accompanied by a preface that developed the notion of two Americas even further, depicting Lima as a heroic voice for the Latin one: "The illustrious Brazilian diplomat and historian, Mr. Oliveira Lima, triumphantly toured the United States, from the Pacific to the Atlantic [...] delivering admirable lectures on the past and future of our America in thirteen great centers of culture—an intellectual ambassador before whom the politicians of imperialism bowed" (Lima 1913a: 181–190).¹³

The year afterwards the entire book appeared in Editorial América, as announced beforehand in a footnote to the *Revista Americana* chapter. The translator into Spanish was Ángel César Rivas, one of the Venezuelan intellectuals Lima had befriended in Caracas. In a clear act of ideological manipulation, the United States disappeared completely from the title—*La evolución histórica de la América latina: bosquejo comparativo* (1916?)—whereas "Brazil" and "Spanish America" were subsumed under the name "Latin America."¹⁴ The exposure of Lima's

¹³ About Lima's relationship with García Calderón and his journal, see Henrich (2016: 226–27).

¹⁴ According to the Portuguese edition, entitled *América latina e América inglesa: a evolução brasileira comparada com a hispano-americana e com a anglo-americana* (Lima 1914b), Lima repeated the Stanford lectures in Portu-

U.S. lectures in two of the most important publishing venues of Latin American thought at that time, under the leadership of key Spanish American critics of the Monroe Doctrine, marked a new phase in the intellectual integration between Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking America. It was not only from the point of view of *La Revista de América* that Latin-American historiography travelled "triumphantly" through U.S. universities, but in North American academic eyes as well. In the words of Professor Percy Alvin Martin of Stanford: "a tireless investigator and productive scholar, Oliveira Lima has done much to raise the study of South American history to a dignity and importance it had never previously enjoyed" (Lima 1914a: 9).

Indeed, Lima's lectures were a foundational work, part of a wave of writings that emerged across Latin America around the turn of the century, described by one of its key voices, Francisco García Calderón, as "the Americanist current [...] a new school that analyzes collective problems. It doesn't propose remedies or formulates them vaguely: it criticizes, dissects, and discusses with a noble American passion" (García Calderón 1979 [1913]: 253–61). The Peruvian historian, who knew Oliveira Lima personally, mentioned him alongside Blanco Fombona, Rodó, Francisco Bulnes, and Manuel Ugarte. While the latter three discussed Brazil as part of Latin America, Oliveira Lima went further: he made the differences and similarities between Brazil and Spanish America—and, to a lesser extent, between Brazil and the United States—a central theme of his work. In doing so, he offered a groundbreaking interpretation, arguably the first rigorous comparative history of its kind.

To achieve that, the Brazilian scholar drew on Spanish American writers, from independence-era Simón Bolívar, Andrés Bello, Mariano Moreno, José Joaquín de Olmedo, and Lucas Alamán, to his contemporaries Rufino José Cuervo, César Zumeta, Ángel César Rivas, Rufino Blanco Fombona, and Francisco García Calderón. The references to the two latter Venezuelans, whom he had known in Caracas, and to the Peruvian, with whom he had begun corresponding in 1911, likely facilitated the publication of his work and attest to the formation of a Luso-Hispanic American epistemological community. It is not surprising, therefore, that Lima described the main purpose of his lectures as "to give an idea [...] of the mind of Latin-American society" (Lima 1914a: 90).¹⁵ And they were indeed received as such by both Spanish American and U.S. learned circles: as a history of Latin America as a whole, paving the way for broader and deeper integration into the trilingual discussions about the Monroe Doctrine and Pan-Americanism.

guese in the Escola de Altos Estudos do Rio de Janeiro in September and October 1913. I could not verify whether Rivas translated from English or Portuguese.

¹⁵ For example: "The best books on the history of the republics as a whole since the attainment of independence, and written from an Hispanic American viewpoint, are F. García Calderón, *Latin America, its Rise and Progress* (New York, 1913), and M. de Oliveira Lima, *The Evolution of Brazil Compared with that of Spanish and Anglo-Saxon America* (Stanford University, 1914)" (Shepherd 1919: 240).

XI. IN ARGENTINA: THE OLIVEIRA LIMA ZEBALLOS CONNECTION

During the 1910s, Lima developed a close intellectual relationship with the Argentine Estanislao Zeballos, an internationally renowned juriconsult, geographer, ethnographer, legislator, and journalist. As foreign minister between 1906 and 1908, Zeballos had pursued an aggressive policy toward Brazil and became known as the personal archrival of Rio Branco. Lima's contact with him could thus signal a friendlier chapter in the history of international relations between the two regional powers, especially given the Brazilian historian's high-profile integration into Argentina's intellectual scene. Lima published articles in *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, founded and edited by Zeballos; he visited the country in 1918; and three years later became a foreign correspondent for *La Prensa*, Buenos Aires's most important newspaper. The 1918 visit lasted seven months and included public events and meetings with local intellectuals and political figures, all documented in *Na Argentina: Impressões 1918–19*, a blend of travel narrative, socio-political analysis, and portraits of Argentine public figures, published in both Portuguese and Spanish in 1920 (Lima 1920a, 1920b).

The Portuguese version included five lectures delivered in Buenos Aires, among them "The Elements of Peace in the New World" at the Instituto Popular de Conferencias; "The Society of American Nations and the Law of Nations" at the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences of the University of Buenos Aires; and "My Professorship at Harvard," at the University of La Plata. Also included were speeches given at the "Celebration of American Fraternity" hosted by the Colombian community, and at the "Reception at the Society of History." Excluding the first lecture, all other talks had been originally delivered in Spanish and reprinted by Buenos Aires newspapers and scientific journals, and *Na Argentina* offered them in Portuguese translation. Lima's Argentine tour thus became a reciprocal event of translation and non-translation, which created an Argentine-Brazilian discussion about Latin American-U.S. relations and the region's place in the world, including the Monroe Doctrine with its recent corollaries and reinterpretations.

In his book, Lima eulogized his host, describing a moment in Zeballos's career when he "rose to become the interpreter not only of his country's stance toward foreign powers but also of the entire Ibero-American world" (Lima 1920a: 167). When Theodore Roosevelt received an honorary doctorate from the University of Buenos Aires, Dr. Zeballos used the occasion to reject the Monroe Doctrine as an exclusive U.S. policy, presenting a doctrine of his own—namely, that the Argentine Republic was fully capable of defending itself and determining its own destiny, so Lima recounted. By the late 1910s, hailing one another as anti-Monroist had apparently become a common form of symbolic capital among Brazilian and Spanish American intellectuals.

XII. CONCLUSION

This article has revisited the Monroe Doctrine not as a fixed doctrine of U.S. hemispheric dominance, but as a contested and pluralized concept, shaped by Latin American actors across linguistic and political boundaries. Through the double lens of translation and non-translation, it has shown how Brazilians entered Spanish-speaking intellectual circuits and how their works were not merely received, but strategically recontextualized, reframed, and repurposed within broader Latin Americanist projects. The multilingual lives and afterlives of *A ilusão americana* and Lima's writings challenge the longstanding historiographical view of Brazil as Latin America's Monroist outlier. They reveal a more complex picture in which edited re-publications, ideological reinterpretations, and multilingual citations wove Brazilian texts into a continental conversation on hemispheric order and U.S. power. More than simply crossing linguistic boundaries, these texts simultaneously served as instruments in the construction of a Latin American identity and regional norms, as well as in the deconstruction of U.S. hegemony. This dual action relied on an infrastructure of diplomatic-intellectual networks and intermediaries. Oliveira Lima's personal ties with counterparts from Venezuela, Mexico, Argentina, and Peru, played a crucial role in creating a multidirectional and multifaceted dialogue, connecting different parts of Latin America with diverse ethnic compositions, levels of modernization, and geopolitical standings, around shared interests and ideas.

At the same time, the article makes a broader methodological contribution by foregrounding the analytic potential of translation studies for the history of international relations. The concept of "non-translation" and the interplay between translational acts and their absences illuminate how proximity such as that between Spanish and Portuguese, and cultural closeness such as that between Luso-America and Hispanic America, do not preclude the need for translation and may even intensify its political stakes. Translation, in such contexts, both crosses frontiers and symbolizes their bridging, to return to Pym's (2010) theory mentioned in the beginning. Put differently, it becomes not only a means of linguistic transfer, but also a site of epistemic and geopolitical negotiation, creation, or confrontation. Conversely, IR gains new depth when its usual objects of analysis—states, doctrines, and diplomacy—are joined by state and non-state actors of different languages.

Ultimately, what emerges is not a Brazil standing apart from Latin America, but a Brazil actively engaged in shaping it diplomatically and conceptually through textual and public interventions. Far from being a Monroist exception, Brazilians participated in a shared continental critique that redefined the Monroe Doctrine from the South. The hyphenated neologism "Spanish-Portuguese America" (Lima 1914a: 58, 112) coined by Oliveira Lima, thus encapsulates not only a cultural vision but a strategic formation, a transnational epistemic community forged through interlingual dialogues and common resistance.

REFERENCES

- Abranches, Dunshee de. 21 October 1913. "Brazil and the United States." *O Paíz*.
- Abranches, Dunshee de. 1915. *Brazil and the Monroe Doctrine*. Rio de Janeiro: Impr. Nacional.
- Alonso, Angela. 2013. "Joaquim Nabuco: Diplomata Americanista." In *Pensamento diplomático brasileiro*, edited by José Vicente de Sá Pimentel. Brasília: Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão, 359–404.
- Álvarez, Alejandro. 1924. *The Monroe Doctrine: Its Importance in the International Life of the States of the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1896. "As bases da fé." In *Cartas de Inglaterra*, Rio de Janeiro: Leuzinger.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899a. "A higiene e a expansão americana." In *Obras completas de Rui Barbosa* [OC], Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Educação e Cultura, XXVI, t. IV, 1942–, 269–74.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899b. "A história repete-se." In OC XXVI, t. IV, 217–26.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899c. "A nova potência militar." In OC XXVI, t. IV, 249–62.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899d. "Chinas americanas." In OC XXVI, t. IV, 315–20.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899e. "O continente enférmo." In OC XXVI, t. IV, 15–18.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899f. "O deleixo latino-americano." In OC XXVI, t. IV, 19–22.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899g. "O futuro dos Estados Unidos." In OC XXVI, t. IV, 321–26.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899h. "Vã confiança – A Doutrina de Monroe: Sua origem." In OC XXVI, t. V, 155–62.
- Barbosa, Rui. 1899i. "Vã confiança – A ilusão americana." In OC XXVI, t. V, 151–54.
- Bernárdez, Manuel. 1908. *El Brasil, su vida, su trabajo, su futuro: itinerario periodístico*. Buenos Aires: Talleres heliográficos de Ortega y Radaelli.
- Bethell, Leslie. 2010. "Brazil and 'Latin America.'" *Journal of Latin American Studies* 42(3): 457–85.
- Bingham, Hiram. 1914. "The Latin American Attitude Toward the Monroe Doctrine." In *Proceedings of the American Society of International Law at Its Annual Meeting (1907-1917)*, Cambridge University Press, 180–96.
- Briceño-Ruiz, José and Andrés Rivarola Puntigliano. 2017. *Brazil and Latin America: Between the Separation and Integration Paths*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Burns, E. Bradford. 1966. *The Unwritten Alliance: Rio-Branco and Brazilian-American Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Candido, Antonio. 1995. *Antonio Candido: On Literature and Society*, translated by Howard S. Becker. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carbó-Catalan, Elisabet and Diana Roig-Sanz. 2022. "Swinging Between Culture and Politics: Novel Interdisciplinary Perspectives." In *Culture as Soft Power: Bridging Cultural Relations, Intellectual Cooperation, and Cultural Diplomacy*, edited by Elisabet Carbó-Catalan and Diana Roig Sanz. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 1–20.
- Cardozo, Manoel da Silveira. 1953. "Preface." In M. de Oliveira Lima, *Impressões da América espanhola, 1904–1906*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria J. Olympio.
- Carvalho, Ricardo Souza de. 2004. "La Revista Americana (1909-1919) y el diálogo intelectual en Latinoamérica." *Revista Iberoamericana* 70 (208–209): 665–76.
- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*, translated by M. D. de Bevoise. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Castro, Fernando Vale. 2013. "Pensando un continente: La América del Sur en las páginas de la Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras y de la Revista Americana." In XIV Jornadas Interescuelas, Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Mendoza.
- Degiovanni, Fernando. 2018. *Vernacular Latin Americanisms: War, the Market, and the Making of a Discipline*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Drago, Luis María. 8 March 1907. [Letter to Oliveira Lima]. Oliveira Lima Family Papers [OLF], Oliveira Lima Library, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.
- Drago, Luis María. 8 August 1908. [Letter to Oliveira Lima]. OLF.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2010. *Papers in Culture Research*. Tel Aviv: Unit of Culture Research, Tel Aviv University.

- Ewell, Judith. 1996. *Venezuela and the United States: From Monroe's Hemisphere to Petroleum's Empire*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Fernández-Bravo, Álvaro. 2004. "Utopías americanistas: La posición de la *Revista Americana* en Brasil (1909–1919)." In *Construcciones impresas: panfletos, diarios y revistas en la formación de los estados nacionales en América Latina, 1820–1920*, edited by Paula Alonso. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 321–338.
- García Calderón, Francisco. 1979 [1913]. *La creación de un continente*. Caracas: Bibl. Ayacucho.
- Gobat, Michel. 2013. "The Invention of Latin America: A Transnational History of Anti-Imperialism, Democracy, and Race." *The American Historical Review* 118(5): 1345–75.
- Gouvêa, F. da C. 1976. *Oliveira Lima, uma biografia*. Vol. 2, 3 Vols. Recife: Instituto Arqueológico, Histórico e Geográfico Pernambucano.
- Guimarães, Feliciano de Sá. 2020. "The Uneasy 'Well-Placed' State: Brazil Within Latin America and the West." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 33(4): 603–19.
- Henrich, Nathalia. 2016. "Ser ou não ser antiamericano?: Os Estados Unidos na obra de Oliveira Lima." PhD diss. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Inman, Samuel Guy. 1925. *Problems in Pan Americanism*. New York: George H. Doran Company.
- Kacowicz, Arie Marcelo. 1998. *Zones of Peace in the Third World: South America and West Africa in Comparative Perspective*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Kozel, Andrés. 2015. "Carlos Pereyra en los laberintos del desprecio. Notas para una sociología de los intelectuales antiimperialistas." *Acta Sociológica* 68: 49–70.
- Lafer, Celso. 2000. "Brazilian International Identity and Foreign Policy: Past, Present, and Future." *Daedalus* 129(2): 207–38.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1898. "Do Prata ao Niagra." *Revista Brasileira* 14: 90–96.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1899. *Nos Estados Unidos: Impressões políticas e sociaes*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 4 December 1905. "O presidente Castro." *O Estado de São Paulo*.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1907. *Pan-americanismo (Monroe-Bolívar-Roosevelt)*. Paris/Rio de Janeiro: Garnier.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1911. *Formation historique de la nationalité brésilienne: série de conférences faits en Sorbonne*. Paris: Garnier.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1913a. "A America para a humanidade." *La Revista de America* 1(9): 181–90.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1913b. "America latina e America inglesa ou a evolução brasileira comparada com a hispano-americana e com a anglo-americana." *Revista Americana* 4: 1-21.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1914a. *The Evolution of Brazil Compared with That of Spanish and Anglo-Saxon America*, edited by Percy Alvin Martin. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1914b. *America latina e a America inglesa: a evolução brasileira comparada com a hispano-americana e com a anglo-americana*. Rio de Janeiro: Garnier.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. [1916?]. *La evolución histórica de la América latina: bosquejo comparativo*, translated by Ángel César Rivas. Madrid: Editorial América.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1918. *Formación histórica de la nacionalidad brasileña*, translated by Carlos Pereyra. Madrid: Editorial América.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1920a. *Na Argentina: Impressões*. São Paulo: Weiszflog.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1920b. *En la Argentina: (Impresiones de 1918-19)*, translated by Valentín Diego. Montevideo: Barreiro y Ramos.
- Lima, M. de Oliveira. 1953. *Impressões da América espanhola, 1904-1906*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria J. Olympio.
- Lima, Thayse Leal. 2021. "South-South Exchanges: Biblioteca Ayacucho and the Construction of a Transnational Literature." *Journal of World Literature* 6(2): 245–65.
- Maíz, Claudio and Álvaro Fernández-Bravo. 2009. *Episodios en la formación de redes culturales en América Latina: Nuevas herramientas para abordar el objeto mutante en que ha devenido la literatura*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.

- Nabuco, Joaquim. 1949. *Cartas a amigos* vol. 2, 2 vols., edited and annotated by C. Nabuco. São Paulo: Instituto Progresso Editorial.
- O Malho. "Olhemos para o Mexico." 19 April 1911a. Rio de Janeiro.
- O Malho. "Fita Americana." 29 April 1911b. Rio de Janeiro.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen. 2014. *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pereyra, Carlos. 1916. El mito de Monroe. Madrid: Editorial América.
- Pereyra, Carlos. 1917a. El crimen de Woodrow Wilson. Madrid: Impr. De J. Pueyo.
- Pereyra, Carlos. 1917b. Tejas. La primera desmembración de Méjico. Madrid: Editorial América.
- Prado, Eduardo. 1895 [1893]. *A ilusão americana*. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie, Éditeurs.
- Prado, Eduardo. 1918. *La ilusión yanqui*, translated by Carlos Pereyra. Madrid: Editorial América, Biblioteca Andrés Bello.
- Preuss, Ori. 2016. *Transnational South America: Experiences, Ideas, and Identities, 1860s-1900s*. London: Routledge.
- Preuss, Ori. 2019. "'Povos quase da mesma língua': não-/tradução, modernização, e as relações Brasil-Argentina, 1865-1900." *Belas Infieis* 8(2): 135–64.
- Preuss, Ori and João Paulo Coelho de Souza Rodrigues. 2025. "Reconsiderando 'Brasil y 'América Latina': La cuestión al revés." *Prismas - Revista de historia intelectual* 29.
- Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication*, revised edition. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.
- Quesada, Vicente Gregorio (pseudonym: Domingo de Pantoja). 1893. *Los Estados Unidos y la América del Sur: los yankees pintados por sí mismos*. Buenos Aires: Imprenta J. Peuser.
- Quijada Mauriño, Mónica. 1997. "Latinos y anglosajones: el 98 en el fin de siglo sudamericano." *Hispania: Revista Española de Historia* 57(196): 589–609.
- Rama, Ángel. 1983. "La modernización literaria latinoamericana (1870-1910)." *Hispanamérica* 12(36): 3–19.
- Revista Americana*, Redacção. 1909. "A Revista Americana." *Revista Americana* 1: 5–8.
- Ricupero, Rubens. 2013. "A política externa da Primeira República (1889-1930)." In *Pensamento diplomático brasileiro: Formuladores e agentes da política externa (1750-1950)*, edited by José Vicente de Sá Pimentel. Brasília: FUNAG, 333-356.
- Rippy, J. Fred. 1922. "Literary Yankeeophobia in Hispanic America (Concluded)." *The Journal of International Relations* 12(4): 524–38.
- Rodrigues, João Paulo Coelho de Souza. 2017. "Embaixadas originais: diplomacia, jornalismo e as relações Argentina-Brasil (1888-1935)." *Topoi* 18: 537–62.
- Roig-Sanz, Diana. 2022. "The Global Minor: A Transnational Space for Decentering Literary and Translation History." *Comparative Literature Studies* 59(4): 631–63.
- Scarfi, Juan Pablo. 2014. "La emergencia de un imaginario latinoamericanista y antiestadounidense del orden hemisférico: De la unión panamericana a la unión latinoamericana (1880-1913)." *Revista Complutense de Historia de América* 39: 81–104.
- Scarfi, Juan Pablo. 2016. "In the Name of the Americas: The Pan-American Redefinition of the Monroe Doctrine and the Emerging Language of American International Law in the Western Hemisphere, 1898-1933." *Diplomatic History* 40(2): 189–218.
- Scarfi, Juan Pablo. 2020. "Denaturalizing the Monroe Doctrine: The Rise of Latin American Legal Anti-Imperialism in the Face of the Modern US and Hemispheric Redefinition of the Monroe Doctrine." *Leiden Journal of International Law* 33(3): 541–55.
- Scarfi, Juan Pablo. 2023. "The Monroe Doctrine in the Americas: Towards a Hemispheric Intellectual History." *Diplomatic History* 47(5): 738–63.
- Shepherd, William R. 1919. *The Hispanic Nations of the New World: A Chronicle of Our Southern Neighbours*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Smith, Joseph. 1991. *Unequal Giants: Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Brazil, 1889-1930*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Sorá, Gustavo. 2003. *Traducir el Brasil: Una antropología de la circulación internacional de ideas*. Buenos Aires: Libros del Zorzal.

- Tenorio-Trillo, Mauricio. 2020. *Latin America: The Allure and Power of an Idea*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wigen, Einar. 2015. "Two-Level Language Games: International Relations as Inter-Lingual Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 21(2): 427–50.
- Zumeta, César. 1899. *El continente enfermo*. New York.

Received: March 14, 2025

Accepted: August 08, 2025

Ori Preuss is Senior Lecturer in the Department of History at Tel Aviv University. His research focuses on nineteenth-century Latin America as both a cultural area and a constructed space of intellectual exchange, with particular emphasis on Brazil. His publications, including *Bridging the Island: Brazilian Views of Spanish America and Themselves* (2011) and *Transnational South America: Experiences, Ideas, and Identities* (2016), have pioneered the exploration of transnationalism within Latin America. He is also a translator and editor of Latin American literature and has introduced Hebrew readers to works of Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, Mariano Azuela, Che Guevara, Jorge Luis Borges, and Ricardo Piglia.

