Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Brazil Institute

Brazilian Embassy in Washington

Brazilian PERSPECTIVES on the United States

ADVANCING U.S. STUDIES IN BRAZIL

edited by
Paulo Sotero
Daniel Budny

Brazilian PERSPECTIVES on the United States

ADVANCING U.S. STUDIES IN BRAZIL

Woodrow Wilson
International
Center
for Scholars

Brazil Institute

Brazilian Embassy
in Washington

BRAZILIAN PERSPECTIVES ON THE UNITED STATES

Advancing U.S. Studies in Brazil

Edited by
Paulo Sotero
Daniel Budny

January 2007

Available from the Latin American Program and Brazil Institute

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
One Woodrow Wilson Plaza
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004-3027

www.wilsoncenter.org

ISBN 1-933549-13-0

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, established by Congress in 1968 and headquartered in Washington, D.C., is a living national memorial to President Wilson. The Center's mission is to commemorate the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson by providing a link between the worlds of ideas and policy, while fostering research, study, discussion, and collaboration among a broad spectrum of individuals concerned with policy and scholarship in national and international affairs. Supported by public and private funds, the Center is a nonpartisan institution engaged in the study of national and world affairs. It establishes and maintains a neutral forum for free, open, and informed dialogue. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Center publications and programs are those of the authors and speakers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center staff, fellows, trustees, advisory groups, or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to the Center.

The Center is the publisher of The Wilson Quarterly and home of Woodrow Wilson Center Press, dialogue radio and television, and the monthly news-letter "Centerpoint." For more information about the Center's activities and publications, please visit us on the web at www.wilsoncenter.org.

The Brazil Institute was created in June 2006 out of the conviction that Brazil and the U.S.-Brazilian relationship deserve greater attention within the Washington policy community. Brazil's population, size, and economy, as well as its unique position as a regional leader and global player, justify this attention. Operating as part of the Wilson Center Latin American Program, the Brazil Institute has unique qualities that set it apart from other Washington institutions: an in-depth and comprehensive approach to the issues that policymakers face in Brazil, in the United States, and in various international banks and agencies in Washington; high-quality presentations and publications; a nonpartisan forum for serious discussion; and the capacity to house public policy scholars. Activities include regular public seminars which stimulate nonpartisan reflection on critical issues in Brazilian development, international relations, and economic and political affairs. These seminars present the views of top scholars, high-level policymakers, and business and civil society leaders on the various challenges and opportunities that confront Brazil and U.S.-Brazilian relations. The Brazil Institute enhances the presence of Brazil in Washington by appointing to the Center leading Brazilian and Brazilianist academics, intellectuals, writers, journalists, former diplomats, and government officials to conduct research or to reflect upon their experience in the field. The Institute also organizes and hosts regular meetings of invitation-only groups of high-level policymakers, analysts, private sector leaders, and scholars, elevating the level of discourse and attention given to the country and its issues, and promoting more constructive and informed U.S.-Brazilian relations. The results of the meetings and the studies carried out in preparation for them are widely disseminated in the form of website articles, editorials, policy bulletins, and working papers that are distributed to members of the policymaking community and to Brazilians and Brazilianists active in shaping U.S. perceptions of Brazil. Significant events or programs also lead to volumes published by the Woodrow Wilson Center Press. Additionally, the Brazil Institute maintains a specialized online resource, Portal to Brazil, with regularly updated news and analysis in English and Portuguese on relevant issues.

BIOGRAPHIES

Roberto Abdenur was appointed Brazilian Ambassador to the United States in April 2004. A career diplomat, he occupied several posts in more than four decades of services to the Ministry of Foreign Relations. Among the most important, Ambassador Abdenur was Secretary-General of Itamaraty and ambassador in Austria, Germany, China, and Ecuador. Ambassador Abdenur received an Economics degree from the London School of Economics and studied Law at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro.

Jacques d'Adesky is a researcher at the Center for American Studies, in the Cândido Mendes University (UCAM) Humanities Institute. He has a Ph.D. in Social Anthropology from the University of São Paulo and a B.A. in Economic Sciences from the University of Louvain, Belgium. D'Adesky has worked as an international staff member of the United Nations Development Program in the Central African Republic, an international advisor at the Cândido Mendes Cultural Center, and Administrative Deputy Director of the Center for African and Asian Studies of UCAM. He is a member of the Advisory Board of *Africana: The Encyclopedia of the African and African American Experience,* and has published articles in academic journals. The most recent of his books is *Antiracismo, Liberdade e Reconhecimento.*

Carlos da Fonseca is a career diplomat. He has worked in the Division of the Southern Common Market and in the Brazilian Embassy in Washington, as First Secretary in the Political Affairs Sector. Fonseca earned degrees in History from the Université de Paris 1 – Panthéon Sorbonne and from the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro. He received his M.A. in Public Policy from the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Recent publications include: "Deus está do Nosso Lado: Religião e Política Externa nos EUA" in *Contexto Internacional* (to be published); "Fora dos Radares de Washington: A Relação EUA-América Latina e a Questão do Déficit de Atenção" and "Os Think Tanks e a política americana" in *Revista Política Externa.*

Carlos Eduardo Lins da Silva is director of Institutional Relations at PATRI, Inc. He holds a B.A. in Journalism from Cásper Líbero College, an M.A. in Communications from Michigan State University, and a Ph.D. in Communications from the University of São Paulo. He was Deputy Editor-in-Chief of *Folha de São Paulo*, Brazil's second largest newspaper, and the Brazilian business journal *Valor Econômico,* as well as Washington correspondent at *Folha.* He has lectured at the Universities of São Paulo, Georgetown, Texas, Michigan State, Rio Grande do Norte, Católica de Santos, and Metodista de São Paulo. He was a scholar at the Woodrow Wilson Center and is currently coordinator of the Media and Society Studies Group at the Instituto Fernando Henrique Cardoso.

Cristina Soreanu Pecequilo is professor of International Relations at the State University of São Paulo. She is also a regular contributor to the Brazilian International Relations Network website, an associate researcher of the Center for International Relations Studies at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, and a visiting professor at the Ibero-American University Center. She has a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of São Paulo, and is a specialist in U.S. foreign policy, equally experienced in studying recent developments in the international system, Brazil's foreign policy and its role in the world, as well as the history and theories of international relations. Pecequilo is the author of various articles and has also published the following books: *Os Estados Unidos: Hegemonia e Liderança na Transição*, *Introdução às Relações Internacionais*, and *A Política Externa dos Estados Unidos: Continuidade ou Mudança*.

Paulo Sotero is director of the Brazil Institute of the Woodrow Wilson Center. A journalist since 1968, he was correspondent in Lisbon and assistant-editor for Latin America at Veja weekly magazine. In Washington since 1980, he was correspondent for Gazeta Mercantil and Estado de S.Paulo. He also worked as a regular commentator and analyst for the BBC radio Portuguese language service, Radio France Internationale, and Radio Eldorado, in Brazil. Since 2003 he has been an adjunct lecturer at Georgetown University both in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and in the Center for Latin American Studies of the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service. Sotero has a BA in history from the Catholic University of Pernambuco, Brazil, and an MA in Journalism and Public Affairs from American University, Washington, D.C.

Antonio Pedro Tota is associate professor of History at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo. He earned his Ph.D. in Social History from the University of São Paulo. In 2004, he was awarded a grant from the Rockefeller Archive Center to conduct research in the archives of Nelson A. Rockefeller. He was a Visiting Professor at Pace University, New York, from January to May, 1996, a Visiting Scholar in the Department of History of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., in 1992, and a Visiting Scholar at the Institute of Latin American and Iberian Studies, Columbia University, New York, from 1989-1990. He is the author of several books, including: *O Imperialismo Sedutor, a Americanização do Brasil na Época da Segunda Guerra Mundial*. He is currently working on a book about Nelson Rockefeller and the modernization of Brazil.

CONTENTS

THE CHALLENGES OF PROMOTING U.S. STUDIES IN BRAZIL

Paulo Sotero*

Historically, the United States has been disproportionately more relevant for Brazil than Brazil has been for the United States. This asymmetry of interests, true for most countries in the world vis-à-vis the United States, could lead one to conclude that Brazilian scholars and intellectuals study U.S. realities closely in order to influence the debate and the shaping of public policies in Brazil. The opposite, however, appears to be true. U.S. Studies has only slowly emerged in Brazilian academic institutions since redemocratization in 1985, whereas in the last fifty years a growing crop of U.S. scholars has continued to study the largest nation in South America, despite its relatively modest impact on U.S. affairs. Know as "Brazilianists," these scholars have produced scores of scholarly papers and books on Brazil in the fields of history, economy, politics, and the social sciences. Translated into Portuguese, some of these works have become indispensable references for Brazilian Studies even in Brazil's universities.

On September 18, 2006, the Brazil Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the Brazilian Embassy in Washington co-sponsored a conference to examine the state of U.S. Studies in Brazil and make recommendations on how to strengthen and deepen the academic field. This meeting marked the official launching of the U.S. Studies Project to be taken up by Brazilian academic institutions. The event, hosted by *Brazilian Ambassador Roberto Abdenur*, opened with a working breakfast at the embassy's residency with thirty scholars, representatives of key institutions, and former ambassadors, and concluded with a seminar at the Brazilian Chancery.

Ambassador Abdenur argued that, without detracting from the significant work conducted on the United States by Brazilian academics, U.S. studies in Brazil is in need of outside stimulation. While a healthy mutual curiosity exists between the two countries, advanced research on the topic in Brazil has been modest at best. It is of strategic importance that Brazil better understand the United States: how the U.S. decision-making process works, and how the United States views Latin America, perceives race relations, and regards foreign investment. The conference was thus a response to the relative lack of supply of research and analysis on the United States, given Brazil's high demand.

* Director, Brazil Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

In the working group session prior to the meeting, *Philippa Strum*, director of U.S. Studies at the Wilson Center, successfully proposed a change in nomenclature, arguing for the use of "U.S." instead "American," to avoid ethnocentrism. She also stressed the importance of taking an interdisciplinary approach to Brazil's advanced study and research of the United States. At the seminar, *Cynthia Arnson*, director of the Wilson Center's Latin American Program, highlighted the apparent ambivalence of Brazilian academics about studying the United States, and underscored the significance of research in fostering a better understanding. Knowledge of the United States is increasingly important for Brazil, given its recent insertion into the international system and the fact that Brazil is a more active international player than most other countries of its economic stature. Participants in the seminar included *Eliana Cardoso*, from the Getúlio Vargas Foundation, and *Carlos Pio*, from the University of Brasília. *Cristina Pecequilo*, from the State University of São Paulo, *Antonio Pedro Tota*, from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, and *Jacques d'Adesky*, from the Cândido Mendes University, presented papers on Brazilian perspectives of the United States.

This bilingual report is a partial record of the conference and includes the works of other individuals who contributed to the initiative. Made possible by financial support from the Brazilian Embassy, the report opens with Ambassador Abdenur's assessment of U.S. Studies in Brazil and the need to find and invest more financial and intellectual capital in this field of research. "The United States has been far too significant a player in the international arena for Brazilians to be able to afford the luxury of ignoring or even failing to learn about it," he writes. The causes of Brazil's relative lack of interest in studying the United States, which occupied part of the discussion, are further explored by *Carlos Eduardo Lins da Silva*. A journalist, former scholar at the Woodrow Wilson Center, and current member of the Brazil Institute Advisory Council, Lins da Silva was the original proponent of the idea of a U.S. Studies project.

Carlos Pio sought to explain the relative lack of interest among Brazilian social scientists in the United States and foreign countries in general. He argued that Brazilian academics are not only neglecting the study of United States, they are not even studying their immediate neighbors, much less the rest of the world. Confirming that point, in January of 2007, Itamaraty announced a major effort to entice Brazilian universities to promote the study of South America in order to make up for the relative lack of specialized knowledge.

The report contains three texts presented at the seminar. "Seductive Imperialism," by *Antonio Pedro Tota*, appears here for the first time in English, in an abridged version. Published in Brazil in 2000 by Companhia das Letras as *O Imperialismo Sedutor* (and for that reason not included in the Portuguese half of the volume), the text traces the history of the successful media campaign organized and executed by young Republican millionaire Nelson D. Rockefeller, on behalf of the administration of Democratic president Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to win Brazilians hearts and minds

during the Second World War and ensure Brazil's logistical and troop support for the Allied forces against the Axis.

Jacques d'Adesky retraces the history of Brazilian Studies on race from Gilberto Freyre on and concludes that, more often than not, Brazilian academics have not drawn inspiration from the United States, given the historically higher tensions in race relations in the United States and the subsequent perception that Brazil is better off. As Brazil struggles with the implementation of affirmative action policies, which were clearly inspired by the U.S. experience, d'Adesky argues that Brazilian experts on race must look to the United States and examine whether lessons can be learned from its northern neighbor, such as the fact that a black middle class emerged in the United States in part as a result of affirmative action.

In discussing U.S. foreign policy, *Cristina Soreanu Pecequilo*, a leading presence among the younger generation of Brazilian scholars, argues that the Bush Doctrine has thrown the United States off the right track it had taken after the fall of the Berlin Wall, to promote global peace and stability and its own interests as the sole remaining superpower. The country has lost credibility and played into the hands of its enemies by contributing to making the world a more insecure place. While such actions have shored up U.S. hegemony, they have done so in an unhealthy fashion and have "raised anxiety about not only the continuation of the Second American Century, but also about the very vitality of [American] democracy, which needs to revisit its roots, re-examine its best traditions, and be re-founded so that it may heal itself."

The volume concludes with a comparative analysis of the role of ideologues in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy under presidents Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. The author, *Carlos da Fonseca*, researched and wrote the paper as a master's degree candidate at the Harvard University Kennedy School of Government, before returning to Brasília to resume his career at Brazilian foreign ministry.

Daniel Budny, program assistant for the Brazil Institute, greatly contributed to the organization of the conference and the editing of this report. Murilo Gabrielli, the cultural attaché at the Brazilian Embassy in Washington, was also instrumental and coordinated the translation of the texts into English. Robert Feron of the Embassy served as translator.

In its mission to foster informed debate of issues relevant to Brazil and Brazil-U.S. relations, the Brazil Institute of the Woodrow Wilson Center will remain involved as a supporter and facilitator in the effort to promote U.S. Studies among Brazilian scholars, with the understanding that the intellectual and financial thrust underlining the project will come from Brazil's academic institutions, foundations, and other interested parties.

THE "AMERICANISTAS" PROJECT: INITIAL THOUGHTS

Roberto Abdenur*

With its vast geography, complex society and unique political life, the United States has always attracted the curiosity of scholars from all over the world. Among the first to analyze the recently liberated nation was Alexis de Tocqueville, whose vital work *Democracy in America* is still a reference for academics around the world. Among Latin American scholars, Domingo Sarmiento, José Martí, and José Enrique Rodó, the author of *Ariel,* also studied the country. Such interest also reached Brazil, as seen in the work of Hipólito José da Costa, writing before Brazil's independence, as well as in books and articles by Eduardo Prado, Joaquim Nabuco, Oliveira Lima, and Vianna Moog. Interest was even expressed by Brazilian Emperor D. Pedro II, who took a lengthy trip to the United States in 1876 (one of the first visits to this country by a foreign head of state), on the occasion of the centennial of U.S. independence, and for many years maintained correspondence with academics associated with Harvard University, such as naturalist Louis Agassiz and poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.[1]

From early on, Brazilian interest in the United States has been matched by American curiosity about its large and unexplored neighbor to the south. Successive generations of scientists, historians, sociologists and political scientists have researched Brazil since the mid-19th century, attracted by its natural scenery (and riches), agricultural potential, colonial past, modernizing republican experience, industrial development of the early 20th century, political oscillations of international alliances in the years leading up to the Second World War, democratic years in the immediate post war period, and, shortly thereafter, constitutional interruption during the military dictatorship.

Hundreds of books and articles have been published in the United States about these and many other aspects of Brazilian life, by such talented "Brazilianists" as Charles Wagley, Richard Morse, Thomas Skidmore, Bradford Burns, Robert Levine, Philip Schmitter, and, more recently, John Dulles, Margaret Keck, Marshall Eakin, Kenneth Maxwell, Joseph Smith, and Barbara Weinstein, among others. Academic centers have been created, university chairs endowed, scholarship funds spent on field research, and increasingly specialized dissertations defended before committees. Generations of Brazilianists have succeeded one another in the United States, boosting the study and understanding of our country.

* Brazilian Ambassador in Washington from 2003 to 2007.

Notwithstanding the works by Hipólito José da Costa, Oliveira Lima, and others an equivalent effort has not materialized in Brazil. If curiosity about or interest in the "Colossus of the North" has always been present, even because Brazil's destiny has frequently been associated with it, this has not resulted in substantial research or development of a specific academic field or research center. Brazil has not produced an "Americanist" tradition.

It is in the national interest of Brazil to change this reality. The United States has been far too significant a player in the international arena for Brazilians to be able to afford the luxury of ignoring or even failing to learn about it. Moreover, it is important for Brazil to learn and understand the various U.S. realities as they affect the bilateral relationship—which has now reached an unprecedented level of intensity, and also the multiple issues included both in Brazil's regional and international agenda. In fact, over the last few years, the U.S.-Brazil partnership has multiplied into initiatives that breathe new life into a relationship that has been historically harmonious, although not necessarily free of friction. In addition to the reciprocity of open and frank dialogue and support for shared values of democracy and freedom, there has been convergence of tangible interest in different areas.[2]

The intensification of this relationship naturally brings with it the probability of disagreements. Despite the fact that the United States and Brazil are multiethnic democracies respectful of the principles of freedom and justice, the two countries are not without their differences. Clashes are unavoidable, but their outcomes are sometimes productive, to the extent to which they lead to greater mutual understanding and a more mature relationship. Such disagreements may simply arise from diverging interests. They may also result from different positions regarding the world. After all, whereas today the United States is a determining factor in introducing topics into the international agenda, Brazil in fact plays and important—and often decisive—role in establishing the terms and conditions under which such topics are addressed. Understanding the role of the United States in the world, both its constructive and destabilizing actions, and the nature of this bilateral relationship depends on a clear and objective view of U.S. realities.

An Interested Interest

The Brazilian Embassy in Washington is intent on fostering the development of "Americanism," not "Americanophilia" or "Americanophobia." Research on the United States is to be moved not merely by enthrallment, but rather by a sense of interest that includes admiration and does not exclude criticism. More so, the United States should be studied with the awareness that one is meeting an imperative strategic for Brazil. Studying the United States is of utmost importance, as it expands understanding of the mechanisms and motivations of an actor whose actions affect the entire world.

This awareness of self interest has prevailed during important moments in the development of Brazilian Studies, when U.S. researchers studied Brazil motivated by legitimate academic interests, while stimulated by a government that considered understanding of the different regions and countries of Latin America a strategic interest. It was not merely by chance, for example, that Brazilian Studies prospered in the United States at times such as the 1940s, under the auspices of the Good Neighbor Policy, when it was in the interest of the United States to foster good will from countries in the region against Nazism and Fascism, as well as to ensure the supply of strategic primary products during times of war times, as was the case of rubber in Brazil. Academic missions to Brazil aimed at surveying the country's national economic potential (such as, for instance, the Cooke Mission) date back to this time, as do invitations for Brazilian intellectuals to visit U.S. universities to make speeches about Brazil (i.e. Érico Veríssimo, who from that experience would produce the work *Gato Preto em Campo de Neve*, and Gilberto Freyre, who would have his *Casa Grande e Senzala* translated into English and published a series of speeches on Brazil as a book—*Brazil: An Interpretation*).

Decades later, the cold war was yet another important strategic stimulus to boost Latin American Studies in the United States. In a few Latin Americanist intellectual circles, it was even ironically suggested that a statue of Fidel Castro should be raised, as his revolution in Cuba led the U.S. government to open its coffers to fund academic programs focused on the region.

Among Latin Americans, interest in the neighbor to the north developed under different circumstances. Beginning in the second half of the 19th century, in the work by thinkers such as the Argentine Domingo Faustino Sarmiento (*Facundo* and *Argirópolis*), Cuban José Martí (*Nuestra America* and *Escenas Americanas*), Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó (*Ariel*) and Brazilian Manoel de Oliveira Lima (*Nos Estados Unidos*), curiosity about the United States emerged from a discussion between the "Americanophiles" and the "Americanophobes," between those who saw the United States as a model of civilization to be emulated by the rest of the Hemisphere as a way to combat local barbarism, and those who advocated their own Latinized mixed-raced solutions.

Such a debate made sense then, at a time when Latin American countries, recently freed from European domination—and in the case of Brazil, reestablished as a Republic—were searching for new models of social and political frameworks. In that context, different modernizing trends, included in some of the works mentioned here, asserted that it was impossible to create national independent nations based on models that referred back to their past as former colonies. In order to achieve the levels of development, stability, and prosperity of more advanced nations, it would be necessary to adopt their own social, political, and economic models and approaches.[3] Inspired by Rodo's "Arielism" and Martí's indigenous model, unlike other groups that took to highlighting Iberian history and culture instead, criticizing the choice

made by certain elites of an "America delatinized by its own will…regenerated in the image and likeness of the archetype of the North."[4]

That debate has since died out. The "Brazilian model" has long been defined and has matured, notwithstanding the day-to-day hurdles that emerge to hinder its accomplishment. It is not in that context that a resumption of efforts to understand the United States is proposed, as initiated by Hipólito da Costa and Oliveira Lima. As mentioned earlier, Brazil should seek to understand the United States due to its increasingly greater importance in the international arena, the rich and dense bilateral agenda, and shared interests. Finally, Brazilians should study the United States for what it can contribute to the understanding of Brazil itself, whose path has been similar in many ways.

A Few Observations on the Study of the Unites States in Brazil

Due to the lack of more consistent data on U.S. Studies in Brazil, which have never been duly compiled and analyzed (relative to Brazilian Studies, which has been the subject of numerous books and dissertations), some brief comments and initial remarks on the topic will be offered as an introduction to the works of *Americanistas* in this volume.

The history of U.S. Studies in Brazil is marked by its conciseness. Over the last couple decades, very few Brazilian writers have sought to understand and explain the United States. A brief survey conducted in Brazilian and U.S. bibliographical files (Brazil's National Library and the Library of Congress) revealed scant few titles published from the earlier part of the 20th century. In addition to *Nos Estados Unidos*, by Oliveira Lima, published at the turn of the century, there are books by Monteiro Lobato (*América*, 1929), Érico Veríssimo (*Gato Preto em Campo de Neve*, 1941 and *A Volta do Gato Preto*, 1946), Hildebrando Accioly (*O Reconhecimento do Brasil pelos Estados Unidos da América*, 1945), Tristão de Athayde – Alceu Amoroso Lima (*Pela America do Norte*, 1955), Clodomir Vianna Moog (*Bandeirantes e Pioneiros: Paralelos entre duas Culturas*, 1955), Nelson Werneck Sodré (*Quem Matou Kennedy*, 1964) and Gerson Moura (*Tio Sam Chega ao Brasil*, 1984), among others.

In more recent years, the number of books focused on U.S. topics has increased. A survey conducted at Brazil's National Library revealed, for instance, that over 60 titles by Brazilian authors were published between 1994 and 2006. This rise has naturally been encouraged by an equivalent increase in the number of doctoral dissertations about the United States, some of which were subsequently turned into books. About 50 dissertations on different fields of study were produced from 1996 through 2004, according to the Foundation for Coordinating Advancement in Higher Education (CAPES).

This increase in U.S. Studies academic and literary production is unquestionably related to an awakening on the part of Brazilian academia to the importance of the study of international relations—a phenomenon that has been recorded particularly

since the mid-1970s. In fact, according to available data,[5] until then, the study of international topics received very little attention, especially when compared with other areas. In addition, the scarce academic production in the area was focused, for reasons that were understandable at the time, on topics related to South America, with special emphasis on the Prata River Basin.

This change in the way in which the topic was dealt, with diversification of areas of study and primarily its systematization, only occurred at the end of the first half of the 1970s. In 1973, the University of São Paulo (USP) and the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP) began to offer their first courses entitled "International Relations." In 1974, the University of Brasília (UnB) went one step further, offering an undergraduate degree in International Relations.

Since then, the situation has changed greatly. International relations, foreign policy, and trade degree programs have proliferated, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, driven by developments such as globalization, Brazil's greater presence in the world arena, and Mercosul. For its part, the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations has sought to stimulate and support expanded studies and research in the area of international relations through an active dialogue with the academic community.

In addition, the number of graduate scholarships granted to Brazilian students who choose to complete specialization courses, masters, or doctoral degrees abroad has greatly increased, many of which in areas associated with Brazil's foreign relations (i.e. political science, international relations, history, and economics). Data from CAPES demonstrate that the absolute majority of such students prefer to remain in U.S. academic centers.

Notwithstanding this development, there is evidence that the attention given to the United States remains relatively scarce among Brazilian academics. Few are the academic disciplines that focus on U.S. topics. Even fewer are the programs or research centers specialized in the field. The reasons for such scarcity may be many, as are the responses to the situation. As a contribution to this discussion, a few questions and initial answers have been outlined below.

Possible Obstacles to the Development of U.S. Studies in Brazil:

- Lack of specialized centers, degree programs and academic disciplines;
- Difficulties in publishing dissertations on the subject;
- Difficulties in conducting field research due to a lack of funding;
- Difficulties in conducting field research as a result of problems with obtaining visas (especially after September 11th);
- Lack of interest or opposing bias on the part of some academic sectors;
- Lack of interest or opposing bias on the part of the population (readership);
- Non-existent or inoperative U.S. Studies associations (such as, for instance, in the United States, the Latin American Studies Association or the Brazilian Studies Association);

- Lack of specific conferences for meetings among experts on the topic;
- Difficulties regarding student exchanges, "sandwich" scholarships, etc.

Initial Suggestions to Remedy the Problem:

- Creating study and research centers (i.e. think tanks), etc;
- Creating degree programs and academic disciplines at higher education institutions;
- Establishing an association of U.S. Studies researchers, linked to entities such as the Brazilian International Relations Association (ABRI), the Brazilian Political Science Association (ABCP) or the National Association of Undergraduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences (Ampocs);
- Periodically organizing conferences in Brazil on topics related to the United States;
- Creating awards for dissertations, articles, and papers on topics related to the United States;
- Conducting lobbying efforts with U.S. entities for the purpose of having study or research scholarships granted to Brazilians interested in topics related to the United States;
- Participation of U.S. foundations in projects aimed at fostering the study of the United States in Brazil (i.e. Tinker Foundation, Ford Foundation, Fulbright Foundation, etc.);
- Developing comparative studies projects involving Brazilian and American research entities.

Endnotes

1. See Roderick J. Barman, *Citizen Emperor Pedro II and the Making of Brazil, 1825-1891*; and Lilia Moritz Schwarz, *As Barbas do Imperador: D. Pedro II, um Monarca nos Trópicos*.

2. The meetings between Presidents Lula and Bush, in June 2003 (in Washington) and November 2005 (in Brasília), resulted in the establishment of cooperation mechanisms in areas such as science and technology, education, health, the environment, trade promotion, and investment, which were added to those that already exist in the fields of agriculture, energy, and economic growth.

3. See Oliveira, Lúcia Lippi: "Diálogos Intermitentes: Relações entre Brasil e América Latina," in *Sociologias*, 2005, no. 14, pp. 110-129.

4. Rodó, J.E. *Ariel*, p. 70.

5. See Cheibub, Z. B. 1981 "Bibliografia Brasileira de Relações internacionais e Política Externa"; Cheibub, Z. B. and Lima, M. R. S. de. 1983 "Relações Internacionais e Política Externa Brasileira: Debate Intelectual e Produção Acadêmica"; Lima, M.R.S. de and Moura, G. 1981 "Brasil-Argentina: uma Bibliografia Comentada" *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, Rio de Janeiro, XXIV, p. 163-184; Miyamoto, S. 1999 "O Estudo das Relações Internacionais no Brasil: O Estado da Arte," *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, No. 012, June 1999, pp. 83-98.

GETTING TO KNOW THE UNITED STATES WELL IS GOOD FOR BRAZIL

Carlos Eduardo Lins da Silva*

Like it or not, the truth is that for all countries, especially those in the Western Hemisphere, what happens in the United States at the beginning of the 21st century has a significant influence on their economies, decision-making processes, and even social and cultural behaviors. The end of the Cold War and the beginning of the War on Terror has unleashed a new and unusual situation in the international arena: the existence of a single superpower, unquestionably superior to all other countries militarily, financially, productively, technologically, and creatively.

It is clear, as has been demonstrated in the complicated process of the intervention in Iraq, that U.S. might is far from unlimited and is not immune to powerful challenges. Even if it wanted to, Washington is not capable of freely imposing its will upon others. But no country can fail to take the United States into consideration in its own process of formulating domestic and international public policies.

Getting to know American society, its way of thinking, common motivations, decision-making mechanisms, administrative structure, shared values, internal contradictions, economic mechanisms, and cultural characteristics is – or should be – a high priority for any nation to be able to plan its domestic agenda for the future, whether or not it agrees with the policies carried out by those running the U.S. government at the time. Without enhancing such knowledge, a country is quite likely to err in its predictions of how the United States may act in a given situation in which its own strategic interest is involved. That, in turn, increases the likelihood that such a country might make decisions that, in the end, may harm its own interests.

Clearly, this line of thought also applies to Brazil, which resides in the same hemisphere as the United States. Geography, history, and culture have continually strengthened ties between these two nations, forging a common destiny that is stronger than either one alone. It is not necessary to emphasize how important the United States is for Brazil, not only economically, but also politically, scientifically, and culturally. In all these areas, the United States undoubtedly has been Brazil's principal partner since 1824, when it became the first country to recognize Brazil's independence.

Nevertheless, it is remarkable to note how often Brazilians are poorly informed or misinformed about the United States. This seems paradoxical given the massive U.S. "presence" in various aspects of the day-to-day lives of Brazilians, including

* Director, consulting firm Patri Relações Governamentais & Políticas Públicas.

the socially disadvantaged. Even among the most sophisticated and well-informed Brazilians, such as academics, business executives, and journalists, it is surprising to see how unaware they often are of the internal workings and nuances of life in the United States and how often they recite clichés and false assumptions when speaking about it.

A banal example was how the Brazilian elite was so surprised by the election and reelection of George W. Bush. Almost all the Brazilians who followed the U.S. elections with curiosity and interest were absolutely certain about the superiority, in every respect, of Al Gore and, even more emphatically, of John Kerry, and the benefits for U.S. society of their victory over Bush. To them, it was simply inconceivable that the result could be anything other than Bush's defeat.

On the other hand, even an intellectually unsophisticated Brazilian who is politically perceptive, and who has lived in the United States for a few years and only superficially following election campaigns, would have been capable of recognizing the likelihood of Bush's success. She would even be able to explain the reasons behind this as well.

Why? One possible answer is that the Brazilian intelligentsia has not yet been able to create a mode of analysis capable of understanding and explaining the complexities of life in the United States. There may be a variety of reasons for this: lack of resources, disinterest, prejudice, lack of suitable channels of communication, acceptance of the conventional wisdom, reluctance to challenge the status-quo, and a focus on other issues and regions of the world.

It is true that many highly respected Brazilian intellectuals have produced studies or conducted sophisticated analyses of the United States. In fact, earlier in this book, Ambassador Roberto Abdenur mentions several of them. Similar examples can be cited of more contemporary efforts made by Brazilian scholars to understand the United States. At the University of São Paulo, the International Situation Analysis Group (GACINT - Grupo de Análise de Conjuntura Internacional) meets bimonthly and two of its members are responsible for following political and economic developments that occur in the United States and analyzing their implications.

Likewise, in Rio de Janeiro, the Brazilian Center for International Relations (CEBRI - Centro Brasileiro de Relações Internacionais) established task forces in 2002 and 2006 to conduct comprehensive studies of the state of Brazil-U.S. relations, with successful results. The São Paulo-based Institute for Economic and International Studies (IEEI - Instituto de Estudos Econômicos e Internacionais) is yet another organization that has focused some of its intellectual resources on accurately assessing specific aspects of the American reality and is preparing to put an even greater focus on the subject area. At the American Chamber of Commerce in São Paulo, the international negotiations committee is expected to publicize, beginning in 2007, a "thermometer" of Brazil-U.S. relations based on a database produced over the course of a year with academic support.

Meanwhile, despite these worthwhile and substantive projects, there is no question that in Brazil there are not enough serious initiatives to systematically encourage and promote—at an intensity compatible with the importance of the United States—high-quality knowledge about how the country operates and which direction it is likely to go.

In contrast, even though Brazil has much less influence on the United States than vice versa, studies conducted by Brazilian Studies scholars ("Brazilianists") are much more comprehensive and substantive, as is reflected by the very existence of the vigorous BRASA (Brazilian Studies Association) and the countless centers and institutes dedicated solely to Brazilian issues at a variety of respected academic institutions, such as the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the Universities of Harvard, Stanford, Columbia, Georgetown, Pittsburgh, Johns Hopkins, and Texas, to name a few.

This disparity can be explained clearly by the most obvious of reasons. For one, the wealth of resources available for academic activities in the United States far surpasses the extremely limited resources of academic centers in Brazil. Likewise, U.S. think tanks have accumulated strength and reputations over the years, compared to the fragility of such a tradition in Brazil, where think tanks are just beginning to take root. Thirdly, the availability of diverse and relative abundant sources of funding for U.S. scholars to develop and conduct research vastly exceeds that available to Brazilian scholars. These are difficult problems to resolve, given that this would basically depend on Brazil achieving economic growth rates capable of permitting vast resources to activities often considered "superfluous" when compared to the provision of basic necessities, such as infrastructure, health, and education, that the country has yet to provide.

And yet, globalization is finally starting to bring a change of direction by making the detailed study of the U.S. reality (and that of other nations as well) a new imperative in Brazil. For example, Brazilian investments abroad have been increasing rapidly, and the United States is one of the most significant destinations. This is not a surprise given the size of the U.S. consumer market. The pragmatism intrinsic in the logic of capitalism certainly will make Brazilian business executives more susceptible to appeals by scholars to fund research aimed at fostering a better understanding of how American society operates, as their own personal interests are at stake.

It is not only funding difficulties, moreover, that hinder the implementation of "Americanist" studies, which are increasingly necessary for Brazil. There is also the burden of accumulated prejudice against the United States and against the corporate financing of research. Such a view is widely held among Brazilian intellectuals and thus prevents the development and realization of such studies. Overcoming these barriers may be even more difficult than overcoming the funding obstacles.

Nevertheless, the prospect of change is also on the horizon for these difficulties as well. During the past 15 to 20 years, international relations courses have proliferated

throughout Brazil. Most of them are of low academic quality and their motivations may be questioned. Even so, it is likely that from this copious universe of schools, professors, and students will emerge a small but substantial contingent of individuals less intolerant of the United States and better prepared and willing to conduct quality U.S. studies in Brazil.

Similarly, even at renowned public and private universities, where anti-American and anti-business prejudice is traditionally the most intense, it is possible to sense change—especially during these times when the death of ideology is being discussed. Over time, ideological resistance to studying the United States and to private sector financing of such studies may give way, even if only slowly and as a minority view.

In university institutions, other non-material hindrances to be overcome are the bureaucracy, self-interest, departmental parochialism, favoritism, nepotism, and other such improper practices that may have been more pernicious to Brazil's intellectual production than many economic and political obstacles, which Brazilians customarily blame for the shortcomings of their academic activity. Overcoming such barriers will certainly require more persistence, determination, and engagement, as well as a joint Brazilian-U.S. effort.

In order to significantly increase Brazilian production of high-quality studies about U.S. society, economics, politics, and culture, a variety of connected, independent, and complementary initiatives should be taken. One such proposal (which gave rise to this book) has already taken shape. This grew out of a meeting of Brazilian academics interested in the United States hosted by the Brazilian Embassy in Washington D.C. and the Woodrow Wilson Center Brazil Institute, in September 2006. This initiative will likely result in an entity based at a university or think tank in Brazil.

But it is important to raise awareness in Brazil of the notion that getting to know the United States better is good for Brazil. More than good, it is essentially necessary. Understanding a country does not necessarily mean supporting it. Even to fight against a country, one needs to know what it is, what it represents, and how it operates. It is now clear that the principal cause of the failure of the U.S. military intervention in Iraq was the profound ignorance that its architects had regarding the target of their invasion. Because the war's architects had not studied Iraq or listened to those who had, the United States got mired there and lost the war.

Reality imposes upon Brazil the task of getting to know the United States better. That task is fundamental to maintaining a stable, productive, and mutually advantageous bilateral relationship between the two countries. This entails overcoming inevitable disagreements on trade issues in a timely and balanced manner, while expanding investments and market access reciprocity. Above all, understanding the United States is essential for Brazil to be able to position itself geopolitically in the manner most propitious for advancing and defending its national interests on the world stage.

In order to achieve the task of better understanding the United States the Brazilian private sector must help build the appropriate mechanisms of interaction that are absent. This is how Mercosul was established: although political will was indeed essential to launching the idea, it was the vigor of investments, trade, and business deals between the private sectors of the four countries that made the common market grow so robustly during its best years.

While the same dynamic is not yet present in the economic relations between Brazil and the United States, it is necessary to foster some type of advocacy on the part of the many interested parties who are already convinced of the importance of this approach. Such advocacy should be pursued through mass media, governments, companies, universities, non-governmental organizations, labor unions, trade associations, think tanks, research institutions, and diplomatic entities.

SEDUCTIVE IMPERIALISM: THE AMERICANIZATION OF BRAZIL DURING WORLD WAR II

Antonio Pedro Tota*

American things are not making us deaf, but they are making us blind, and as in the classical image, we are like moths that the light attracts to their death.
Lima Barreto, "Nosso Ianquismo."
Revista Contemporânea, Rio de Janeiro, March 22nd, 1919

In mid-1942, the construction of *Parnamirim Field*, the well-known U.S. base in Natal, Brazil, was completed. U.S. soldiers and technicians began arriving in Brazil's Northeast by airplane, en route to North Africa in order to help British soldiers, trapped there by the Germans under the leadership of Rommel, the commander of the Africa Korps. In this way many Americans began living in the Northeast. In order to communicate—and receive clearance for starting their engines—with the Portuguese-speaking mechanics, American pilots would use body language: they would flash a fist with the thumb straight up. It was the "positive," the "thumbs up."[1]

Once the general populace of Brazilian Northeast imitated the "positive" sign with the thumb up, Brazil had Americanized. Luís da Câmara Cascudo, the renowned researcher of Brazilian popular culture and folklore who was fascinated with gestures, did not foresee the dimension of "thumbs up." Not only did it substitute the traditional gesture of clasping the earlobe with two fingers to indicate that something was good or positive, but the "thumbs up" also became synonymous with other expressions: agreement, friendship, beauty, good morning, good afternoon, and good night. It would be used, at least in Brazil, for almost everything. It was much more internationalized than the clasping of the earlobe had been until then. Thus, in the 1940s, the gesture, which symbolizes Brazilian Americanization, spread from Parnamirim Field throughout Brazil.

It was very difficult for many to admit that Brazil was becoming Americanized. "Americanization" was a perennial topic of discussion and was transformed into a polemical issue almost always associated with modernization. Academics, intellectuals, and artists argued extensively in favor or against. Ties between culture and economic dependence are evident in the analyses. Manichaeism was irresistible in the studies of Brazil's "Americanization." The quotation marks are significant. This phenomenon is often interpreted as a negative influence and a destroyer of Brazilian culture; just as

* Associate professor of History at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica, São Paulo.

often, however, it is seen as a paradigmatic and mythical force, capable of liberating and modernizing Brazilian society from cultural and economic lethargy.

To use Umberto Eco's terms to describe the attitude of intellectuals toward the impact of mass communication, both the "apocalyptics" and the "integrated" have contributed to keep up the lively discussion. But, they also have hindered a more substantial investigation of the nature of U.S. cultural influence through mass media. One cannot always blame the imperialism of the media for the influence and the superiority of other cultures over that of Brazil. By doing so one runs the risk of fetishizing this same media.[2]

From French to English

In the early 1930s, the *Carioca* [resident of Rio de Janeiro] musician and composer Lamartine Babo composed the fox-trot "Song for Englishman to See." The majority of the words in the verses were homophonic with English:

Ai love iú	*I love you*
Forget isclaine maine Itapiru	*Forget isclaine my Itapiru*
Forget faive ander uda ai shel	*Forget five under uda I shall*
no bonde Silva Manuel (money well)	*In the streetcar Silva Manuel (*money well*)*
[...]	*[...]*
Ai, Jesus!	*Oh, Jesus!*
Abacaxi, whiskey of chuchu	*Pineapple,* whiskey *of chayote*
Malacacheta independencin day	*Malacacheta independence day*
No strit flash me estrepei (step away)	*In the street flash I got screwed up* (step away)
Delícias do inhame	*Treats made of inhame*
Elixir de inhame	*Elixir of inhame*
Reclame de andaime	*Ad for the andaime*
Mon Paris, je teme	*My Paris, I love you*
Oh! yea! mai veri gud nait [...]	*Oh! yea! My very good night [...]*

Lamartine was known for the critical irony of his lyrics. The title itself, "Canção Para Inglês Ver" (Song for Englishman to See), is connected to the traditional relationship between Luso-Brazilian people, on one hand, and the English on the other. It is believed that the expression came from Dom João, the governing prince, in the first decade of the eighteenth century, who said when he arrived in Salvador, which was all lit up for his reception: "It is good for Englishmen to see."[3]

The spelling of the words in the Lamartine song is in "Portugenglish," following a trend of the 1920s that was critical of foreignisms, as for example, in the poetry and chronicles of Juó Bananére. The meaning of some words that Lamartine Babo used in this song cannot be found in an English dictionary. The critical view of foreign expressions acquires a character that is almost anthropophagic in the modernist sense: the whiskey was produced from *chuchu* (chayote), a vegetable used as an ingredient

of popular dishes, and not from Scottish malt or Kentucky corn. The "Ai love iú" (I love you) rhymes with the Itapirú word, of Tupi-Guarani origin. In 1933, it was Noel Rosa's turn. Rosa was one of the most popular samba composers, who criticized foreign influence in Brazilian culture in a famous tune at that time. He attacked "Americanization" with the song, "Não Tem Tradução" (It Is Untranslatable), a samba that shows the tensions and resistance of popular culture at a moment when an increased use of foreign expressions was noticeable in the media.

O cinema falado	*The talking picture*
É o grande culpado da transformação	*Is the great culprit of the transformation*
[...]	*[...]*
Se eu fizer uma falseta,	*If I make a misrepresentation*
A Risoleta	*Risoleta*
Desiste logo do francês	*Soon gives up the French*
E do inglês	*and the English*
[...]	*[...]*
Depois o malandro[4] *deixou de sambar*	*Afterwards the scoundrel stopped dancing samba*
Dando o pinote	*Jumping*
Na gafieira a dançar	*In the* gafieira (dance hall for popular music)
O fox trot	*To dance the fox-trot*
[...]	*[...]*
Da exibição	*Of the exhibition*
Não se lembra que o samba	*He does not remember that the samba*
Não tem tradução	*cannot be translated*
No idioma francês.	*Into French*
Tudo aquilo	*Everything*
Que o malandro pronuncia	*the scoundrel pronounces*
Com voz macia	*With a soft voice:*
É brasileiro:	*It is Brazilian*
Já passou de português...	*It is beyond Portuguese...*
Amor lá no morro é amor pra chuchu.	*Love back in the slums is intense love.*
E as rimas do samba não são I love you	*The rhythms of the samba are not I love you*
E esse negócio de alô	*and this business of "hello"*
Alô boy, Alô Jone,	*Hello boy, Hello John*
Só pode ser conversa de telefone.	*Can be only telephone chat*

Both Noel and Lamartine—each in their own way—criticized the "Americanization" of Brazilian society. They also criticized the traditional French influence, which was already diminishing around that time. A paradigmatic change was emerging in the mid-1930s. Liberal Europe was equated with things out of fashion. Modernization came from North America, or for some, from Germany.

Excluding the quotation marks, the questions remain: what exactly was the meaning of the Americanization of Brazilian society? Is it possible to determine the moment when this process began?

Americanism as a Paradigm

In 1940, a small incident occurred in Brazilian show business which demonstrated that Americanization had to overcome some resistance from an important sector of Brazilian society. On the night of July 15, the Carioca elite gave Carmen Miranda the cold shoulder during her show in the Urca Casino in Rio de Janeiro. She had just arrived from New York, where she had performed on Broadway, on the radio, and in the movies.

At the beginning of the show, Carmen greeted the audience, "Good night, people." The public did not even react to her incorrect English: the proper greeting would have been, "Good evening." Even the joking attitude of the singer, known as the Brazilian Bombshell, was not accepted by the public. The atmosphere worsened later when she sang "The South American Way," a rumba by Jimmy McHugh and Al Dubin, which in her interpretation, resembled a samba. Dead silence was the reaction of the audience who had gone to the Urca Casino to see Miranda.

Perhaps the audience did not react solely in defense of both Brazilian nationalism and popular culture, which was being bombarded by one of its most popular representatives. To those Brazilians, any cultural manifestation, even if it was popular, could not come from the Americas and, much less, from the United States, which had been always identified with "barbarian" mass culture. The Portuguese writer Eça de Queirós synthesizes this social group. For them, there was "more civilization in a Parisian alley than in all of New York." The paradigm was Europe, and in particular, France. The audience at the Urca Casino on July 15 found Carmen Americanized and somehow vulgarized, and very distant from the civilized alleys of Paris.

Two months later, the offended Carmen Miranda retaliated for the cold reception. In the same Urca Casino, she performed the samba, "They Say I Returned Americanized" (*Disseram que voltei americanizada*), composed with typical Brazilian *molho* ("soul," literally, "sauce") by Vicente Paiva and Luís Peixoto.

E disseram que voltei americanizada,	*They said that I came back Americanized,*
Com o burro do dinheiro,	*With a lot of money,*
Que estou muito rica,	*That I am very rich,*
Que não suporto mais o breque de um pandeiro	*That I no longer support the beat of the tambourine*
[...]	*[...]*
Que já não tenho mais molho,	*That I no longer have* molho,
Ritmo nem nada.	*Rhythm, or anything.*
E dos balangandãs	*And the* balangandãs (bracelets and necklaces)
Não existe mais nenhum [...]	*Do not exist anymore [...]*
Mas pra cima de mim	*But why project on me*
.	

Pra que tanto veneno?	*So much poison?*
Eu posso lá ficar americanizada?	*Can I be Americanized?*
Eu que nasci com o samba	*I, who was born with the* samba
e vivo no sereno,	*and live in the fog,*
Nas rodas de malandros,	*In the circles of the* malandros,
Minhas preferidas.	*My favorite circles.*
Eu digo mesmo eu te amo	*I really say* te amo
E nunca I love you,	*and never* I love you,
Enquanto houver Brasil.	*While there is Brazil.*

Carmen Miranda sang in the most traditional style of the Carioca samba singers, the style that had characterized her as a Brazilian performer. In the second part of the samba, when she replies, "But why project on me" (or "why do you come to me with that attitude?") she changes her tone, giving to her voice a touch of the *malandro.* At the end of the song she pronounces the word "Brasil" as southerners do—such as politicians like President Getúlio Vargas—by stressing the letter "L." However, the singer who had reaffirmed her genuine Brazilian identity soon returned to the United States and was swallowed up by the Hollywood machinery.

The world situation of the 1940s suggested to U.S. foreign policymakers that attitudes such as those of the audience at the Urca Casino on July 15 needed to be examined carefully. Brazil was seen as an important partner in the hemisphere and the safest way to guarantee this partnership was to Americanize Brazil by peaceful means. The Americanization of Brazilian society could minimize some resistance to political ties between the United States and Brazil. Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy was the instrument with wide scope for the execution of the Americanization plan. The fine-tuning of the operation was carried out, as we will see, by a true "factory of ideologies," created by the American government. Inside this "factory," Americanism—understood here as a programmatic ideology—was redefined with specific "raw materials," in which the suffix "ism" had been transformed into a powerful intentional tool, with the clear objective of replacing other "isms," whether indigenous or not. Americanization was the process of "selling" this ideology on the "weaker cultures" of Latin America.

Americanism can be better understood if we analyze some of its more important elements that took shape in the United States mainly during the first half of the twentieth century.[5] One such element is democracy, always associated with U.S. heroes, and, especially with the ideas of freedom, individual rights, and independence. Democracy, freedom, and individual rights were guaranteed for all U.S. citizens, regardless of social class, religion, and race.

However, the more important ideological component of Americanism is progressivism. Strongly rooted in American culture, it is related to rationalism and to the idea of abundance, as well as the creative ability of the North American person, so-called American ingenuity. This dimension of Americanism exalted the free and

energetic man, capable of transforming the natural world. Thanks to this, the market could offer some useful and attractive products in abundance, creating a new form of pleasure: the pleasure of consumption. As these products became available to all, independently of their class in society, life would be easier, enjoyable, and enriching.

The same can be said about music. The rhythm of swing and Glenn Miller's Big Band was much more attractive than the German martial music of military bands, or the SS goose-step. Almost everything was dictated by the rhythm of money-generating capitalism. It was irresistible. Or, as professor Richard Morse liked to say: one can tap your foot to it, making a connection between U.S. popular music and Americanization. Once the difficulties of modern life were eliminated, the roots of social dissatisfaction would be removed. Social peace would be achieved by generalized consumption. Some key words had acquired a mythical meaning in the ideology of Americanism: progress, science, technology, abundance, rationality, efficiency, scientific management, and the American way of life. In short, as Charles Maland pointed out, "economic growth provides the opportunity to meet social needs, to defuse class conflict, and bring blue-collar workers into the middle class."

Traditionalism is another important element in the ideology of Americanism. There exists the myth of the pure and healthy life on the farm, the close relationship with nature, the small town**,** the high regard for family values, individual courage, and the fear of God. Everything, in reality, had validity only for white, Anglo-Saxons, fundamentalists, anti-communists, and passionate imperialists. Indeed, the democracy-slavery paradox—present in the origins of Americanism—was swept away by Grant and Sherman's troops at the end of the Civil War. On behalf of the Union, slavery was abolished and a more dynamic market economy was put in place by force through the reconstruction policies of magnates from the North.

Regional differences diminished through the implacable advance of the components of dynamic and standardized American modernization, such as railroads, the telegraph, the telephone, newspaper, and photography. The standardization took place at all levels. The cinema, the greatest of all U.S. innovations in entertainment, disseminated the American way of life more than any other media. The movies Americanized the United States first and then the other countries of the Americas shortly after. It disseminated the bucolic image of the pioneer past, farmers, small towns**,** the simple life—in sum, traditionalism, by means of modern and complex mass media. *Movie-Made America* is the remarkable title of Robert Sklar's book. It was a commercialized Americanism. In the first half of the Nineteenth century, Alexis de Tocqueville had already foreseen U.S. power and the subsequent Americanism over Ibero-America:

> It is unquestionable that North Americans will one day be called upon to supply the wants of the South Americans. Nature has placed them in contiguity and has furnished the former with every means of knowing and appreciating those de-

mands, of establishing permanent relations with those states and gradually filling their markets. The merchant of the United States could only forfeit these natural advantages if he were inferior to the European merchant; but he is superior to him in several respects. The Americans of the United States already exercise a great moral influence upon all nations of the New World. They are the source of intelligence, and all those who inhabit the same continent are already accustomed to consider them as the most enlightened, the most powerful, and the most wealthy members of the great American family. All eyes are therefore turned toward the United States: these are the models which the other communities try to imitate to the best of their power; it is from the Union that they borrow their political principles and their laws.

The Americans of the United States stand in precisely the same position with regard to the South Americans as their fathers, the English, occupy with regard to the Italians, the Spaniards, the Portuguese, and all those nations of Europe that receive their articles of daily consumption from England because they are less advanced in civilization and trade. England is at this time the natural emporium of almost all the nations that are within its reach; the American Union will perform the same part in the other hemisphere, and every community which is founded or which prospers in the New World is founded and prospers to the advantage of the Anglo-Americans."[6]

In the world situation of the 1940s, the Tocquevillian idea of the propensity of the Americas to Americanism was more real than ever. A considerable part of the world was practically inaccessible to the United States. Nazi-fascist-dominated Europe was, in a sense, out of reach to the North Americans.

Of all the ideological components of Americanism, progressivism was the best suited "to conquer" the "other Americas" because of its simple and direct character: i.e., to work, to produce, to earn money, and to consume. The other ideological components of Americanism were inherent and present in progressivism in an abridged form.

Germanism as an Alternative Paradigm

To strengthen Brazil's sovereignty, many Brazilians tried to point out paths to the country's future. During the administration of Dom Pedro II, for instance, some liberal thinkers such as Tavares Bastos and Andre Rebouças exalted the republican U.S. formula. On the opposite side was Eduardo Prado, a conservative thinker inspired by the country's past and the British regime, repudiated the formula and defended the monarchy. At the time of World War I, a book intended for "active Brazilians with courage and strong will" suggested Germany as a "third way," in order to avoid

British and Yankee influences. Dunshee de Abranches, an outsider thinker, wrote in *A Ilusão Brasileira* (The Brazilian Illusion), "Germany, which after 25 years of wise and happy internal reconstruction, had changed from a third-ranked country to a *leading power*, was worthy of being imitated by us, who possess the most vast and productive territory in the New World."[7] Abranches emphasized that, compared with other European countries, Germany had shown superiority in all fields. He believed that Brazil, a country with even more resources, could do as well or even better than Germany by putting an end to the perennial extortion caused by the association with "Perfidious Albion," as England was termed by the Frenchmen.

In the United States, the formulation of Americanism was the ideology that explained the modernization of the nation in the New World. In Germany, through *Germanism*, the ideological justification for expansion and modernization was sought in a conservative manner. Abranches saw Germany as a model country during World War I. This concept was echoed among certain Brazilians who were part of the power structure in Brazil at the time of World War II. During the 1930s and early 1940s, many Brazilians thinking about their country's future were attracted to the ideology of *Germanism*. *Germanism* was another paradigm, which presented an alternative to dependence on England and the increasing influence of the United States. Therefore, the North American Republic, with its Americanism, would have to supersede the Germanic paradigm. The United States would have to be accepted as a more viable model than the fascinating Germanic model, at that moment a well-oiled and apparently invincible war machine.

The technological and consumerist aspect of Americanism was not appreciated by a significant sector of officers of the Brazilian Armed Forces. The military identified the mass production of gadgets by U.S. industries with the wastefulness of an excessively materialized and commercialized society. For many Brazilian military officers, the autarchic Nazi-Germany model was apparently a more appropriate paradigm at that moment. The relentless advance of the Nazis in Eastern Europe during the first half of the 1940s engendered enthusiasm not only among high levels of the Brazilian government, but also among Brazilians of German descent living in the South who were not fully integrated into Brazilian society. The German colonies in the southern states of Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catarina, and Paraná had already been reached by Berlin Radio's airwaves.

The "fascinating" side of fascism gave more luster to the Germanic model. The power of attraction of the elegance and sensuality of fascism was felt by a character in Sartre's novel *La mort dans l'âme*. While watching the march of German soldiers into Paris, Daniel was "delighted by their beautiful hair, their tanned faces, with eyes that looked like iced lakes, their slender bodies, their incredibly long and muscular hips.... A delicious, unbearable sensation, spread all over his body...he repeated, gasping: 'As if they were butter—they are entering Paris as if they were butter.'...He would have liked to have been a woman to toss them flowers."[8]

If some masochistic Frenchmen were delighted by the Nazi victory, what is to be said about the population of Germanic origin from the south of Brazil? Could it be that in the eyes of Brazil's officers, German soldiers seemed to be more elegant and better fighters than the French with their khaki uniforms? For Susan Sontag, the Nazi soldiers were aesthetically more attractive. Especially the SS soldiers, with their well-cut uniforms, black boots that seemed to compel the soldiers to stand erect, and white gloves hiding their hands. This elegance made the American soldiers look like salesmen in civilian clothes, with their neckties and shoes with laces.[9] Thus, Brazil's aesthetic-military paradigm became Germany.

Even Frank Capra, considered to be one of the most distinguished "manufacturers" of the American dream, was impressed with the aesthetic side of Nazi ideology. In April 1942, Capra and Anatole Litvak went to the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and in a special screening watched *Triumph of the Will*, the already famous film by Leni Riefenstahl. Capra was astonished:

> It scared the hell out of me. My first reaction was that we were already dead, we couldn't win that war...just exactly as the Austrian did and the Czechoslovakians did and the Channel countries did. That picture just won them over....When I saw it, I just thought, 'How can we possibly cope with this enormous machine and enormous will to fight?' Surrender or you're dead – that was what the film was saying to you.[10]

Frank Capra, who felt terrified by "fascinating fascism," was the aesthete momentarily distanced from U.S. cultural and marketing reality. The film transformed power into spectacle, politics into aesthetic: a demonstration of camaraderie, youth, willpower of the people (*Volk*), and blood. But, outside the deeply idealized context of that historical German moment, the marches, the speeches, the parades, the torches, and the references to the heathen cults of the primitive Germanic tribes had almost no significance. The German model touched the heart of some *integralistas* and isolated officers of the Brazilian Army, but only for a short time: It did not take them long to convert to Americanization. When Capra recovered from the impact, he retaliated with the series he produced together with Litvak, "Why We Fight," aimed at the soldiers on the front; a documentary with propagandistic intentions sponsored by the Office of War Information and the Signal Corps, a movie company linked to the U.S. Armed Forces. The series had little impact beyond the barracks. It is currently an integral part of the archives on World War II. Capra's commercial films, such as, for example, *It's a Wonderful Life*, were a much more efficient vehicle for the American way of life. In other words, the market was the best road to Americanization.

The German model was not easy to understand, and it was difficult to adapt to Brazilian reality. The Nazi autarchic pattern was rooted in the remote past of German history, mixed with fragments of conservative imperial culture and the

modernization of the Weimar age. In sum, Nazi Germany was based on the project of self-sufficiency. The ideological project was strengthened by a combination of traditional culture, racism, and enlightened rationalism.[11] Furthermore, one must add to all of this the idea developed at that time by an arsenal of war literature, the result of *Fronterlebnis* (war experience at the front), which portrayed Germany with a more masculine culture. A generation was forged capable of fighting *Amerikanismus,* which was seen as a "veritable plague" with its Taylorism, its mass production and consumption, and the rationalism of its industry, and as a threat to the German spirit. For the German right wing, *Fronterlebnis* produced strong souls to fight the American way of life and its escapism.

This formulation, which seemed to transform Nazi Germany into a significant world power, captured the attention of some Brazilian Army officers. General Pedro Aurélio de Góis Monteiro was invited to attend one of the many huge military parades in Berlin. Góis Monteiro did not manage to visit Germany, but in one way or another, a project of self-supported expansionism remained in the thinking of the military officers of the 1930 Revolution. Although Brazil did not have the past technical experiences that came from schools of engineering,[12] it had more natural resources than Germany.

Until Brazil reached technical independence, the Brazilian government could buy weapons and machines produced in the great German industries, under the system of compensation offered by the Germans. Already in 1935, "the Brazilian government made an informal compensation arrangement with Germany, in spite of having signed a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States in February of the same year. Finance Minister Arthur da Souza Costa defended this move, arguing that certain Brazilian commercial interests depended on the compensation system to export their products to Germany, while others used it to import German goods."[13]

The manifestation of the Brazilian government's autonomy generated protest from the U.S. government. But for the more nationalistic military sector, such attitudes of independence in Brazilian commercial relations strengthened the idea of distancing Brazil from the orbit of the U.S. economy. At the same time, it would divest itself from the feminine image of Latin America portrayed by the U.S. press since the end of the nineteenth century.[14] This image would change through a *Fronterlebnis* transposed to Brazilian reality and forged in the remote Paraguay War (1865–1870), in Canudos, (the backland peasants rebellion in the Northeast at the end of 20th century) in the Contestado (the peasant rebellion in the South at the beginning of the 20th century), in the military upheavals of 1922, 1924, and 1926–27, in the movement of 1930, and the brief battles against leftists in 1935.

However, the formulations of the military were hindered by Brazilian historic-cultural reality, which demanded different mechanisms from the German model. President Getúlio Vargas seemed to better understand the difference; on the international level he tried to maintain equidistant relations with "mercantile Yankee

imperialism" and "romanticist Germanic imperialism." This game was not easily understood by the general staff of the Armed Forces. Some of President Roosevelt's skillful and sensible advisors on U.S. foreign policy were paying attention to the conflicts of Brazilian internal politics.

As previously mentioned, German expansionism threatened the hemisphere and the equilibrium set by the interests of the United States. Three days before the swastika flew from the Eiffel Tower, President Vargas took advantage of the situation: his speech on board the battleship *Minas Gerais,* delivered on June 11, 1940, is known for its dubious message: "we march toward a different future...the time for short-sighted liberalisms, sterile demagogies is over...the energetic peoples suitable for life need to follow their aspirations."[15] He commented on the repercussions of the speech in his diary.[16] Many saw the speech as Germanophile; that is, at least, what it sounded like to England. The United States was initially surprised. A diplomatic discussion took place involving Chancellor Oswaldo Aranha, U.S. Ambassador Caffery, and Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles. However, the tense situation was evaded.

A few days after having criticized the democracies, Vargas had been skillful enough to show his support for the policy of pan-American solidarity proposed by President Roosevelt. On June 12, Vargas had already recorded in his diary: "We began the talks on our war planning with the head of the American military mission, our military people, and the minister of the exterior."[17] The game of Brazil's head of state yielded its first results.

The Good Neighbor Policy, the Intellectuals and Americanism

There is no denying that World War II was the turning point in the history of cultural relations between Brazil and the United States. However, the idea of the Good Neighbor Policy, which included culture in the international agenda, was developed a few years earlier during the government of the Republican President Herbert Hoover. Elected in November 1928, President Hoover embarked on a trip through Latin America that, according to him, was not exactly a recreational trip. He intended to change some important aspects of U.S. foreign policy. As soon as he arrived in Honduras, President Hoover gave a speech in which the expression "good neighbor" was used,[18] which later would be adopted by President Roosevelt in 1933.

Hoover was preparing the ground for his Latin America foreign policy. However, he was not well received in all the countries he visited. Argentina and Uruguay showed little enthusiasm. In Buenos Aires there were protests against the presence of the U.S. president. But when President Hoover arrived in Rio de Janeiro, on December 21, 1928, he received a warmer welcome.[19] The poet Oswald de Andrade also welcomed the North American leader in his own way:

Hip! Hip! Hoover! Poetical message to the Brazilian people

América do Sul	*America of the South*
América do Sol	*America of the Sun*
América do Sal [...]	*America of the Salt [...]*
Onde vem o presidente eleito	*Visited by the president-elect*
Da grande democracia americana	*Of the great American democracy*
Comboiado no ar	*Convoyed in the air*
Pelo vôo dos aeroplanos	*with the flight of the airplanes*
e por todos os passarinhos do Brasil	*and all the birds of Brazil*
As corporações e as famílias	*The corporations and the families*
Essas já saíram pelas ruas	*Already had left for the streets*
na ânsia	*Anxious*
De o ver	*to see*
Hoover!	*Hoover!*
E este país ficou que nem antes da descoberta [...]	*And this country was as it was before the discovery [...]*
Mas que mania	*But what obsession*
a polícia persegue os operários	*the police pursued the laborers*
Até neste dia	*Even on this day*
Em que eles só querem	*In which they only want*
O ver	*To see him*
Hoover! [...]	*Hoover! [...]*

The verses of Oswald de Andrade disclosed the critique by sectors of the Brazilian intelligentsia regarding the growing presence of the Anglo-Americans in the country. They also disclosed the disagreement on racism, as seen in the work of Mário de Andrade:

Mas por que tanta esquivança!	*But why so much escapism*
Lá tem boa vizinhança	*Is there any good neighborhood*
Com prisões de ouro maciço	*With massive gold prisons*
lá te darão bem bom lanche	*There they will give very good lunch*
e também muito bom linche	*and also very good lynching*
Mas se você não é negro	*But if you are not black*
O que você tem com isso!	*What do you care!*
No, I'll never be	*No, I'll never be in*
in Color Line Land […][20]	*Color Line Land [...]*

For a long time Americanism had forged a discrediting image of Latin America. The white Protestant man was valued. He was always mentioned as leading progress in the fight against uncivilized life, and created an opposite image for Latin Americans. According to this concept, to the south of the Rio Grande was the America of the Indians, the blacks, the women, and the children. America needed to learn the lessons of progress and capitalism to abandon this "inferior" position. Ultimately, America needed to be domesticated.[21]

Some U.S. intellectuals began to criticize this superiority image, mainly after World War I. Those were the 1920s – the "splendid drunken twenties" of the United States. The years of nonconformism and flappers, as carefree, young women who liked to dance were known. The Brazilian term for flappers was *melindrosas*.

At this time, a generation of U.S. intellectuals, started to question the segregation and materialist-consumerist character of their society. They criticized, above all, the prejudiced interpretations formed in the drunken twenties that some periodicals made of Latin American cultural peculiarity. These intellectuals believed that it was essential to understand what were commonly regarded as negative qualities: the "savage" and "natural" aspect of certain social groups of their own country and of the Latin American peoples. It was a phase of introspection for these intellectuals. It was necessary to understand the savage forces and not deprecate them. This was a route to a more spiritual United States, in which nature was the source for regeneration.[22] This approach tried to keep alive the idea that the Wild West frontier had not died. Many went looking for the pure and genuine values of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. They learned their customs, dances, food, music, and even slept with them, all with the intention of criticizing the American way of life. The idea to go to the origins was what guided young U.S. thinkers such as Mary Austin, Franz Boas, John Collier, Robert Herrick, and Lewis Mumford. All of them in a certain way engaged Indians and criticized the addicted, capitalist, and materialistic American culture. Perhaps this is one of the bases of "Freyrian" Brazilian sociology: Gilberto Freyre had connections with Franz Boas.

From Indians to women, from women to children, from children to blacks and their folkloric music. From there to jazz, which white people such as Gershwin took upon themselves to incorporate into concert music. It is "natural" that Latin America was the next step. According to Frederick Pike, "Latin America's cultural and racial *mestizaje,* instead of being taken as a badge of inferiority, became now a symbol of hope to a generation intent upon synthetisizing culture and nature, rather than obliterating nature so as to safeguard cultures."[23]

One of the intellectuals who had searched for this synthesis most intensely was Waldo Frank. According to Frederick Pike, Frank has to be understood as an integral part of a generation of East Coast Jewish intellectuals who stood for a messianic and millenarian concept of history. The idea of the American melting pot, according to Frank, should be carried beyond U.S. borders. The Kabbalah supplied the basis for a curious theory of integration between the North and the South of the continent: the feminine aspect of God (shekhinah) had been separated from its divine head; later a sacred marriage joined the parts again, forming a union of God with the feminine principles. Frank drank from this source and created the popularized interpretation according to which the United States always had been seen as the masculine part and the Latin peoples as the feminine part of the Americas.[24] For him there should be a union between the feminine and the masculine parts of America, and not the domination of one over the other.

Frank and other intellectuals of that time believed that Latin America should not follow the steps of U.S. historical development, which had produced an excessively materialistic society. With the help of its intellectuals, Latin America should deepen its mystical sensitivity and help North Americans recuperate their lost spirituality, their pioneering past. In 1942, during a trip through Latin America, Waldo Frank spread such interpretations. It was not by chance that the Good Neighbor Policy was understood by some sectors in Latin America as the first phase of sincere relations with the United States.

These were the intellectuals that opened avenues to the U.S. government in order to create new ways of interpretations of the Latin American countries. The conditions that would be used as the basis for relations with Latin America were created during the government of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt with the Good Neighbor Policy.

From Anglo-Saxon America to Ibero-America

One of the tasks of the Good Neighbor Policy was to change the image that Latin Americans had of Anglo-Americans. This image was synthesized by the dictator of *El Recurso del Método* (Reasons of State), by Alejo Carpentier: "Por muy bien cortado que esté un frac, puesto sobre el lomo de un yanqui parece siempre un frac de prestidigitador" (A tuxedo – no matter how well cut – once put on the shoulders of a Yankee always looks like the tuxedo of a magician).

For public opinion on the subcontinent, U.S. citizens had always been associated with the arrogance, bad taste, and superiority of the Uncle Sam image with his Mephistophelian goatee: Uncle Sam was simultaneously a ridiculed, comical, and fierce figure with his flawless top hat threatening the Latin American peoples.

New times introduce new images. Already in 1938, arrogance was coming from German Ambassador Karl Ritter, who insulted Chancellor Oswaldo Aranha.[25] The old image of the unstylish U.S. mannerisms contrasted with the European elegance of Ambassador Jefferson Caffery: the refinement of this Southern gentleman belied the association of his tuxedo used in official ceremonies with the image of any magician.

Nelson Rockefeller was one of those responsible for this change by "spreading among the Latinos the information that the Yankees...had a genuine interest in promoting a better way of life: they were not cultural barbarians, as frequently portrayed by Latin American intellectuals."[26] One of the most important tools for this task was the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs lead by Nelson Rockefeller, which this author calls the "Factory of Ideologies."

Latin America: Nelson Rockefeller's Manifest Destiny

The success of German forces in Western Europe, given the conquest of Denmark, Norway, Belgium, and Holland, and later with the invasion of France, was more than

enough to make the United States feel threatened. Evidently, both Central and South America were also included in the war plans of the Axis. It was believed that England alone would not be able to subdue the powerful Nazi war machine.

Isolationist-guided U.S. foreign policy and neutrality became the subject of intense debate in the country's political circles. In spite of an official declaration of reaffirmed neutrality on September 5, 1939, U.S. public opinion's isolationist profile changed between the time of the invasion of Poland in September 1939 and the defeat of France in June 1940. In a radio announcement, President Roosevelt stated that the country would remain outside the conflict, but that he could not demand the neutrality of all U.S. citizens.

On June 10, 1940, as its vanquished government left Paris, French Prime-Minister Paul Raynaud made a dramatic request for Roosevelt's help, which complicated continued U.S. neutrality. The isolationists, led by such people as Charles Lindbergh and Herbert Hoover, organized in the so-called America First Committee, lost ground. In late June, Congress approved the Burke-Wadsworth Act which created the first peacetime draft in U.S. history. In early 1941, the United States already had called up and was training 1.6 million soldiers.

Acting against U.S. political tradition, President Roosevelt tried to run for a third term in the presidential elections of 1940. Latin America held an important function in this process. In the campaign, Roosevelt gave increasing emphasis to defense and continental cooperation, which guaranteed the support of certain Republicans. This approach bolstered the sectors that advocated strengthening relations with Latin America.

The most agile and dynamic of the private groups that were urgently proposing closer relations with Latin America was led by the multimillionaire Republican Nelson Rockefeller, who had donated $25,000[27] to the Democratic Party campaign. The Republicans had been weakened without the support of Rockefeller, and Roosevelt was reelected with 54 percent of the vote.

In this context the U.S. government developed, not without major controversy, its policy toward Latin America. The evangelist "missionary" Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller was to play an important role in this policy. Nelson was the second son of John D. Rockefeller Jr., of the well-known family of multimillionaires who owned Standard Oil, a company present in many Latin America countries. He graduated in economics from Dartmouth College in 1930. Rockefeller was not an above-average student, nor did he have a vocation for business, as he confessed in a few letters to his father. However, he had an interest in the arts, which he seemed to have inherited from his mother's side of the family. Familiarity with the arts was used skillfully by Nelson to navigate between politics and business.

According to President Roosevelt, not only the United States, but all of the Americas had to be transformed into a hemispheric stronghold. At the pan-American meeting of September-October 1939, held at the behest of the United States, American

countries formed a commission that founded the Inter-American Economic and Financial Council. The U.S. representative also obtained approval for the formation of a neutrality zone of 300 miles around the two American continents. This measure proved ineffective: at the end of the year, the Prata estuary was scene of a naval battle involving the German ship Graf Spee and a British squadron.

After the Nazi army invaded Denmark in April 1940, U.S. foreign policy urgently needed to formulate a way to guarantee the hemisphere's security. The misery caused by the economic backwardness of Latin American countries could foment revolutions from nationalists, socialists, or sympathizers of Nazi-fascism which would jeopardize U.S. interests in the region. In mid-1940, the Inter-American Commission of Development was founded with the objective of promoting the economic potential of the "other American Republics." In the eyes of U.S. strategists, the economic, social, and also military weakness of the Latin American countries was a direct threat to the interests of the United States.

During the 1940 election campaign, two groups had formulated different proposals for a Latin America policy. The first was led by Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles, assisted by Adolf Berle, the secretary's assistant, and by the Leader of the pan-American Union, Leo Rowe. The second, led by Nelson Rockefeller (and previously mentioned), was not as well known, nor official, but was noticed by influential politicians. The group called itself the *Junta*, in a reference to Latin American dictatorships. The *Junta*'s most prominent personality was Beardesley Ruml, the treasurer of Macy's, who became the link between Rockefeller and Washington. Harry Hopkins, the secretary of Commerce and President Roosevelt's alter ego, introduced Rockefeller to the president, who, with an eye on his re-election, accepted the magnate's invitation to participate in a short-wave radio program transmitted to Latin America directly from the New York Museum of Modern Art. From then on, Nelson Rockefeller's political trajectory was remarkable.

A plan with economic and political measures for Latin America was devised at the *Junta*'s meetings in Rockefeller's luxurious apartment on Fifth Avenue. The objective was to impede the increase in trade and influence of the Axis in the hemisphere. To achieve this, the United States would have to adjust its policies to the rising nationalistic movements, instead of fighting them. At the moment when Paris was being taken by the Nazis on June 14, 1940, Nelson Rockefeller arrived in Washington and presented his plan to Secretary Harry Hopkins, who suggested that he send it to President Roosevelt. The next day, Roosevelt submitted Rockefeller's proposal to the Commission of Inter-American Affairs, formed by the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Treasury. The memorandum was accompanied by a note from President Roosevelt in which he said he was anxious for a rapid response on the proposals related to Latin America, which he hoped to obtain by June 20.[28]

The memorandum, entitled "Hemisphere Economic Policy," was a synthesis of the text written by Rockefeller and his *Junta*. It criticized bureaucratic formulas de-

veloped in several long pan-American meetings and argued that the most efficient way to fight totalitarianism was to adopt measures that made the Latin American economy more competitive. The security of the United Sates depended on close economic and cultural cooperation with all the governments of the Americas. It would be possible to make a qualitative leap in the living conditions of Latin America's peoples with emergency measures such as the purchase of the agricultural and mineral production of the region. Rockefeller was putting into practice the experience he had gained during his trips with Rovensky to the Standard Oil fields. During these trips, he realized the urgent necessity to modify the relationship of the company with the inhabitants of the "host" countries. The objective of this *realpolitik* was to control anti-Americanism by peaceful means, because armed intervention by United States was not part of the plans of the Good Neighbor Policy promoted by President Roosevelt and his closest advisors.

The group's proposal had a big advantage over the others that came from government organisms: it was supported by Rockefeller's fantastic financial power and was independent of the bureaucracy.[29] The *Junta*'s program was very bold: suggestions that the United States reduces or eliminates taxes on products imported from the "other Americas;" the development of a more appropriate transportation system for the distribution of Latin American products; incentives for investments, with the objective of assuring production of raw materials, etc. External debt should be analyzed according to a realistic point of view, that is, according to the possibilities of the debtor instead of the requirements of the creditor. It criticized U.S. functionaries who worked in Latin America: they lacked knowledge of local culture and local needs.

To be successful, the program would have to promote the integration of the federal government with private initiative. An interdepartmental commission, assisted by representatives of private companies, would be in charge to assure the successful realization of the project.

The Creation of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs

To prevent possible rivalries between departments, Nelson Rockefeller was skillful enough not to openly suggest his name as coordinator for the program, even though he was eager to occupy a position in the government. But, as the intense conflict of interest among the New Dealers hindered the peaceful choice of a leader for the new agency, the president preferred the name of Nelson Rockefeller just the same. Not having any official relationship with the Roosevelt government, Rockefeller had created the conditions to have his name suggested: he was "neutral" and Republican. This was exactly what happened. At age 32, Nelson Rockefeller was hoisted into the political machinery of the Roosevelt government. The Office for Coordination and Cultural Relations between the Americas was created on August 16, 1940, and its

direction assigned to the young millionaire. In the following year, the agency would change its name to Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA) which clearly reflects the increase in Rockefeller's authority: it evolved from an office of coordination, to the office of *the coordinator.*

The Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the Americas was composed of three divisions: the Commercial and Financial Division, the Division of Communications, and the Division of Cultural Relations. Political economic objectives were at the heart of the Office's agenda regarding a "hemisphere economic policy." However, to reach this objective, cultural activities and communication received highest priority. From the beginning, Rockefeller hoped that, with financial aid, he could politically stabilize the region south of the Rio Grande. Without a doubt, he was involved in the fight against the Nazi expansion, but the political vision of the entrepreneur prevailed; he wanted to bar German products that competed with U.S. products in Latin America. Simultaneously, socialist proposals that pointed out the capital-labor antagonism could be stamped out with the propaganda of the U.S. model: consumption of wonderful products, material progress, and good salaries.[30] The industrialization of the subcontinent would, therefore, have to be stimulated and linked with the intensification of trade relations. In order to expedite these relations the implementation of a communications network was deemed necessary.

In the months following the creation of the Office, many projects in the economic realm were launched. One year after its formation, the coordinator wrote to Vice President Wallace that all the energy of the group had been spent in the construction of solid economic relations between the north and the south of the American continent. The flow of trade between the United States and Latin America had noticeably grown. In this short period, Eximbank (Export-Import Bank) loans for Latin American countries had jumped by more than $200 million to $700 million. U. S. strategists began to stockpile Latin American products.

After the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and the United States joined the war against the Axis, the range of products bought from Latin America increased. Brazilian rubber and quartz acquired a vital role in the hemisphere's defense. In the area of cultural relations, a lot of work remained to be done. Culture and propaganda began to be accepted as equally strategic. Social and political stability would be the best defense for the whole continent. Germanism would have to be fought in Latin-American markets.

Nelson Rockefeller had powerful allies in the Roosevelt administration who helped him realize his ambitious project. One of the most important was Henry Wallace. A passionate proponent of the New Deal, Wallace was Roosevelt's first secretary of agriculture, and later, as vice president, he defended almost religiously the idea that the Americas could be united through agriculture—especially through corn, the American cereal par excellence.[31] According to him corn "culture" would win out over other "cultures" that were strangers to the American reality. Thanks

to the connections cultivated by Rockefeller, he often came out on top against those who opposed his project. This was the case in the conflict between Rockefeller's Office and other information agencies of the Roosevelt government.

Communication and Information

Rockefeller's information service disclosed in a 1941 report that several U.S. businesses were represented in Latin America by Germans or Nazis sympathizers. Ironically, these representatives used advertising and propaganda by their companies to disseminate veiled anti-U.S. messages. Nelson believed that the future of these enterprises in Latin America not only depended on the sale of U.S. products, but also on the dissemination of the "American way of life." He was, therefore, conscious that success in the economy had to be rooted in a solid ideological base. Thus, for Rockefeller communications included the intelligence service. His friendship with J. Edgar Hoover, the feared head of the FBI, was not an accident.

All means necessary would be used to consolidate the image of the model to be followed, which meant that the United States liberalism and democracy would have to be a paradigm. The formula, even though inadequate for countries with an Ibero-American formation, needed to be made attractive to Latin-American cultures with different roots.

The press and propaganda were important means of disseminating the principles of Americanism which were rephrased and presented in a more acceptable way by the Office. The Press and Publication Divisions, which together with the divisions of Radio, Cinema, and Information, as well as Propaganda, among others, formed the Division (or Department) of Communications, was the spine of OCIAA. It had two objectives: to disseminate positive "information" on the United States, by means of a communications network maintained by OCIAA in close collaboration with the countries of the continent; and to counterattack Axis propaganda. It also wished to propagate in the United States a favorable image of the "other Republics."

Theoretically, Rockefeller's projects had to be approved by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. In practice, however, Rockefeller enjoyed virtual autonomy. His advisors often traveled without the knowledge of the State Department, creating friction with career diplomats.

With headquarters in New York and Washington, the Press and Publication Division was led by John M. Clark, editorialist of *The Washington Post*. Francis A. Jamieson of The Associated Press later succeeded him. Everyone came from the world of big U.S. newspapers and news agencies. The professionals in this area had to counterattack the German propaganda service, represented in Latin America by the German Transoceanic Agency, which supplied news and photographs at low prices.

High-ranking employees of the Office never used the word propaganda in documents prepared for distribution. The United States differentiated itself this way from

the Nazi Germany. The Nazi government not only made constant use of the word, but its famous Popular Ministry of Education and Propaganda was one of its more important organs.

The propagandistic strategy of the Office included the publication of brochures, pamphlets and magazines. The most widely distributed among these was *On Guard*—published in Portuguese (*Em Guarda*), Spanish, and English—a magazine in the style of *Life*. In the initial project (at the end of 1940), the publication was called *On the March*, but Cordell Hull, being more in tune with diplomatic relations, vetoed the name as being excessively aggressive. The name *On Guard*, on the other hand, suggested defense rather than attack.

The magazine propagated an image of the United States as the fortress of hemispheric democracy, a stronghold from which the countries of the American continent could request support whenever necessary. The subjects of the news articles varied: the production of war material, the excellence of a war tank, how to take care of a vegetable garden, the efficiency of the U.S. nursing service, notice of allied victories, etc. In 1945, the magazine had reached a monthly circulation of more than 500,000 units and was distributed in many Latin American countries.

The Press Division was one of the biggest in the Office. In the United States alone, it had about two hundred full-time employees. Among them were some Brazilians, such as Orígenes Lessa, Marcelino de Carvalho, Raimundo Magalhães, and Carlos Cavalcante. They performed almost all functions: sending photos to Brazil's biggest newspapers and helping distribute official documents, speeches, and pamphlets. There were more than 15 million copies of "Why We Bear Arms," a speech pronounced by Roosevelt shortly before the United States joined the allied forces in World War II, and more than 2 million copies of illustrated booklets, such as "The United States in the War" and "True Heroes," which described the performance of U.S. soldiers at the front. For the magazine's marketing and distribution in Brazil, the Office enlisted young idealists who wished to be active in the anti-Nazi front.

The Motion Picture Division

Another important section of the Office was the Motion Picture Division leaded by John Hay Whitney, a refined millionaire friend of Rockefeller. Known as "Jock" Whitney, he had a curriculum vitae that clearly justified his choice to supervise the division. As one of the entrepreneurs who had financed the lucrative film *"Gone with the Wind,"* he enjoyed great influence in Hollywood. Rockefeller himself was a shareholder in RKO Pictures. One of the great achievements of the Nelson-Jock duo was to have won over artists such as Walt Disney and Carmen Miranda for the cause of "freedom" of the Americas.

Compared with German film production, even taking into account the tradition of cinema during the Weimar Republic, the U.S. film industry was in a privileged

situation. Because of the war, German films no longer reached South America, especially after the British blockade. Since American movies had no competition they reigned absolutely.

The OCIAA tried to consolidate the role of movies as a propaganda vehicle for the allied cause. The Motion Picture Division was considered one of the most important departments of the Office, even though it had a reduced number of employees, since a large part of the material arrived completed from Hollywood. In 1944, only forty people worked in its offices in New York, Washington, and California.

The films were divided into two branches: those intended for screening in movie theaters, and the non-commercial films presented in schools, clubs, or outdoors. The nerve center of the division was located in New York City and included three sectors. The production and adaptation section selected films produced by other departments and by Hollywood, and adapted them to Portuguese and Spanish. In this section scripts were also produced. The short-feature films section was responsible for newsreels, documentaries, and cartoons related to U. S. inter-American policies. Even though many of these materials were intended for Latin American countries, they were also screened in the United States with the objective of spreading a good image of Latin America. And, finally, there was a section that supervised the distribution of the 16-millimeters. The commercial circuit was in charge of the 35-millimeter films.

The non-commercial production was directed at educational institutions, clubs, churches, companies, unions, and rural organizations.[32] For example "Americans All," the black-and-white twenty-minute film on the work of youths in every country in the Hemisphere, was shown in Brazil, as was "Defense Against Invasion," a Disney animated film in color on the benefits of vaccination. On the other hand, U.S. viewers could see Brazil in an eleven-minute short feature in color of scenes from Rio de Janeiro, the Amazon rain forest, and the port of Santos. They also saw a ten-minute film telling the story of Brazil's fishing school, created by President Vargas. They saw "Brazil Gets News" a ten-minute film in color explaining the functioning of a big São Paulo newspaper. In addition, they saw films with Carmen Miranda, Charlie Chan, and Bette Davis, commercial Hollywood productions supposedly set in Brazil.

For obvious reasons, the Motion Picture Division had an important branch office in Hollywood, which was responsible for contact with big producers and assisted the main office in significant ways. It promoted the inclusion of Latin American artists in big studio productions, but mainly it worked on changing the "bandit" image that Hollywood had forced on Latins, especially its Mexican neighbors. Whenever possible, the division suggested that the big producers research Latin American customs before making their films. This way they would avoid problems of interpretation, and some diplomatic friction, as had been the case of *The South American Way*, Carmen Miranda's first film, produced by Darryl Zanuck. In this film, Carmen sings a rumba

in Portuguese, and another actress uses castanets. The problem was that the film was set in Argentina, where there are neither rumbas nor castanets.[33]

For these and other reasons, Nelson Rockefeller sent "Jock" Whitney on a reconnaissance trip through Latin America. In August 1941, Whitney, who had traveled with Walt Disney, sent a report to Rockefeller from Rio de Janeiro, which stated:

> The trip appears to be a success and, therefore, seems justified…This is a fascinating land, very surprising in the majority of its aspects, with a dazzling and unreal landscape…the people of Rio de Janeiro are very friendly and hospitable, but also very critical. You feel that they want you to like them, afterwards they like you, and if this does not occur you are the culprit, which I find correct…Walt Disney's success as entrepreneur and celebrity is bigger than expected.[34]

The educational short feature films produced by Walt Disney became very popular. One of them on malaria,[35] for example, opens with a bald eagle, the symbol of the United States, followed by the credits: *a Walt Disney production – Filmed under the auspices of the OCIAA.*

The Radio Division

Although theoretically subordinated to the Department of Communications, the Radio Division – similar to the Motion Picture Division – enjoyed great autonomy. Initially, it was located in New York, but later on it was transferred to Washington. The Radio Division did not produce programs directly, but it contracted them from different studios, many of them located in Manhattan. The Radio Division was directed by Don Francisco, a public relations professional. The objective of the division was defined by Don Francisco himself in a document sent to the coordinator's Office, dated June 5, 1942:

> The radio helps to create a dynamic public opinion in the Western hemisphere, continuously supporting the war effort of the American republics. Once public opinion is informed, it will not accept nor will it tolerate the propaganda of the Axis countries that reaches the continent.[36]

Until the beginning of World War II, the big radio stations had never bothered to expand their activities in Latin America, because there were no prospects of substantial profits. European radio stations, especially the Axis countries, took advantage of this gap left by the Americans.

In 1939, Radio Berlin broadcast varied programming in short wave: from an "Entertaining Concert" at noon; to "Greetings to Our Listeners" at 10:50 p.m; to "Helma Panke Sings German Songs" at midnight; soon thereafter, a Brazilian

Orchestra Concert, under the direction of the maestro Spartaco Rossi, with pieces from Brazilian composers, such as Nepomuceno, Mignone, and Carlos Gomes, interpreted by the soloist Christina Maristany. Its entire programming was sprinkled with economic and political updates. At 11:30 p.m. it aired the latest news and reports from Germany in Portuguese, and at 2:00 a.m. the same program in German.[37]

With a more ideological objective (they did not aim at immediate material results, as U.S. radio stations did), the German and Italian stations had specific programming for Brazil. The signals emitted in Berlin and Rome were much more powerful than those from the United States. Additionally, in these totalitarian regimes, the media was under the authority of the government, which used them for political ends, while in the United States the radio stations were independent and belonged to the arena of free enterprise, with commercial objectives. Therefore, to reach consensus was more difficult.

The Germans continued aiming at Latin America, especially Brazil, with Radio Berlin short waves. About 1 million Germans and Brazilians of German descent resided in the country's southern states. The airwaves would be the first battlefield in which the United States and Germany would have to match their forces. Therefore, Rockefeller devoted special attention to the radio as a communications and propaganda medium. The Division of Radio was Rockefeller's favorite arena. His accurate reasoning was that radio could reach a wider audience from all social classes. Consequently, he sent Don Francisco to travel to Latin America to evaluate the conditions for starting up a broadcasting program.

The big U.S. communication industries would have to serve the interests of combating ideologies contrary to liberalism. Thus, Brazil was an important target to be reached via broadcasting's short waves. In reference to radio, Rockefeller also used his position to achieve his objectives. The powerful NBC had its studios in Rockefeller Center, which facilitated negotiations with the Office. Although the connections Rockefeller had with NBC were significant, CBS was the first network to offer the radio sector for the Good Neighbor Policy. The company's president, William Paley, traveled to Latin America and received an enthusiastic official welcome in Brazil.

The "radio-journal" was the first form of approved programming to receive initial funding: $50,000 in April 1941 for the daily radio news transmission for all Latin America countries. The first editions of this journal were produced in partnership with CBS, retransmitted by American Telephone & Telegraph (AT&T) and distributed by International Telephone & Telegraph (IT&T) to local stations in Latin America. In order to fight the Axis radio programming, U.S. communication corporations chose to collaborate instead of compete with each other.

In a CBS document dated June 5, 1940, the company announced the appointment of Luis Jatobá, "the reputed number one Brazilian radio announcer."[38] Jatobá was one of many Brazilians who had been working in the United States, and, as one of Brazil's most famous voices, he had been participating in the war effort.

Rockefeller's familiarity with the big entrepreneurs facilitated the formation of this "alliance" between NBC and CBS, the two big rivals in the United States. The alliance was valid only for short-wave transmissions in Latin America. Some newspapers and magazines, among them *Reader's Digest Selections* and *On Guard*, published the schedule of all the programming. The Brazilian radio stations all transmitted the programming sent from the United States: *Cruzeiro do Sul, Mayrink Veiga,* and *Tupi* in Rio de Janeiro; *Record, Cruzeiro do Sul*, *Cosmos, Cultura,* and *Tupi* in São Paulo; *Farroupilha* in Porto Alegre; *Rádio Club de Pernambuco* in Recife; and *Pampulha* in Belo Horizonte. In the *Hora do Brasil* – one hour of official Brazilian governmental broadcasting, mandatory by all radio stations across the country – five minutes were yielded to the Office, which transmitted from New York. On the normal airwave they also heard daily commentaries from Júlio Barata, who spent a short period in the United States, or Raimundo Magalhães, a high-ranking employee in Getúlio Vargas' Department of Press and Propaganda, who had been "on loan" at the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Consolidation of the Rockefeller Office

On July 30, 1941, while Nazi troops invaded the Soviet Union, the Office directed by Rockefeller changed its name to Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, also known by the acronym OCIAA. The wider scope of the Office was owed to the urgency triggered by the Nazi advance during the second half of that year.

The Office's structure became much more complex, with new divisions and an increase in the number of employees. In reality, the Office's organizational structure would change constantly, depending on the situation. In the documents, there was no consistency in the names of the units within the Office. Sometimes a division was named a section; other times, a division; and still other times, a department. In any case, the organization commanded by Nelson Rockefeller was transformed into a complex structure, a confusion of subdivisions, with headquarters in the main cities of the United States and in most Latin America countries. The OCIAA was considered one of the U. S. agencies that were best prepared for war.

Most of the employees were people trusted by the Coordinator. Rockefeller used executives of big companies, people who could apply their knowledge to prepare the Americas for war and the acceptance of U.S. hegemony. This was the case of James W. Young, the first director of the Department or Division of Communications, director of Thompson, the well-known public relations company, with headquarters in New York. Don Francisco, director of the prestigious Division of Radio, was an executive of Lord & Thomas,[39] another powerful public relations company, who also relied on the contribution of J. W. G. Olgilvie, vice president of IT&T. Karl August Bikel, who also worked in the Communications Division, was head of United Press. As already mentioned, Rovensky, assistant for commerce and finances, was vice president of the Rockefeller family bank.

Andrew V. Corry, a mining engineer, was invited to be part of OCIAA's group of experts, as he was a distinguished strategic minerals expert. The modern phase of the exploration of natural resources of the Latin American countries started at this point. Without a doubt, there was an effort to fight expansion by the Axis, but also the bases for a systematic economic exploration had been launched in a peaceful world.

Signals of change in the worldwide situation were already noticeable in 1943. Nazi troops had lost the initiative after the defeats at Stalingrad and Kursk. North Africa was re-conquered. Italy was already out of the conflict, even though local Nazi forces resisted until 1945. This transformation in the international picture encouraged a change in U.S. policy for Latin America. Rockefeller knew how to adapt the objectives of his Office to this new reality.

Rockefeller was proposed for the position of assistant to the Secretary of State for Latin American Subjects in 1944. The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs changed its name to Office of Inter-American Affairs. The exclusion of the figure of the coordinator removed the political character from the Rockefeller Office. A bureaucrat took over its command. From then on, U.S. foreign policy underwent significant changes.

Endnotes

1. "When expressing agreement or approval, my wife instinctively clasps the lobe of the ear. My grandsons raise their thumb. This gesture became popular in Brazil after 1942, introduced by North American aviators. The mechanics raised their thumbs, thumbs up, signaling to the pilots that the engines functioned well after repairs. From the airports the sign spread during the last 30 years. In the Rome of the emperors, as well as during the time of the republic, when the Romans made the *dextram pollice*, the sign meant to grant life to the defeated gladiator in the stadium. When inverting the thumb, *pollice verse*, the loser would be sacrificed by the winner. It has been a classic gesture for at least 2,000 years." Luis da Câmara Cascudo, *História dos Nossos Gestos*, p 154.

2. Ciro Marcondes Filho, "*Imperialismo cultural, o grande vilão da destruição da 'nossa' cultura*," pp 79-84.

3. Luís da Câmara Cascudo, Locuções tradicionais no Brasil, p 204. See also Peter Fry, "*Para inglês ver*" (an idiomatic expression, which means it is impressive and/or its appearance is great), pp 17-8.

4. Malandro, a scoundrel-trickster, a typical Brazilian character "of European origin (pícaro, Schelm), [… which] underwent a change in Brazil: Local socio-economic conditions forced him to create survival tactics and assume a life style described by Roberto DaMatta […] as the 'ponto certo do equilíbrio entre a ordem e a desordem' (the point of equilibrium between order and disorder)." in Brecht's Reception in Brazil by Lorena Ellis. Roberto DaMatta, *Carnavais, Malandro e Heróis*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1979 as quoted by Leopoldo M. Bernucci, "*O Prazer da Influência, John Gay, Bertolt Brecht e Chico Buarque de Hollanda*," LATR 27.2 Spring 1994, p 30.

5. These reflections were based on proposals contained in Gary Gerstle, *Working-Class Americanism: The Politics of Labor in a Textile City, 1914-1960*; Luiz Werneck Vianna, *The Problem of Americanism* in Saraiva, Câmara Cascudo, musicólogo desconhecido, pp 83-6. Tocqueville (*O problema do americanismo em Tocqueville*); Antonio Gramsci, op. cit., and James Olivier Robertson, *American Myth, American Reality*.

6. See Ibid, loc. Cit. *Democracy in America, The Three Races in the United States*, p 445.

7. Dunshee de Abranches, *A Ilusão Brasileira* (justificação histórica de uma atitude), p 353.

8. See Jean-Paul Sartre, La mort dans l'âme (1949). Quoted by Susan Sontag, "Fascinante fascism", pp 59-83.

9. Ibid.

10. McBride, Joseph. *Frank Capra – The Catastrophe of Success*, p 446.

11. To the reactionary modernists — using the typical ideal concept created by Jeffrey Herf — a project for Germany would have to be based on the principle of inwardness (Innerlichkeit) added to modern technology. The big German paradox was the result of the combination of Volkische Kultur and Zivilisation, that is, the traditional culture of the race and rationalism. See Jeffrey Herf, *Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich*. p. 15.

12. Ibid.

13. Frank D. McCann, *The Brazilian-American Alliance* — 1937-1945, p 153.

14. American newspapers from the beginning of the century published various caricatures in which Latin America was always represented as a women and the U. S. by the traditional Uncle Sam. See John J. Johnson, *Latin American in Caricature*.

15. Edgard Carone, *A Terceira República* (1937-1945), p 60.

16. Getúlio Vargas, *Diário*, vol. 2: 1937-1942, pp 319-20.

17. Ibid, p 320.

18. "I come to pay a call of friendship [...] I would wish to symbolize the friendly visit of one good neighbor to another. In our daily life good neighbors call upon each other as the evidence of solicitude for common welfare and to learn of circumstances and point of view of each, so that there may come both understanding and respect which are cementing forces of all enduring society." See Alexander de Conde. *Herbert Hoover's Latin American Policy*, p 18.

19. The Brazilians had prepared "a welcome such as few men ever received in Brazil [...] or in any other South American nation." The *New York Times*, December 22, 1928. See Alexander de Conde, op. cit., p 23.

20. A color line, which Mário de Andrade harshly criticizes in this "Nova canção dixie" (1944; New Dixie song), was the line or barrier which separated the blacks from the whites in public places. This was a common practice especially in the southern states of the United States. Quoted in Telê Ancona Lopez, Mário de Andrade: ramais e caminhos, p 64.

21. This reflection is based on the interesting work by Frederick Pike, "Latin America and the Inversion of United States Stereotypes in 1920's and 1930's: The Case of Culture and Nature", pp 131-62.

22. Ibid, p 137.

23. Ibid, p 148.

24. John J. Johnson, *Latin America in Caricature*.

25. See Ricardo Antônio Silva Seitenfus, *O Brasil de Getúlio Vargas e a formação dos blocos: 1930-1942 — o processo do envolvimento brasileiro na II Guerra Mundial*, pp 205-6.

26. Frederick B. Pike, *FDR's Good Neighbor Policy: Sixty Years of Generally Gentle Chaos*, p 253.

27. Ibid., p. 253.

28. "Appendix", History of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, op. cit., p. 279.

29. Gerard Colby & Charlotte Dennett, op. cit., p. 96.

30. Elizabeth A. Cobbs, *The rich neighbor policy: Rockefeller and Kaiser in Brazil*, p. 9.

31. Cary Reich, *The life of Nelson A. Rockefeller: worlds to conquer, 1908-1958*, p. 211.

32. Other American republics in films — a list of 16 mm motion picture films on South and Central America and where they can be secured — Released by Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Columbia University Library, School of Library Services, Government Papers.

33. See Martha Gil-Montero, *Carmen Miranda, a Pequena Notável*, p. 103.

34. "Report of John Hay Whitney from Rio de Janeiro", 29 de agosto de 1941, Rockefeller Archive Center (rac), Record group 4, series 0. box 7, folder 56.

35. Walt Disney/ociaa, naus, mpd, Section M-1515, reels 306.241-306.252.

36. rac, Record group 4, series 4, box 9, folder 73. In the same document, Don Francisco explains that transmitting programs to Latin America was a difficult task, because "we are dealing not with one area, but with twenty different Nations, each varying according to political and psychological background. Programs suitable for us may not be suitable for any part of Latin America, and programs suitable for Mexico may not be appropriate for Argentina. Likewise, the question of Brazil, where programs must be written in Portuguese, is a problem itself."

37. "*Südamerika — Programm des Deutschen Kurzwellensenders*", Fundação Getúlio Vargas, CPDOC, 7238/83.

38. CBS News, Library Special Projects, Latin American Section, New York, June 5th, 1940.

39. rac, Record group 4, series O, box 9, folder 10, document of internal circulation.

U.S. STUDIES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF RACE RELATIONS

Jacques d'Adesky*

Today, the United States is a point of reference for understanding the realities of the contemporary world. Certainly, however, this does not mean that the United States reflects its future. Nor does it show what we will necessarily become tomorrow. The rest of the world, in particular Brazil, has its own unique characteristics and its own history. Nevertheless, if U.S. society is so fascinating, it is because it epitomizes the first modern democracy, established as a constitutional system, governed by representatives of the people, with limitations on the powers of those who govern and respect for individual rights. As it became a mixed and multiracial society, conditions were advanced within its borders for what could be enriching encounters between cultures, but also ethnic conflicts and tensions resulting from a "clash of civilizations" in the globalized world of the 21st century.

Studying the history of U.S. society and making comparisons between its politics, economic development, cultural and literary expression, and ethnic and race relations, and those found in other societies offer a means to improve Brazil's vision and also to foresee or anticipate its possible future transformations. Using the "mirror" of comparative analysis is also a good way to improve Brazil's self-understanding. Nevertheless, when faced with the comparative potential of race relations in the United States and in Brazil, one is compelled to note that what was reflected in that analytical "mirror" through the 1960s was used in ways that were not very appropriate. The realities of race relations in the United States were often disregarded, as they were seen merely as the opposite of race relations in Brazil.

U.S. Studies as viewed from the perspective of race was never a major topic in Brazilian universities. Nevertheless, during the 20th century, several researchers attempted to use comparative studies of the United States and Brazil as a means to understand the realities of race relations in Brazil. Gilberto Freyre, during his travels through the South of the United States, wondered why blacks in the United States were the victims of lynchings, something that did not occur in Brazil. In fact, he was seeking to learn more about his own country, rather than about the United States. He did not seek a reflection of his own reality in the other country, but rather observed that the other was culturally different; that there were indeed differences, which showed they were not the same. Certainly, the famous typology devised by Oracy Nogueira that in the United States racial prejudice is based on origin (heredity),

* Researcher at the Center for Studies of the Americas, Institute for the Humanities, Cândido Mendes University.

while in Brazil it is based on features (physical appearance), continues to be helpful in clarifying the Brazilian realities of today.[1] Whereas the American system tends towards a single and direct classification, without allowing for grey areas—you are either White, Native American, or Black—in Brazil, the key is precisely the possibility of changing one's classification, based on the type of hair, lips, skin color, etc., but also based on criteria such as money or power, which allows a black to be socially classified as mulatto, or a mulatto to be classified as white![2]

Strengthening the thesis that the U.S. standard is the mirror-image opposite of the Brazilian model, Roberto DaMatta argues in his book, *Relativizando: uma Introdução à Antropologia Social*, that in the United States there is not a "triangle of races," as in Brazil. According to him, this myth allows ordinary individuals, intellectuals, and politicians to devise a society with sharp hierarchical divisions, as though it were a whole, integrated by human ties, such as sex and other associated "racial" attributes. This is the fable that makes it possible to visualize Brazilian society as something unique. Meanwhile, the racist U.S. credo defines the "races" as being distinct individual realities, which proceed in parallel, never being expected to meet. In Brazil, they are face to face, in a complementary manner, like the points of a triangle where the white is always on top, while the black and the Indian form the two legs of our society, always being below and systematically being encompassed by the White. There, in the United States, in order to maintain the principle that everyone is equal before the law, racism established that the liberated blacks were to be considered humans, but different, which enables use of the "separate, but equal" theory. While in Brazil, the cultural tradition derived from the Iberian Peninsula, where proximity and coexistence would result in a profoundly anti-egalitarian system based on the logic of "a place for everything, with everything in its place."[3]

Another way of discussing the U.S. racial situation was raised by many Brazilian historians who studied the transatlantic slave trade, comparing slavery in the United States with that in Brazil, while seeking to identify differences that could assist in better understanding the political, economic and cultural development of the country. Many of them pointed out that slavery in Brazil had been more benign, due to the primacy of Catholicism and the propensity of Portuguese colonizers to mingle with the indigenous and slave populations. Those traits would explain the high degree of miscegenation in Brazil, which is not found in the United States, considered puritanical and opposed to close contacts between people of different racial ancestry.[4]

Published Brazilian academic output on the topic of race in the United States over the last 50 years has been episodic and has not led to the creation in Brazilian universities of a specific field of studies, nor has it fostered the emergence of "Americanists" specialized in the topic. Nor were those that did study the United States able to achieve the same level of activity as the "Brazilianists" who have devoted their efforts to uncovering the specific aspects of race relations in Brazil, such as Donald Pierson, Carl Degler, and Thomas Skidmore, whose published texts have become works of

reference. Also, it is possible to note the emergence of a new wave of Brazilianists since the 1990s who have been engaged in the topic of race relations. Compared with the previous generation, these scholars, in the fields of sociology and anthropology, have advocated innovative approaches to racial inequities, and have presented studies that identify the black movement as being a significant actor in the struggle against racism, despite having previously been a low profile social group, whose actions were often overlooked or given only minimal attention. It is interesting to note that this new generation of Brazilianists has expressed a broad range of concerns, encompassing inequities that affect blacks and indigenous peoples.[5]

Surely, we can ask ourselves: why is there not a tradition of U.S. Studies in Brazil that focuses on the issue of race in the United States? Why has this approach never been more than sporadic bleeps on the agendas of Brazilian intellectuals and university students? As mentioned earlier, such studies were generally undertaken as comparative studies. While seeking to understand the realities of race in the United States, they tended to begin by uncovering Brazilian race relations. This dialectic approach has been employed by historians, sociologists and anthropologists, and has had the merit of pointing out possible similarities that may exist, but, primarily, making the differences evident. Thus, while seeking an explanation, not so much within U.S. realities, but by contrasting them with the situation in Brazil, a mistaken conception may have arisen that the situation in Brazil was relatively more benign. In sum, while observing the U.S. model of race relations, although it could not offer inspiration, it could at least serve to demonstrate that Brazil had resolved its racial integration, to the extent to which blacks were not victims of the types of explicit violence carried out in the United States. Therefore, that approach, at most, served as a consolation, by showing that, with regard to this issue, the situation was much better at home, in Brazil.

When accepting this rationale, one should bear in mind that U.S. Studies regarding the issue of race was motivated by a desire to establish the differences and specific aspects of the Brazilian racial situation, which *a priori* was viewed as being better. Moreover, to the extent to which a consensus arose among Brazilian intellectuals in the 1950s that there was a "racial democracy" in Brazil, there was a loss of momentum to seek to understand more deeply U.S. race relations, which were increasingly deemed to be the antithesis of the successful Brazilian model. During that era, even the two major leaders of the Experimental Black Theater (TEN), Abdias do Nascimento and Guerreiro Ramos, used the expression "racial democracy" in their writings, viewed as the healthy Brazilian standard, even while they simultaneously denounced the existence of color prejudice and the remaining traits of discrimination in Brazil.[6] Later, in the 1960s and 1970s, Abdias would adopt a more radical stance of denouncing Brazilian racism, to the point of completely repudiating the expression "racial democracy."

The binary and exclusive standard that until recently was characteristic of U.S. society was the opposite of the Brazilian identity, because it shattered the desired ideal of miscegenation, by recognizing the relevance of racial differences. In Brazil there

was no legal or social requirement that would oblige people of African ancestry to declare themselves black or mixed-race. In the United States, light-skinned people with African ancestry were considered black. It was a rigid standard that arose during slavery. It was also an important factor in the creation of a fundamentally binary customary way of preparing statistics, which differentiates between those with European ancestry and other inhabitants. Obviously, in the United States, as in other societies that bought slaves from Africa, there were inter-racial marriages and even, in some instances, those that were legally recognized. However, throughout the 19th century, U.S. society increasingly managed to reduce the social space that existed in certain regions of the South, namely those where there had been a strong French or Spanish influence, so as to prevent children born to mixed-race couples from being recognized as belonging to a distinct category.[7]

By April 2000, one characteristic of the U.S. statistical system, compared with the Brazilian, was the impossibility of conceiving racially mixed categories. Although black individuals could be differentiated into two groups, and only two groups (black and mulatto), everyone remained constrained within the limits of the black population and those with lighter skin color tone did not, by any means, occupy an intermediary position between the two races. As a matter of principle, those with lighter skin could not be considered white, according to the strict requirement of the "one drop rule" that came from the most rigid slave states, under which a single drop of black blood was enough for someone to be legally defined as black.[8] This binary standard did not allow for the possibility of crossing the color line, except for those who used the subterfuge of "passing" (as a white) or who claimed that they belonged in another category, such as Latin, Hawaiian or, now, "mixed-race."

Compared with the U.S. standard, the Brazilian model, in contrast, is a more fluid and inclusive society, in terms of recognizing categories of color and race. The Brazilian model has its roots in blending and assimilation because, quite contrary to the situation in the United States, light-skinned people of African ancestry in Brazil can legitimately recognize and declare themselves white. Similarly, Arabs or Jews who in European countries may suffer discrimination based on religion or because they are viewed as immigrants, are considered to be whites in Brazil, even if they maintain their specific cultural values.

Due to the fluid nature of these classifications and the low rate of ethnic and racial tensions, Brazil became a point of reference in the eyes of the world, soon after the Second World War. At that time, it was seen as a unique and successful example in the field of race relations. This attracted the attention of UNESCO, which in 1951 and 1952 went as far as to sponsor a series of studies aimed at verifying this reality, for the purpose of making universal what was believed to be unique. Many are familiar with the disappointment created by the conclusions of those reports, which did not fail to recognize the profound social inequities between whites and blacks, as well as the existence of color prejudice.

The frustrating result of the so-called UNESCO project did not serve as a pretext to attract the attention of Brazilian sociologists or anthropologists concerning the racial realities in the United States. The U.S. model of race relations seemed to be of little interest, when compared with the Brazilian model, which was judged to be more proper and ethical. It could not serve as inspiration for Brazil, where blacks were racially integrated and were not subjected to acts of violence, as in the United States. The prevalent interpretation was that the racial inequities in Brazil were merely reminiscences of the colonial past and were expected to disappear through Brazil's economic and industrial development. That optimistic view was strengthened during the period of military rule. Speaking about the existence of racism and racial discrimination in Brazil was seen, according to Carlos Hasenbalg, as unpatriotic, as something inconceivable, as an imported issue. Nevertheless, some opposing voices pointed out that racial discrimination had specific aspects that were related to the context of contemporary society, which therefore could not be explained solely by the colonial past.

This vision of harmony and cordiality in the field of race relations would remain unaltered until the end of the 1970s, when the consensus regarding the desired ideal of "racial democracy" began to be increasingly questioned by the Black Movement, which emerged in Brazil's major cities, denouncing the racism and racial discrimination that members of the Afro-Brazilian community were subjected to. In the 1980s, with the consolidation of democratic rule in Brazil, the Black Movement, during that period characterized by the informality of its activists and intellectuals, became a network of organizations and associations that spread throughout the country. Also, during the 1980s, and primarily beginning in the 1990s, the charges would be accompanied with statistical data proving the disproportionate inequality that affected blacks, relative to whites, in terms of income, life expectancy, and access to university. When demanding equal opportunities for the population with African ancestry, the Black Movement has implicitly questioned the idea of miscegenation as the magic antidote for racism and racial discrimination, while showing that the mere existence of miscegenation, in and of itself, does not make Brazilian society free from racism, prejudice, or racial discrimination.

In this regard, it is worth recalling that as early as 1969, when comparing the situation of blacks in U.S. society with that of blacks in Brazil, sociologist Nelson Mello e Souza predicted the eruption of a racial struggle in Brazil by 2000. He stated that during the 1980s, and especially during the 1990s, the blacks would be in a position to demand open access to areas that previously had been off limits to them. Even though the racial struggle in Brazil would not be as dramatic as U.S. racism, it would be tied to opportunities for upward social mobility by blacks, fostered by the development of wealth, industrialization, and urbanization in Brazil by the year 2000.[9]

It behooves us to agree that Mello e Souza was partially correct in his predictions. A small black middle class has developed, which has supplied the Black Movement with

leaders and activists who have not ceased to demand full citizenship rights for Afro-Brazilians, as well as equal opportunities in the labor market and in access to universities. Their demands included recognition of appropriate images of blacks in the media and better political representation of blacks in the Brazilian Congress, among others. A full-blown racial struggle did not erupt, even though certain intellectuals with ties to the Black Movement see the disruptions and acts of vandalism carried out by drug traffickers in Brazil's major cities as a prelude to a possible open racial conflict, taking into account the fact that the vast majority of the organized crime bosses are blacks from the urban slums and city outskirts where the population with African ancestry is concentrated.

During the 1980s and 1990s, the Black Movement paid greater attention to the situation of U.S. blacks. The image that has begun to form is that they have social and economic standards of living that are much better than their Afro-Brazilian counterparts. Despite the existence of a more open racism in the United States the current perception is that U.S. society offers greater opportunities for social mobility: a black bourgeoisie and a significant Afro-American middle class do exist. These observations led leaders of the Black Movement to require the implementation of public policies to benefit blacks, at the federal, state, and local levels. This began to occur in the 1980s, with the creation of the Palmares Cultural Foundation by President José Sarney, as well as councils in various states and municipalities to advocate for and promote the interests of the Afro-Brazilian community.

It may have been these demands that led President Fernando Henrique Cardoso to take the first affirmative action measures in Brazil, in 2001, in an initiative without precedent under any other Brazilian government. Having personally conducted research on race relations in Brazil in the 1950s, it was probably easier for him to recognize the existence of racism in Brazil, right at the beginning of his government, in 1995. His wisdom and his vision of the future led him to acknowledge that Brazil could not be a country of fairness without addressing the "debt" owed to its Afro-Brazilian population. In July 1996, at the opening of the International Seminar on Multiculturalism and Racism: the Role of Affirmative Action in Contemporary Democratic States, Cardoso challenged the intellectuals who were present to propose solutions appropriate for Brazil, with the aim of ensuring greater integration of blacks. At the same international seminar, Vice President Marco Maciel suggested

> Examining the U.S. experience, beginning with some of its most significant milestones that may serve as inspiration, so that we are able to move from the always-fertile field of promises to the more promising terrain of accomplishments, of achievements, because this cannot be delayed any longer. It behooves all of us to agree that social exclusion, while dramatic from the perspective of the denial of equal opportunities that emerged as the distinguishing feature of our civilization, produced consequences that contributed to aggravating racial discrimination. It is a vicious cycle that will not be broken if we address the consequences without eliminating the root causes.[10]

Maciel was convinced that offsetting measures on behalf of blacks did not represent merely a step in the struggle against discrimination, but rather the end of an era of inequality and exclusion, if one sought to achieve a society that is both egalitarian and fairer. He also said that, compared with the U.S. experience, Brazil has the advantage of not needing to overcome the mechanisms of segregation and separation, the elimination of which required so much effort on the part of U.S. society.

Despite the expectations of President Cardoso and Vice President Maciel, the international seminar did not produce any action plan of concrete policies, nor did it provide a thoughtful approach on whether or not affirmative action policies were appropriate for Brazil. No consensus was reached concerning the option of a policy of "positive discrimination" that would ensure that blacks receive more equitable treatment, while simultaneously serving as compensation for the discrimination suffered in the past by their ancestors. Certainly, the international seminar served to raise awareness once and for all, by the executive branch of government about the need to establish public policy measures on behalf of the Afro-Brazilian population, which came to be implemented in 2001, as highlighted above, in a manner almost concurrent with the holding of the U.N. World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, which was held in Durban, South Africa, also in 2001. Although there is no apparent causal relationship with the international seminar, beginning in 1997 there has been a noteworthy observed increase in the number of studies, papers, and published texts on the topic of affirmative action, based on a comparative analysis of the U.S. experience. Among the published works, one can cite the book *Ação Afirmativa e Princípio Constitucional da Igualdade*, by Joaquim Barbosa Gomes, which has become a reference book in the area of Brazilian law, as it describes and analyses in a comprehensive manner the entire process of establishing legal jurisdictions in the struggle for equality in U.S. society.[11]

Taking a comparative approach to the topic of affirmative action and the ways in which the law has been used in the United States and Brazil, the book *Na lei e na raça*, by Carlos Alberto Medeiros, shows how U.S. racial realities have changed significantly over the last four decades, to become much more nuanced.[12] It is also worth noting the report *Para além do racismo*, which is the result of a collective undertaking carried out in the year 2000 with the aim of comparing race relations in Brazil, South Africa, and the United States. It is a publication that was coordinated by Lynn Huntley of the Southern Education Foundation, with the collaboration of Brazilian researchers and scholars such as Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, Edna Roland, and Ana Maria Brasileiro, among others. In a chapter of his most recent book, José Augusto Lindgren Alves also describes the race relations situation in the United States, highlighting that the era of legal segregation happened long ago and that in recent years U.S. society has provided African Americans with greater opportunities for access to the universities and for participation in the economy and in decision-making processes. He comments that this new situation led some scholars to propose the idea that the U.S.

race standard is becoming "Brazilianized," a circumstance that can be understood as a demonstration that open racial segregation has been replaced with separation within a social class.[13]

These texts can be classified as "Americanist" studies dedicated to race relations and demonstrate the importance of a potential field for research that could be devoted to understanding U.S. realities at the end of the 20th century, as well as the existing challenges for the 21st century. They also demonstrate that the U.S. race standard has changed drastically. From 1945 through 1980, open racism and legal discrimination diminished spectacularly. The U.S. economy moved completely into the modern era, in which the criterion of race has no importance, making it possible for well-qualified and educated blacks to pursue unprecedented opportunities, with the expansion of jobs in the public sector and also in major corporations. Even if their statistical data have not yet reached parity with those of the white middle class, it is noteworthy that one third of the wealthiest blacks have become much more prosperous, which had never before occurred in U.S. history. But, simultaneously, one third of the poorest blacks remain poor, or have even become worse off than poor whites. Similarly, a growing proportion of black males are unemployed, imprisoned, or otherwise not counted as part of the economically active population.

Due to these changes, the U.S. racial standard can no longer be considered the antithesis of the Brazilian model, and as such continued to be overlooked by Brazilian intellectuals, just as occurred previously with comparative studies of the two countries. Moreover, such studies by "Americanists" are sorely missed precisely at this moment when implementation of affirmative action policies in Brazil is being discussed. As has been seen, this new U.S. reality has been hidden by those who oppose affirmative action, who distort the discussions by using outdated images of U.S. race relations, having frequently cited the alleged possibility that such policies on behalf of blacks could stir up racial hatred in Brazil. Meanwhile, it is difficult for them to admit that aside from the abolition of the famous "Jim Crow laws," through Supreme Court decisions, the adoption of affirmative action in the United States contributed decisively to the emergence and consolidation of a strong middle class and a bourgeoisie that exercise significant influence over how the country is governed.

On the other hand, such studies implicitly reveal that the Brazilian model of race relations has not succeeded in raising the economic standards and political influence of the population with African ancestry to the same relative level already achieved by blacks in the U.S. Despite industrialization, often seen as a mode of integrating Brazilian society, the comparative studies indicate that the so-called "universalist" policies do not provide for the attainment in Brazil of a true equality for all. While examining the Brazilian race situation in view of the current U.S. race situation, it becomes obvious that it is no longer possible to state that the Brazilian standard of "cordial race relations," of a flexible fluidity, often seen as the greatest virtue of race

relations in Brazil, is sufficient to ensure that blacks can have a truly equal share of the economy and Brazil's political decision-making processes.

With regard to the alleged "Brazilianization" of U.S. race relations, it is highly unlikely that this could fully come about. And even if racial discrimination in the United States were to become more subtle and veiled, it must be said that, even were the U.S. race standard to become less rigid, this would not necessarily imply a linear convergence with the Brazilian standard. The differences in social and economic contexts, culture, and history are immense. Each country, in its own way, is profoundly different with regard to racial issues. Although African Americans account for a relatively smaller share of the U.S. population than is true of Afro-Brazilians in Brazil, African Americans, as noted above, exercise greater influence in the economy, politics, and mass media. In Brazil, the black bourgeoisie is almost nonexistent, consisting mainly of small businessmen who do not have significant influence within the business community.[14] In politics, a similar situation prevails in the Brazilian Congress, where there are hardly any black members of Congress. Among communications media, compared with the many U.S. media outlets owned by African-Americans, which are quite extensive, there are hardly any blacks in Brazil who own newspapers, magazines, or radio and television stations. A notable exception is the recently created *TV da Gente*, owned by the singer and businessman Netinho, although it does not broadcast to all of Brazil's markets.

While sharing a democratic model based on respect for the value of human dignity, the United States and Brazil could be led to draw inspiration from one another in ways of combating racial discrimination and promoting the ideal of equality for all. Under the rubric of consolidating democracy in Brazil, Marco Maciel states that: "eradicating the visible and hidden forms of racism, which have permeated Brazilian society for centuries, tolerated by widespread complacency and indifference by almost all, is now a responsibility of all."[15] Perhaps the current debate over affirmative action policies—which promote equal access to universities for people with African or Indigenous ancestry—is a positive step in the direction of "universalist" policies to guarantee the equal opportunities theoretically guaranteed by the Brazilian Constitution. The two-dimensional nature of social and racial discrimination, of which blacks are the victims, calls for the design of specific and differentiated public policies that take into account the disparities inherited from the past, as well as the inequities produced in our time, which in the end exacerbate and replicate those inequities.

Endnotes

1. Oracy Nogueira (1985). *Tanto preto quanto branco: estudos de relações raciais.*

2. Perhaps we can recognize in Oracy Nogueira's typology the basis for the argument of those who proclaim, in light of the recently-created Brazilian affirmative action policies, that in Brazil it is not possible to identify who is black! Nevertheless, it is necessary to observe that the

status of a black being classified as a white is not always permanent. In the event of a conflict or disagreement in a social context, or even in a family environment, often the black who is socially considered to be white can once again be viewed pejoratively as black, through insults or other offensive remarks that portray the individual as black, such as "dumb" negro, "dirty" black, "shameless" black, etc.

3. Roberto da Matta (1984). *Uma Introdução à Antropologia Social*. pp.58-85.

4. Several contemporary Brazilian authors, among them Jacob Gorender, Flávio Gomes, Luis Felipe de Alencastro and Maria Sylvia Carvalho, have challenged the notion that Brazilian slavery was peaceful, which they consider to be quite romanticized.

5. Among these, we can cite Edward Telles, Michael Hanchard, and Jonathan Warren.

6. See, for example, the column entitled "*Democracia Racial,*" which appeared in the newspaper *Quilombo*, whose Editor-in-Chief was Abdias do Nascimento (Year I, no. 1, Dec. 9, 1948; no. 2, May 9, 1948), as well as the text by Alberto Guerreiro Ramos "Política de Relações de Raça no Brasil" (May 13, 1955), *Introdução Crítica à Sociologia Brasileira*.

7. See Paul Schor, "Le métissage invisible. L'héritage de l'esclavage dans les catégories du recencesement américain", in Patrick Weil and Stéphane Dufoix (editors). (2005) *L'esclavage, la colonisation, et après*.

8. *Ibidem*, pp. 308-309.

9. José Itamar de Freitas. *Brasil ano 2000. O Futuro sem Fantasia*. pp. 87, 92 e 93.

10. José Souza (org.), *et alii*. *Multiculturalismo e racismo: o papel da ação afirmativa nos Estados democráticos contemporâneos*. pp. 19-21.

11. Joaquim Barbosa Gomes. *Ação afirmativa e princípio constitucional da igualdade: o direito como instrumento de transformação social. A experiência dos Estados Unidos*, 2001. During that period, the author was a Professor at the School of Law of the State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ) and a member of the office of the federal public prosecutors (MPF). At this time, he is a Justice of the Federal Supreme Court, having assumed that position in 2004.

12. Carlos Alberto Medeiros. (2004) *Na lei e na raça. Legislação e relações raciais, Brasil-Estados Unidos*.

13. See José Augusto Lindgren Alves. *Os direitos humanos na pós-modernidade*, pp. 65-88.

14. See "Pesquisa de empresas afro-brasileiras no Estado do Rio de Janeiro," 2004/2005.

15. Marco Maciel, *Ibid*, p. 19.

Bibliography

Alves, José Augusto Lindgren. 2005. *Os Direitos Humanos na pós-modernidade*. (São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva).

Degler, Carl. 1976. *Nem preto nem branco. Escravidão e relações raciais no Brasil e nos Estados Unidos* (Editorial Labor do Brasil).

Fry, Peter. 2005. *A persistência da raça. Ensaios antropológicos sobre Brasil e África do Sul.* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira).

Gomes, Joaquim Barbosa. 2001. *Ação afirmativa e principio constitucional da igualdade. O direito como instrumento de transformação social*. A experiência dos Estados Unidos. (Rio de Janeiro: Renovar).

Gorender, Jacob. 2000. *Brasil em preto e branco* (São Paulo: Editora Senac).

Guimarães, Antonio Sérgio Alfredo. 1999. *Racismo e anti-racismo no Brasil.* (São Paulo: Editora 34).

Hanchard, Michael George. 2001. *Orfeu e o poder. Movimento Negro no Rio e São Paulo (1945-1988)* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora UERJ).

Matta, Roberto da. 1984. *Relativizando: uma introdução à antropologia social.* (Petrópolis: Vozes,).

Medeiros, Carlos Alberto. 2004. *Na lei e na raça. Legislação e relações raciais. Brasil-Estados Unidos.* (Rio de Janeiro: DP&A Editora).

Nogueira, Oracy. 1985. *Tanto preto quanto branco: estudos de relações raciais* (São Paulo: T. A Queiroz).

Petrucelli, José Luis. 2002. "Raça, etnicidade e origem nos censos de EUA, França, Canadá e Grã-Bretanha," *Estudos Afro-Asiáticos.* Year 24, No. 3 (CEAA/UCAM/Pallas Editora).

Schor, Paul. 2005. "Le métissage invisible. L'héritage de l'esclavage dans les catégories du recensement américain", in Patrick Weil, Stéphane Dufoix, ed, *L'esclavage, la colonisation, et après...* (Paris: PUF).

Souza, José (Org.). 1997. *Multiculturalismo e racismo: o papel da ação afirmativa nos Estados democráticos contemporâneos.* (Brasília: Ministério da Justiça / PNUD).

Ramos, Alberto Guerreiro. 1995. *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ).

Relatório. 2001. *Para além do racismo. Abraçando um futuro interdependente. Brasil, África do Sul, Estados Unidos* (Atlanta: The Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta).

Relatório de análise. 2004-2005. *Pesquisa de empresas afro-brasileiras no Estado do Rio de Janeiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Colymar).

FROM BUSH TO BUSH (1989–2006): U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Cristina Soreanu Pecequilo*

The emergence in 1945 of the United States as the international system's dominant power marked the beginning of the American Century and of a new style of leadership. Drawing on the principles of multilateral internationalism, U.S. leadership sought to bring about a political, economic, and social order inspired by the classical liberal ideals of the American Republic, and also the ideals of multilateral cooperation envisioned by the Wilson Administration.[1] Clothed in a blend of powers both traditional and new, the U.S. approach to international ebbs and flows was also concerned with the containment of a rival system—Soviet Communism—poised as counterpoint to the ways of the West.

After the end of the Cold War, many announcements heralded not only an extension of the American Century, but the dawn of a new era in international relations. The fall of the Berlin Wall was hailed as the harbinger of a Second Century of Leadership, destined to strengthen *Pax Americana* following the disappearance of the Communist enemy. What is certain though is that a lengthy series of transitions followed, with and without the United States. Nearly two decades after the end of the bipolar world—five years after 9/11—history is accelerating, and with it the ebbs and flows within the United States and elsewhere.

I. Bush and the Status Quo Plus (1989–1992)

Described by U.S. analysts as "a Cold War personality," George H.W. Bush entered the White House at a time when the conflict was clearly wearing thin. Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. were experiencing economic problems related to the strain of a lengthy conflict—a conflict intensified by actions of the Reagan Administration during the 1980s. This resurgence of Cold War military spending,[2] aid to anti-Communist freedom fighters, and destabilization efforts all added to the strain felt on already weakened Soviet economic and political system. Concurrently however, the increased defense spending, coupled with the tax-cutting free-market policies of Reaganomics, cost the United States dearly. These factors led to a shifting of US-Soviet relations and the resulting policy of *Rapprochement*.

When George H. W. Bush took office in January of 1989, the general expectation was that a new power structure—reminiscent of the Allied Powers during World

* Associate Professor of Foreign Relations, UNESP

War II—would be established among the superpowers. Despite their rivalry, Bush and Gorbachev both signaled the importance of a united front for administering the international system, coordinating superpower activities and smoothing the transformation that their bilateral relations were undergoing. Increasingly, however, this agenda was hampered by Soviet weakness in Eastern Europe, which gradually drifted away from the Soviet sphere of influence—particularly after Warsaw Pact troops left the region and elections were held in several countries—culminating in the destruction of the Berlin Wall. To Soviet and U.S. observers, these events underscored the United States' position as the dominant world power.

Most of these processes, however, had an internal consistency of their own and were not the product of direct U.S. action. In addition, as of that moment, winners and losers alike were beset by transitional difficulties. Even though it was the only remaining superpower, the United States also experienced social and economic problems in the wake of over four decades of conflict. Although the U.S. system's greater complexity and flexibility enabled it to ride out the changes intact—instead of collapsing like the U.S.S.R.—it was a moment of relative crisis. The end of a large-scale conflict was likewise attended by a process of power adjustments and rethinking of domestic and foreign strategies. Indeed, if containment set the course for the nation beginning in 1947, what new priorities would take its place on the agenda? Would the relative crisis weaken the U.S. position as the dominant world power or further entrench it?

Taking as a starting point the debate over the sources of U.S. power, questions arose about its sustainability and viability—or whether the country had the will to keep itself in the saddle as the dominant world power. To those predicting its decline, the financial and political expenses of the Cold War coupled with overextended overseas commitments would exhaust available resources and undermine the foundations of U.S. power. The United States would thus have to fall back from the system and channel more resources into domestic policy matters, thereby abandoning its dominant position and accepting an emerging multipolar world. Members of the competing school of thought predicted a triumphant renewal of U.S. global prevalence. They recognized the stressful factors but disagreed as to their impact and outcomes. Foreign and domestic adjustments were necessary, but for continued U.S. predominance as the unchallenged world power, reformulation would suffice.

Meanwhile, arguments between isolationists and internationalists centered on what role the United States should play, given the collapse of its Communist rival. The isolationists divided into two distinct schools: radicals, who advocated complete disengagement from the system and a "return home," and neoconservatives, who pressed for an overhaul of multilateral internationalism. To advocates of multilateral internationalism—a moderate faction which included Bush—U.S. hegemony needed to redirect its priorities without losing sight of its market orientation.

Contradictory though it may seem, neoconservative isolationists were still internationalists—to the extent that they did not advocate pullout from the inter-

national system, but rather, revisiting policy with the aim not only of consolidating but even expanding U.S. hegemony in the aftermath of the Cold War.[3] This posture was initially expressed in a 1992 Pentagon document, *Defense Planning Guidance* (DPG), claiming that foreign engagements needed to be reviewed based on the new power arrangements which emerged after the disappearance of the U.S.S.R.: the unipolar moment.[4]

According to the DPG, as the only remaining superpower, the United States ought to take advantage of the times in order to bolster its leadership in the international system. Its priorities should be the preservation of unquestioned military superiority and blocking the emergence of rival, regional powers on any continent (whether friend or foe), plus the acquisition of new spheres of influence. A larger presence in Eurasia to fill the void left by the collapse of Soviet power was suggested in order to strengthen political and strategic positions by providing easier access to such regional natural resources as oil and natural gas. The idea was to eliminate the sole remaining vulnerability its advocates perceived in the U.S. agenda: energy.[5]

Due to the Bush administration's moderate profile,[6] however, that agenda was quashed and neoconservative aspirations placed on hold. The job of overhauling the country's overall post-containment strategy was held over until the Clinton Administration (1993–2000), with Bush working on what could be called a *Status Quo Plus*. Offering no innovations or transformations to guide U.S. international policy, this Status Quo Plus focused on projecting power into such familiar areas and issues as Eastern Europe, NATO, and Asia, flanked by some new initiatives aimed at promoting free trade in the Western Hemisphere: the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the North America Free Trade Area (NAFTA).

Politically and economically, Bush did not have what it took to press for change—or at least made no showing which would bolster hopes for a reform agenda. Standing pat did nothing to clear up the growing impression that the United States' influence was declining, but it played a key role in carrying Clinton to power on his domestic renewal platform summed up in the campaign slogan "It's the economy, stupid."

II. Clinton and the Indispensable United States: Engagement and Expansion (1993-2000)

The first post-Cold War president, Bill Clinton brought with him a basically domestic agenda. His election ended twelve years of Republican domination in Washington. In sharp contrast to Bush, often called the "foreign policy president," the Clinton administration's priorities were to transform the economy and society in hopes that renewal would make the threat of decline vanish. Although this platform did not advocate full disengagement from the system, it did call for lessening the nation's international commitments, sharing the costs with allies, and strengthening the role of multilateral organizations.

The announcement of this "minimalist" stance raised fears in the international community that the United States would abandon its leadership role. Some worried that the total lack of strategic thinking and initiatives experienced since the Bush Administration would only worsen and so destabilize global power arrangements that, absent an overarching superpower, struggle to fill the vacancy that might result. Pragmatically, however, very few nations or blocks of nations had any interest in the weakening of that global preponderance—despite the discomfort which unequal power situations naturally give rise to.

As noted earlier, U.S. leadership and power stabilized the international system. The country assumed a role of "preserving the balance."[7] This bolstered the credibility and reliability of existing political arrangements. It likewise lessened unstable power relations and rivalries, especially in such fragmented areas as Asia (whose nations would rather establish partnerships with the United States than alliances among themselves, as the cases of Japan, China, and India illustrate).

Faced with these pressures, the Clinton Administration sought to renew its political initiative by unveiling a post-Cold War grand strategy of Engagement and Expansion (E&E), in September of 1993. Unlike its predecessor, containment—which faced a clear and definite enemy, E&E had a multidimensional view of the United States and the international system, zeroing in on economic and political specifics. Although its effectiveness never really jelled until 1996, with economic recovery underway and domestic problems well in hand, E&E finally began shaping the so-called "Second American Century." The asserted renewal made itself felt domestically and internationally, and with it came the view of the United States as the "Indispensable Nation."

Although held up for scorn as no more than a recovery of "leftovers" from the principles of containment, the rise of democracies, and expanding free markets, E&E turned out to be a differentiated strategy which preserved and entrenched the multilateral internationalist leadership agenda. Given the de facto decline in U.S. power which had begun the previous decade, E&E called for an entire set of economic and political tactics aimed at strengthening the country. Within the context of globalization, a link had to be forged between geopolitics and "geoeconomics."

Along the geoeconomic axis, the process began by modernizing and reinventing government, making it more efficient and less deficit-prone. The agenda called for building up domestic competitiveness and productivity to levels compatible with those of European and Asian allies. Furthermore, there was a need to expand international markets for the sale of U.S. products, restoring the balance of trade and fueling economic recovery. It was therefore crucial that trade barriers be lowered through multilateral negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO). To these items were added proposals for regional integration in Asia through the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and in the Americas through NAFTA and the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). U.S. influence in the financial and investment

worlds drew strength from increasing humanitarian aid to and crisis intervention in such countries as Mexico, Russia, and Brazil.

This renewal of domestic power bases was accompanied by international reduction of the costs and commitments of leadership, and a sharing of tasks with regional partners. The idea was a shift toward Selective Engagement, laying the groundwork for transition toward a world marked by increasingly multipolar trends as a result of the growing strength of both the European Union and China. The enlargement of NATO and negotiations for China's admission in the WTO were also associated with these initiatives, which, tactically, amounted to "engagement to contain." Within that context, international governmental organizations (IGOs), likewise reworked and re-strengthened, would remain essential elements for the preservation—and increase—of order.

In another cost-cutting move, the Armed Forces were slated to undergo modernization to make them smaller, more flexible, and more effective, with no curtailment of their offensive or defensive capacities. Rogue and failed states[8] were earmarked for special attention because of their potential for local destabilization. Additional pressure was brought to bear on North Korea, Iraq, and Iran, while transnational threats such as international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) were closely monitored.

The E&E record of success in handling international ebbs and flows while fostering U.S. recovery notwithstanding, neoconservatives insistently pointed to the maintenance of multilateral internationalism as proof of America's weakness. Although the neoconservatives had been swept out of power and influence during the first Bush administration, they had never stopped building and consolidating their influence, reworking their agenda, and reframing their plan of action. To accomplish this they shifted into alternative venues, continuously cultivating their bases in the media, in religious movements, and through their ties to important private-sector entities such as the energy industry and the military-industrial complex.

The first consequences of this sustained struggle for growth were felt during the 1994 elections. During the mid-term elections of that year, for the first time in decades, the Democratic Party lost control of Congress. At that opportune moment, the "Republican revolution" led by Newt Gingrich and the "Contract with America" platform offered a series of social, political, and economic transformations which the incumbent Clinton administration had failed to bring about during its first term in office.

Still, this early advance was overshadowed by Republican tactical errors and Clinton's personality and political skill. These plus the 1995 Oklahoma bombings, renewed economic recovery, and international offensives resulted in Clinton's re-election in 1996. Nevertheless, just as Gingrich was a little too quick to pronounce Clinton politically dead in 1994, the Democrats underestimated the "neocons." The miscalculation was readily evident during the 1998 Clinton impeachment process

and in the polarization of the electorate which brought George W. Bush into the White House in 2000.

The younger Bush's rise to power was also part of an ongoing process of social change better grasped by the Republicans. The Democrats, increasingly identified with a progressive discourse centered on topics seen by sections of the population as sideline issues, such as civil and minority rights, drifted away from a significant fraction of the electorate. Faced with the trends and claims being advanced, these voters formed the impression that their own demands—for such things as improved quality of life, employment, and health benefits—were low-priority items, and responded in kind with a rightward shift.

Resulting as it did from a long list of domestic, demographic, ethnic, value, and economic changes, this shift in voter profile and preference went undetected by the Democrats. The neoconservatives, for their part, toned down some of their own shrillness and busied themselves with platform offerings more in touch with voter anxieties. The transformations afoot had to do with the growth of minority populations—especially Hispanics eager to fully realize the American dream—and various groups in the poorer Southern states, in industrial states (mostly engaged in steelmaking), and the agricultural Midwest—all of them directly affected by Clinton's policies of modernization and lowering of trade barriers. From their perspectives, the economic recovery of the 1990s—based as it was on globalization and lowering of trade barriers and tariff schedules—had increased their exposure to competitive pressures and whittled away at their income levels and employment figures (this on top of a tax hike). Another, wealthier cohort likewise disapproved of Clinton's policies and longed for a return to classical Republican economic and political values.

Addressing these demands in 2000, Bush's campaign staff sorted these priorities into two initiatives: "Compassionate Conservatism" and "Distinctly American Internationalism." Sizing up the conservative agenda, it held out hope for the United States' moral regeneration and recovery of family values, plus an easing of restraints on individual citizens—manifested in favor of gun ownership and tax cuts. The social agenda was skillfully offered as centrist, and stripped of radical rhetoric on controversial issues such as abortion, civil rights, and sex education. Neoconservatives likewise stepped out of character and introduced themselves as moderate centrists.

Distinctly American Internationalism meanwhile followed the pattern laid out in *Defense Planning Guidance* (which traced its beginnings to the Reagan Administration), and promised a vigorous renewal of leadership. Among its stated goals were a recovery of the Armed Forces through increased investment, and their resumption of "Star Wars" development—now called Theater Missile Defense (TMD). There was also a need to recover U.S. strategic positions within the international system, renewing the policy of maintaining a presence in Europe and Asia, and minimizing the weight and influence of multilateralism. This would remove all restraints on the country's future actions so that distinctly U.S. power could be projected throughout the world.

This kind of projection also called for new attitudes toward enemy or even allied nations (Japan, Russia, China, and European Union countries), no longer referred to as "partners," but rather, "competitors." With regard to failed and rogue states, Clinton-era negotiations were to be replaced by military pressure or even intervention for regime change. It amounted, therefore, to a traditional view of the world and the role of U.S. power in that world, a view harking back to the post-WW II era—yet dismissing as relative the very order then erected by the United States for the exercise of its power, thereby reverting to isolationism and unilateralism.

Representing the loyal opposition, the Gore agenda promised to press forward with Clinton's policies—domestic and foreign—but owing to personality traits and tactical errors, the Democratic candidate was unable to stem the success of the Bush campaign. While Gore was depicted as "Al Bore," Bush was seen as likable and populist. Bush was also flanked by key party figures and mobilized his voters. Gore's approach was different. He tried to keep the still-popular Clinton off the dais and appeared too sure of victory. In the midst of a heated campaign, the way was open for a Republican return to power.

Even after losing the popular vote, Bush's victory in the Electoral College placed him in the White House—following a Supreme Court decision that laid bare before the world the indirect workings of U.S. democracy. So began the 21st century and the implementation of the neoconservative agenda.

III. The Bush Era (2001–2006)

The still-unfolding Bush Era has, from its beginnings, brought a significant number of tactical changes to the U.S. leadership posture and done away with its benign appearance. A discernible change has occurred in the nation's ways of governing the international order, which points to the possibility that unilateral isolationism may yet prevail over the multilateral internationalism which followed World War II. The trend became starkly evident in the wake of 9/11, as seen with the directions taken by the two Bush administrations.

The first term: 9/11, the Bush Doctrine, and the War in Iraq (2001–2004)

As soon as he entered office, and despite the countless pressures and questions surrounding his administration, Bush began implementing his domestic and foreign agenda in no uncertain terms. Leaving behind campaign moderation and promises of non-intervention—especially where social and civil rights were concerned—Republicans pressed forward with policies advanced by religious and educational lobbies. Additionally, Bush presided over a hefty tax cut, increased defense spending, and fired up the TMD program.

In the international arena, hard-line changes in the WTO plus announcements that the United States would neither ratify the Kyoto Protocol nor join the International

Criminal Court showed that Bush administration priorities were more closely geared toward GOP agenda unilateralism. The drift away from partners such as China and the European Union was evident. Those relations were cooling, as were interactions with Russia. Actions fell in line with priorities—openly announced since the presidential campaign—namely strengthening America's dominant power position.

Braving international protests condemning its policies, the White House stood by its goals, backed by leading names from the GOP roster: Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice heading up the Vice Presidency, Defense Department (DOD) and National Security Council (NSC), were hard-liner representatives. This group, later dubbed the neoconservative hawks, was offset by Colin Powell—a moderate Republican in charge of the State Department. Even though Powell's decisions were passed over, his presence was considered crucial for putting a mediator's face on Bush's staff.

Entrenched as it was, this neoconservative agenda was somewhat shaken on September 11th of that year by the unprecedented terrorist attacks on New York and Washington—well inside the continental United States. To many, 9/11 seemed a response to Bush administration initiatives and emphasized the need to once again channel the country's superpower policies through multilateral avenues. Still, more than just an isolated event, the attacks fit into an historical process of challenging U.S. leadership along with the order it fostered—a process which had been taking root since the previous decade.

Back in 1993, at the beginning of the Clinton Administration, that same World Trade Center had been the target of a bomb attack. There had also been a stepping-up of attacks on and threats against U.S. interests in the Middle East and Africa in 1998 and 1999. Moreover, these attacks led the Democratic administration to invest in anti-terrorism studies toward the end of Clinton's second term. Some of those involved in the studies claim they did not receive proper attention from the incoming Bush administration, and that the 9/11 attacks were the result.[9] As pointed out, however, 9/11 was part of a larger cycle, and not anything brought on, directly or indirectly, by President Bush.

The neoconservative agenda was shaken up initially inasmuch as there was a brief resumption of multilateral activity and discourse. This resumption sought to rebuild the initial coalition in the global war on terror, beginning with the attacks on Afghanistan—identified as a sanctuary for the Al-Qaeda terrorists responsible for the 9/11 attacks—and culminating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Touted as a defensive and protective war, the Operation drew broad international support and was conducted by Powell. This pattern, however, was quickly abandoned in other areas. Not only was there a rebirth and expansion of the isolationist/unilateral view, the results of which could be seen in the Bush Doctrine of September, 2002, but also in a toughening up of domestic legislation.

The hardening of U.S. laws, creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and passage of the Patriot Act reflected this trend. Whenever fear is tossed on the

scales against the preservation of freedom, large segments of society—not just in the United States but in many other countries—have opted, with hardly any protest, for controversial measures in the name of national security. Among these measures, wiretaps, cause for apprehending suspects, and "tougher" interrogation techniques have aroused considerable attention.

On the international front, overcoming the geopolitical and geoeconomic features of E&E, the Bush Doctrine drew its priorities from the reasoning behind Distinctly American Internationalism, to which it added a new ingredient: an enemy to fight in the shape of international terrorism. The first draft of the National Security Strategy had already been touched on in an earlier comment on the Axis of Evil,[10] whereby Iran, Iraq, and North Korea were held up as countries which sponsored global terrorism and harbored terrorists, and were unconditionally hostile to the United States. Also included in this Axis were such countries as Libya, Syria, and Cuba. Already Bush was pointing to the importance of active measures aimed at stemming the growth of threats to the American way of life and to democracy in general.

The Bush Doctrine itself was drawn up by the National Security Council and the White House, and portrayed as the unification of U.S. values and interests aimed at transforming the United States' tactical posture, itself shifting from a policy of containment to one of prevention. Those who formulated the policy thought that the United States had attained a historically unprecedented level of power and ought to be prepared to put it to constructive use, preserving and enlarging its national interest and security. According to Bush,

> We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. So we must be prepared to defeat our enemies' plans….History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but failed to act. In the new world we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of action….We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends.[11]

Even given the absence of confrontation among the great powers[12]—united as they are by the common purposes and ideals of progress, freedom, and democracy in a positive balance of power—today's international system is not fully safe or stable because transnational forces and rogue and failed states perceive aggression as their only available means. Although a minority, these disruptive elements present a direct threat. Though intrinsically weak, they possess the technological means and know-how to cause great harm. Through violence, they may destabilize countries genuinely committed to peace, and draw sustenance through the oppression of those countries' populations. According to the NSS, WMDs are the weapons of choice for these states and groups, to be used ruthlessly and with no concern for consequences. Terrorism is now the primary threat to security.

Given this reality, it is imperative for the United States—due to its high position and moral leadership—to work side-by-side with its allies and, when necessary, alone, to prevent these threats from achieving their full potential. In other words, preventive steps must be taken in the face of clear signs of aggression to keep these countries from acquiring the means to attack, or from actually attacking democracies. The NSS makes specific reference to what it calls preemptive and preventive action.

Preemptive action is a response to easily-identified existing dangers, while preventative action is intended to keep situations deemed potentially threatening from fully forming into real dangers. Preventive action, in other words, seeks to intercept these emerging dangers and neutralize them before they develop. This is a very complex task which requires reliable intelligence and sound evaluations (and which cannot completely eliminate error).

Tactically, preventive action is the most significant break with the classical multilateral posture of the United States, its partners, and IGOs. It makes plausible the belief that containment may be replaced by an attack posture, with watchful waiting set aside. To the extent that the United States reserves the right to act on its own judgment of what it perceives as dangerous, and alone choose its method of action, before the danger fully emerges, therein lies the consolidation of the isolationist/unilateral drift of America's policy as the dominant world power.

Reactions to this policy choice included loss of trust in the United States and a growing feeling that any and all governments might be targeted for preventive intervention—provided only that their policies be considered a threat to the nation's security and interests. The medium and long-term effect of such a situation on the global balance of power is that other nations will, through means of their own, commence to seek preventive protection against perceived threats to their own security.

To achieve its purposes, the United States will continue to invest in its conventional and high-technology instruments of military power, to protect the entire country as well as the territory of its allies. The essential objective, as has been argued, is to prevent the growth and reach of hostile forces into the core democracies. Also inherent in this priority doctrine is a change in position concerning nuclear weapons, allowing for the possible use of such armaments even if the United States is not attacked using similar means, and allowing for the use of such decisive power against non-nuclear nations. Rhetorically, however, a pro-multilateralism discourse can still be heard.

Here the strategy assumes that the battle will be more than simply military, but also multidimensional and long-term, amounting to an active struggle in the field of values and ideas. Hence, the multilateral cooperation with international partners and organizations to further pro-active engagement and recovery policies aimed at undeveloped or unstable societies (as in the case of Africa). New policy priorities in this case include nation-building initiatives, economic, technical, and financial aid and a lowering of trade barriers. The primary partners in that job are old and new NATO allies, with emphasis on continuously restructuring the alliance to meet new challenges to the system.

Also under study are partnerships with Russia, China, and India—pivotal states in their regions, each (warily) seeking their own place in the sun. Top priority items for the Americas are flexible coalitions with key countries in the hemisphere—Mexico, Brazil, Canada, and Chile - to make possible the creation of a prosperous, democratic hemisphere. Still, there are those who point to regional drug-traffic-related crises in Colombia, and the poverty and misery of the Andean region, and argue that there is a real possibility of regional intervention in addition to existing aid programs. Underlying all these issues are the issues surrounding the FTAA and the dangers of left-wing populism. Another case specifically examined is the conflict between Israel and Palestine.

In every situation or sphere, the standard for determining priorities in partnerships with other nations comes down to a single essential element: its nearness to or distance from and its alignment with or opposition to U.S. policies. The situation is highly reminiscent of the beginnings of the Cold War, especially in its more recent Reagan phase, which arrayed international policies along a simple polar axis: East versus West or Communism versus Capitalism, and now democracy versus terror. Even though this democracy versus terror separation plainly ignores the division between Eastern versus Western civilization or between the United States and the rest of the world (as developed by Samuel Huntington), the rift has deepened on the account of tactical U.S. policy choices, which distances the country from its partners and, directly or indirectly, encourages her enemies.

The doctrine focuses on U.S. domestic security issues, which underwent preventive revamping and adjustment to the realities of the new post-invulnerability era. Budgets for domestic enforcement agencies grew, and their powers were recast. Preserving a cohesive and prosperous society is essential, with national security built "from the inside out."

The practical application of all of these concepts culminated in 2003 with the war in Iraq and with the consideration of new military operations in other countries such as Iran, North Korea, and Syria, events which spotlighted the Doctrine's hazards and internal consistency. To the Executive Branch, the DOD, and the NSC, this war was simply the natural course of the campaign against terror which began with the 2001 operation in Afghanistan. Saddam Hussein, a traditional enemy of the United States in the Middle East was seen as a focus of instability and danger which, by those evaluations, included the potential to become a real threat to neighboring countries, given his known aggressive behavior and supposed possession of WMDs. Hussein, along with Bin Laden, was allegedly responsible for 9/11. Both of these claims, albeit unconfirmed (and the former recently disproved) served as a foundation for gaining domestic support. Playing on widespread fears over security, they sent the message that preventive action was necessary for the protection of the United States.

Most of the international community did not support the intervention in Iraq and perceived no such imminent risk. During practically all of 2002, the United States tried to "prove its case" to the U.N. Security Council, and finally got approval of

a dubious resolution on the situation in Iraq. UNSCR 1441 determined that Iraq would suffer "grave consequences" if it did not accept U.N. demands. Despite the opposition of important allies such as France, Germany, former enemy Russia, and China, that was enough of a mandate for war. With the support of a Coalition of the Willing, the only important member of which was Great Britain (and Japan, but with a much smaller commitment), the United States got its war and began the attacks on Baghdad in March of 2003.

The military attack swiftly deposed Saddam Hussein and his allies, although the dictator was not captured until late that year. The United States promptly pronounced the operation a success and set up an interim government which, due to local violence and instability, was quickly replaced, remaining to this day on somewhat shaky ground. Then again, a similar situation persists in Afghanistan, although the U.S. government does not recognize the existence of civil war in either case. True to form, efforts relating to the Israel-Palestine question sketched out in the Roadmap to Victory got nowhere. The difficulties in managing the Hamas issue and increasingly hard-line Israeli policies persisted, complicated more recently by Israel waging war on Lebanon as part of the struggle against Hezbollah.

All of these difficulties and domestic economic problems notwithstanding, the Bush Administration won a second term in office, boosted by fear in the wake of 9/11 and the vacuum left by the Democrats. Throughout the campaign, neocons handily exploited popular fears, installing an alert system for new terrorist attacks, running Bin Ladin videos, and characterizing Democratic candidate John Kerry as weak and indecisive. In addition, the Democrats proved incapable of offering an alternative to the Bush agenda, focusing instead on already-familiar criticisms of the administration.

Within that setting, attacks by the Democrats had little effect, while the united Republicans rallied around the Administration's program, praising its consistency and vision. When pressed on account of foreign-policy flaws and contradictions, the increasing costs of the war, the violence, or the deficit, Republicans sidetracked discussion to controversial side issues such a proposed Constitutional Amendment banning homosexual marriage, thereby turning the debate to their advantage. So even though the 2004 elections were again polarized (Bush's 51 percent versus 48 percent for Kerry), unlike the year 2000 Bush now was elected with a popular mandate, consolidating Republican gains in the House and in state gubernatorial campaigns.

The second term: tactical adjustments (2005–2006)

Forging ahead with his policies as he had since 2001, Bush returned to the White House signaling that he intended to put to good use the political capital voters had handed him, despite Kerry's significant share of the vote. The country was still divided, but that fact was overshadowed by GOP domination of the political system, which it used to press home its domestic[13] and foreign agendas.

The Cabinet became increasingly neoconservative with the departure—announced during the campaign—of Secretary of State Colin Powell, to be replaced by the National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice. Rice was recommended for the job by her former second-in-command at the National Security Council, Stephen Hadley. This ensured that the two institutions would continue to conduct foreign policy as a team. The harmony was further reinforced by Dick Cheney staying on as Vice President and by Donald Rumsfeld's continued presence in the Defense Department, despite widespread criticism of his military strategy in Iraq[14] and his position on the question of torture at U.S. military facilities (Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib). On this issue of torture, additional protests were lodged over the nomination and confirmation of Alberto Gonzáles to the Attorney General's Office.[15]

Bush's inaugural address in January, and his State of the Union Address shortly afterward, simply confirmed the trend. In both speeches Bush restated his commitment to the global war on terror through preventive and preemptive action, and pledged aid to other nations in the struggle against the enemies of freedom. Whether through fresh military intervention or political interference, regime change remained a priority item. Again he pointed to the dangers posed by other members of the Axis of Evil –North Korea and, especially, Iran and Syria–warning them of America's unwavering commitment to self-defense and the spread of freedom.[16]

Although no new preventive interventions have been announced, and Bush and Rice may themselves have abandoned the prospect, these cannot be completely ruled out given the Bush administration's tactical views. In the short and medium term, however, they are not likely for logistical reasons. U.S. troops are already fighting on two fronts, making new incursions into the Middle East rather difficult. Then there are the human and financial costs involved in new operations. These would first require greater stability in Iraq or the transfer of troops to a multilateral corps, which does not appear likely. An additional objection would apply to Korea. Situated as it is in Asia, and given its involvement with other regional powers such as China, Russia, Japan, and South Korea, the United States would hardly have a free hand there.

Within this context, as a sort of tactical adjustment to the Bush Doctrine, work was begun on a framework of assertive multilateralism, primarily by Rice and her advisers. This version of multilateralism was intended, through a series of amendments and closer contact among member States, to restore the efficiency I.G.Os possessed when first created in 1945, and bring them into the 21st century, ready for combat against the clear and present danger of terrorism. The agenda can be observed in two sets of initiatives: sending key personalities such as John Bolton and Paul Wolfowitz to the U.N. and World Bank, respectively, and also in Rice's reconciliation offers tendered in 2005, when the new Secretary of State made a tour through the most important regions and countries allied with the United States.

Two purposes became apparent during this tour - smoothing relations with longtime allies upset over the war in Iraq, and gaining renewed support for the U.S.

agenda by diversifying partnerships. One should note that on these trips, Rice was sometimes accompanied by President Bush himself, and on other occasions, by Donald Rumsfeld. On the question of the longtime allies, these visits did benefit U.S. relations with European and Asian partners, but did not eliminate suspicion or reverse their own plans for action, especially in the cases of Russia and China.

With regard to Europe in particular, there are still issues pending with France and a drift away from such partners as Spain and Italy, where domestic politics led to the election of candidates not nearly as closely aligned with the United States as their predecessors had been. Along these lines, a recent and important setback for Bush occurred in Tony Blair's England: in 2007 Blair announced that he would be moving out of 10 Downing Street. Much of his loss of popularity is traceable to the post-9/11 war on terrorism. Then again, the change of administration in Germany clearly benefited Bush. Conservative Angela Merkel replaced Schroeder, one of the main opponents of the war in Iraq.

Beyond Europe, Rice traveled through China, the Middle East, and also Brazil—an important regional partner likewise visited by Bush in 2005. Topics such as multilateral FTAA negotiations[17] were nevertheless supplanted by U.S. efforts to strengthen bilateral interchanges and by its greater preoccupation with political issues. Foremost among these are apprehensions over the spread of the "irresponsible populist left" symbolized by Hugo Chavez, Evo Morales, Fidel Castro (whose health gives rise to much speculation about Cuba's future) and defeated Mexican candidate Lopez Obrador. Hopes of curbing this leftward slide, viewed as a threat to democracy, rest on alternatives offered by the "responsible" left, including Vasquez in Uruguay, Bachelet in Chile, and Lula in Brazil.[18]

Current efforts to reach "new allies" such as India extend way beyond traditional Bush administration practices. A bilateral nuclear agreement with India preserves the development of its civil and military programs and opens up the possibility of purchase or exchanges of technology and equipment with the United States. To Rice, the fact that India is not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is not an obstacle since that country, by indirect means, has already met the treaty requirements. Political and trade provisions were also added to the U.S.-India bilateral nuclear agreement. The agreement, therefore, has many ramifications: it adds another partner to the Bush Administration's global agenda and, in terms of the global and Asian balance of power, holds some potential for containing Chinese advances while fostering Russia's recovery in Asia.

All of these efforts have nevertheless brought no new assertiveness to multilateralism, as can be seen from the impasses in the W.T.O. and U.N. The changes in the U.S. position, albeit positive, and even though reincorporating some aspects of multilateral internationalism, have not led to any real change in the workings of the Bush Doctrine. A revised edition of this Doctrine, published in March of 2006, underscored government-related features of the war on terror. Despite their transnational

character, terrorist groups rely on political states in order to function, and with each passing day, countries such as Syria and Iran are increasingly perceived as threats. Furthermore, President Bush has emphasized that the threats offered by these nations are not limited to terror, and gone on to compare their extremism to the fascist ideologies of the 1930s.[19]

Iran has in recent months emerged as the most decisive threat to global stability and to the United States, by these evaluations, due to the development of its nuclear capabilities. Within the U.N. Security Council, the United States and its European allies reached agreement with Russia and China on the approval of a resolution imposing sanction on Iran for its nuclear transgressions. The Middle East is likewise caught up in a spiral of confrontation, blocking hopes for the building up of democracy in the region—especially given the tension, as we've seen, in Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon, Israel, and Palestine.

Reverberations of all of these changes overseas are continuously felt in the United States, where no moderate faction has recovered sufficient strength to "break" the rule of the neoconservatives. The neoconservative hold on power was strongly contested, however, in the 2006 legislative elections, which was fought around the Iraq issue and resulted in Democratic control of Congress. These swings have to do with shifting domestic values and demographic changes affecting the United States altering its traditional profile. Twenty first-century America is a country undergoing change, and the choices made there establish not only the course of U.S. policy, but that of the entire international system as well.

Closing Observations

From 1989 through 2006 the United States has faced a series of foreign and domestic challenges which brought out the nation's strength and possible vulnerabilities. From George H. W. Bush to George W. Bush, passing through Clinton, strategies have been reworked and implemented. Unprecedented events left U.S. society deeply shaken at the crossroads of some very tough choices. Those choices have socially and culturally altered the United States. They have affected the country as a world leader and wrought changes on a global scale.

Unlike 1945, when U.S. power and its global role were perceived as multidimensional, isolationist and unilateral tendencies took root in 2001 and remain up to today. Instead of strengthening the order it brought about, the United States appears to be deconstructing its structural and ideological foundations, resulting in an atmosphere of increasing global insecurity.

Within this scenario, the global expansion of preventive doctrines in states of varying sizes and varied interests is spreading. Although at first these policies appeared to be a reaction to an environment perceived as increasingly hostile— an immediate defensive effort—additional consequences may yet materialize: destabilization of specific regions, fragmentation, a power vacuum and the forging of alliances in opposition to the

United States. In the medium to long term, such alliances may reflect a consolidation of alternatives to U.S. leadership, a deepening of multipolar trends, or an increase in coalitions opposed to the U.S. role as the dominant world power. Political frameworks for shared power and multilateralism now tend to erode and undermine the credibility and legitimacy of familiar institutions such as the U.N. and the W.T.O.

As the historical processes driving this transition accelerate, they appear to be converging toward increasingly frequent spirals of confrontation abroad. The domestic reaction has been polarization and division, which in turn add their own proportions to the crisis. Within the United States, the upshot of all these conflicting forces has been to raise anxiety not only about the continuation of the Second American Century, but also about the very vitality of democracy, which needs to revisit its roots, re-examine its best traditions, and be re-founded, so that it may heal itself.

Endnotes

1. For a more detailed examination of this and other U.S. foreign policy traditions against a background of Foreign Relations from the 18th century to the 21st, see Cristina S. Pecequilo (2005) *A política externa dos EUA: continuidade ou mudança?*

2. The military buildup was spurred by increased defense budgets for conventional, nuclear, and high-tech weapons systems—the last of which led to the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which promised to make the United States invulnerable to nuclear attack by providing a defensive shield against missile attacks. (SDI was often referred to as Star Wars by the media).

3. Isolationist/Unilateral were chosen as modifiers for this Internationalism, to underscore the quest for complete freedom of action by the United States and its position as the dominant superpower.

4. The expression traces its origins to articles written by Charles Krauthammer in 1990. It was brought back into use by other intellectuals having ties to the neoconservatives, such as Robert Kagan and William Kristol (2000 and 2006).

5. Energy is a recurring theme in the worldview of U.S. leaders and strategic thinkers. In his 2006 State of the Union address, President Bush promised investment in alternative energy sources to end dependence on imports, since the United States was, in his words, "addicted to oil."

6. The groundwork for the War in Iraq and conduct of Operation Desert Storm in 1990-91, based on U.N. negotiations and coalitions, are examples of that moderate approach – a moderation not observed in the new war in 2003.

7. Other expressions associated with the U.S. style of leadership are "honest broker" and "empire of consent" as opposed to an "empire of coercion." The terms were coined by Gaddis (1998) to contrast U.S. and Soviet actions during the early days of the Cold War.

8. Rogue states are nations relatively well-organized structurally, but ruled by authoritarian leaders of oppressive regimes not all committed to the rules of international comity, and which back aggressive transnational groups likewise hostile to order. Failed states are nations with no apparent political organization, awash in social and economic crises, and which shelter and generate radicals.

9. These accusations were made by Richard Clark and were also the subject of analysis in the Congressional 9/11 National Commission report. Still, the report avoided correctly blaming the Bush Administration for the attacks, and concluded that the White House would have been

unable to prevent the attacks. The report did not give the government to clean bill, however, and pointed to faulty performance by intelligence agencies such as the CIA and FBI. Testimony by such key administration figures as Powell and Rice were taken in preparing this report.

10. The idea was first aired in President Bush's State of the Union Address in January of 2002 reaffirmed in several speeches and finally included in the NSS in September.

11. See Chapter V of the NSS, "Prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction."

12. The document warns that Russia and China are not yet fully integrated into this world, but are going through a lengthy transition process with some potential for backsliding. For more on these relationships see NSS Chapter VIII "Develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power."

13. To the idea of Compassionate Conservatism was added the concept of an Ownership Society, adding to existing values and moral principles the notion of increasing economic and individual freedom.

14. Rumsfeld's "shock and awe" strategy, to critics, are to blame for the unstable conditions in Iraq, since the presence of troops alone has apparently not—since the beginning of operations—sufficed to bring local stability.

15. Gonzáles was responsible for reevaluating the concept, paving the way for tougher "interrogation methods." Other controversies, such as how to define "enemy combatant," as opposed to "prisoner of war," are included in this agenda. Enemy combatant is a category for members of terrorist groups are not identified as citizens of any particular state. Secret prisons for terrorism suspects are also coming under fire, and their existence was recently acknowledged by President Bush.

16. According to Charles Krauthammer's *The Unipolar Moment* (2004), this posture, known as "Democratic Realism" pragmatically strengthens U.S. positions in strategic areas without losing sight of the loftier ideals of progress and democracy.

17. During his first campaign, Bush had promised a new policy for the hemisphere—the Century of the Americas—heralded by the resumption of such projects as FTAA (negotiations on which remained on hold, though slated for completion in January of 2005). These advances, however, never materialized, with the region placed on the back burner even before 9/11.

18. For a deeper look into this debate, see Jorge G. Catañeda's "Latin America's left turn" and Peter Hakim's "Is Washington Losing Latin America?"

19. The purpose is to cast terrorism/fundamentalism as systemic, anti-Western challenges similar to those posed by fascism and communism in the 20th century, as well as remove all doubt as to their true nature, and the nature of the lopsided wars fought in the aftermath of 9/11 - lopsided in terms of the power difference between the combatant States, and in terms of the visibility profiles of State and non-State actors.

Bibliography

Boot, Max. 2004. "Think again: neocons," in *Foreign Policy*, January/February.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1997. *The Grand Chessboard* (New York: Basic Books).

----------. 2004. *The Choice* (New York: Basic Books).

BUSH, George W. 2002a. State of the Union Address.

----------. 2005a. Inaugural Address (January).

----------. 2005b. State of the Union Address.

----------. 2006. State of the Union Address.

Castañeda, Jorge G. 2006. "Latin America's left turn," in *Foreign Affairs,* May/June.

Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M. 2003. *America Unbound* (Washington: Brookings Institution).

Election Data 2000/2004. www.fec.gov

Gaddis, John Lewis. 1998. *We Now Know* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

----------. 2005. "Grand strategy in the second term," in *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 84(1).

Gorce, Paul-Marie. 2002. "The Hawk Doctrine," in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, English Edition (September).

Golub, Philip. 2001. "America's Imperial Longings," in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, English Edition (July).

----------. 2003. "United States: Inventing Demons," in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, English Edition (March).

Hakim, Peter. 2006. "Is Washington Losing Latin America?" in *Foreign Affairs*, January/February.

Halimi, Serge. "Election 2004 Special: The United States Bush Record" in *Le Monde Diplomatique,* English Internet Edition.

----------. "What's the Matter with West Virginia?" in *Le Monde Diplmatique,* English Internet Edition.

Hagel, Chuck. 2004. "A Republican Foreign Policy," in *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 83(4), p. 64-76.

Hirsh, Michael. "Bush and the world," in *Foreign Affairs,* September/October 81(5), pp. 18-43.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. *O Choque de Civilizações* (São Paulo: Objetiva).

----------. 2004. *Who are we?* (New York: Simon and Schuster).

Ikenberry, G. John. "America's Imperial Ambition," in *Foreign Affairs*, September/October, 81(5), p. 44-60

Johnson, Chalmers. 2004. *The Sorrows of Empire.* (New York: Metropolitan Books. New York).

Kagan, Robert and Kristol, William, ed. 2000a. *While America Sleeps* (San Francisco, Encounter Books).

----------. 2000a. *Present Dangers: Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign and Defense Policy* (San Francisco, Encounter Books).

Klare, Michael. 2002. "United States: Energy and Strategy," in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, (November).

Krauthammer, Charles. 1990-1991. "The Unipolar Moment," in *Foreign Affairs* 1(70) Winter, p. 23-33.

----------. 2004. "In Defense of Democratic Realism," in *The National Interest* Fall, p. 15-25.

Kristol, Irving. 1995. *Neo Conservatism* (Chicago: Elephant Books).

Levey, David H and Brown, Stuart S. 2005. "The Overstretch Myth," in *Foreign Affairs*, March/April.

National Security Strategy for a New Century, White House, NSC, 1993, 2002, 2006.

Nye Jr, Joseph S. 2002. *O Paradoxo do Poder Americano (*São Paulo: Ed. UNESP).

Pecequilo, Cristina S. 2005. *A política externa dos EUA: continuidade ou mudança?* (Porto Alegre: Ed. UFRGS).

----------. Artigos on www.relnet.com.br and www.ilea.ufrgs.br/nerint.

Prestowitz, Clyde. 2003. *Rogue Nation* (New York: Basic Books).

Revista Idéias. 2003. "Terrorismo e Guerra." Year 10, Vol. 2 (IFCH/UNICAMP).

Rice, Condoleezza. 2005. Remarks at Swearing-in Ceremony as Secretary of State (January) www.state.gov.

Todd, Emmanuel. 2002. *Após o Império* (Lisboa: Edições 70).

Vizentini, Paulo Fagundes. 2004. *Descompasso entre as nações* (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Record).

WHISPERING IN THE EAR OF THE PRINCE: IDEOLOGUES AND FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING IN THE PRESIDENCIES OF RONALD REAGAN AND GEORGE W. BUSH

Carlos da Fonseca*

I. Power and Knowledge

The relationship between scholars and public officials is well-known and well-documented. Throughout history, intellectuals have sought to "whisper in the ear of the Prince." The list of famous teachers who prepared young princes for the responsibilities of power is long: "Aristotle tutored the young Alexander; Seneca taught Nero; Gerbert of Aurillac instructed both a future German emperor, Otto III, and a king of France, Robert Capet; Thomas Hobbes saw to the education of the young Prince of Wales who would become Charles II; and Cardinal Mazarin took time from other duties to see to the training of Louis XIV."[1]

Intellectuals, however, frequently went beyond the traditional role of "tutors of a willing prince or president." Increasingly, as the responsibilities and the processes of government became more complex, experts and intellectuals performed important duties within State administrations, as their "basic skills [such a]s writing and calculating gave [them] a set of tools that helped shape the emergence of an expert class within nascent bureaucracies."[2] They came to work as record-keepers and scribes, thus controlling the amount and quality of information obtained by rulers in order to make their decisions. From that vantage point, they pondered the relationship between power and knowledge. Based on such analysis, some wrote what can be considered 'practical manuals on statecraft' (the so-called 'Mirror of Princes' of Renaissance), a few of which (Machiavelli's *The Prince*) have survived until today.

In the United States, despite occasional episodes of hostility and suspicion towards scholars, policy experts have been successful in their tutoring duties, particularly in the 20th century. Allan Whiting, while alluding to the pejorative way FDR's academic advisers were referred to by the press ("brain trust"), emphasized the role played by people such as Rexford G. Tugwell in preparing Roosevelt for his 13-year tenure.[3] It was precisely under Roosevelt that the tradition of policymakers increasingly relying on scholars was inaugurated—not so much as a byproduct of the president's personal inclinations or character,[4] but as a direct consequence of the changes in the presidency that occurred under his leadership: the establishment of the "Modern Presidency,"

* Diplomat, First Secretary at the Brazilian Embassy, in Washington, D.C.

which entailed expansion of the role of the federal government during the Great Depression and the Second World War, and the creation of new bureaucracies within the executive branch, etc.[5]

This phenomenon persisted in the following years. Nelson Rockefeller served as a special assistant for foreign policy to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, for whom he convened a group of academics to discuss the country's long-term international objectives. Among the participating experts was young Harvard professor Henry A. Kissinger. Walter Heller, member of the Council of Economic Advisers, coached Kennedy in matters of Keynesian economics, just as years later budget director Kermit Gordon would tutor Johnson in fiscal policy. In foreign policy, the role of academics reached its apex under JFK and his ideal of a "new frontier," to be conquered with the help of the "best and the brightest." Kennedy began what was to become a tradition: during his tenure, the post of National Security Advisor was considerably upgraded and, since then, has been frequently occupied by renowned scholars (McGeorge Bundy, Walt Rostow, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Richard Allen, Anthony Lake, Brent Scowcroft and, finally, Condoleezza Rice).

Informing or influencing? From scientific neutrality to ideological activism

The role of intellectuals in policymaking is frequently an ambiguous one. While giving the 'Prince' his knowledge, which will allow for an informed decision, the scholar is also providing him with advice that reflects his own opinion—and sometimes his own interests.

A very fine line separates the act or the willingness to inform from the act or the willingness to influence. The very idea of influencing is in itself difficult to encompass. Hicks, Forgette, and Couloumbis assert that "influence…can range on a continuum from total control over one person's behavior to a mere awareness of another's attitudes or advice."[6] Whiting defines it as "guidance" on the destinies of the State. According to him, "sometimes [the scholar] has been openly explicit in articulating advice, as with Machiavelli. More often, however…he has sought to influence through private persuasion or has rendered counsel indirectly through scholarly essays."[7]

Going a step further, David Newsom distinguishes between "traditional scholars," who will limit their role to providing policy makers with the "truth" (an attitude that will frequently turn them into "critics rather than allies of official policy"), and "political scholars," who "desire to influence beyond the campus…stay close to politicians and welcome occasional immersion in governmental action."[8]

In a similar note, Allen Smith argues that "truth speaks to power in many different tones of voice." The "cloistered intellectual," deprived of any political ambitions, can afford to be faithful to the truth, and provide the "Prince" with information that need not "bend to anything" to justify or accommodate "pressing political ends or personal ambitions." The policy adviser, on the other hand, "if [he] aspire[s] to be of use, must speak to power in a political context; and [he] must speak a useful truth."

Failure to do so, suggests Smith, will eventually bring frustration to the 'counselor,' as in the case of Francis Bacon, a "philosopher with political ambitions," who "fell from grace" during the reign of James I, and wrote (in his essay 'On Counsel') that "the best advisers are the dead, for books speak plain when counselors blanch."[9]

In his typology, Dennis Florig[10] added a third category to those of Newsom and Smith. According to him, among the scholars with a career (or active involvement) in politics, there are the more traditional-style intellectuals, whose activities are focused on producing information that is, at the same time, academically sound and politically applicable; there are what we could call "intellectuals for rent" who abdicate their own "truth" in exchange for power and prestige; and there are activist intellectuals, who promote a political agenda by influencing policymakers. Florig refers to the latter group as "ideologues."

In its definition of the term "ideologue," the American Heritage Dictionary notes that it refers to a person (expert, scholar) with an "intense allegiance to a set of ideas." This definition, although correct, does not come close to encompassing all the various dimensions of such individuals, especially with respect to their relationships with policymakers. Thomas Langston, who wrote a book on the subject, referred to such "activist scholars" as "men of ideas,"[11] in contrast to traditional scholars (such as academics), which he called "men with ideas."[12] According to him, an ideologue is noteworthy not only in showing allegiance to his ideas but also as someone who

> Exhibits certain specific traits in his thinking. He believes that his ideas are logically certain and thus impregnable to criticism. Consequently, he often appears to be 'close-minded'. [He] believes that his ideas are true not just conditionally but absolutely. He is certain, furthermore, that his way of looking at the world can help make sense of a wide array of phenomena that leaves others confused…. Finally, [he] is likely to affiliate with like-minded individuals in clubs, organizations, think tanks….and knows not only what he believes but what he wants to do. He has an agenda and believes that the world might be transformed by its implementation.[13]

In the United States, ideologues play an important political role, with their importance being a function of how much they are able to influence the presidents, whom Florig considers to be the "ideological leaders"[14] of the nation. Florig asserts that ideologies matter in politics because "at the intersection of the President's roles as media politician and policymaker is political philosophy or ideology…Presidents must offer justifications for the policy actions they take." Ideologies "define a consistent public philosophy that justifies those choices."[15]

Due to their specific policymaking roles presidents are also central figures in any process of reiterating or changing ideologies. As Florig said, "because of its media visibility, the presidency is the single most important institution…for the development

of ideology."[16] Once an ideology has become embedded in politics, many institutions may contribute to enforce it. In the process of generating ideology, or promoting ideological change, the "bully pulpit" of the presidency is irreplaceable.

Thus the importance of ideologues, who seek to "whisper in the ear of the Prince" with greater intensity than traditional scholars. Langston defines the significance (and utility) of ideologues and ideologies for Presidents:

> Ideology and ideologues can provide cues to action valid for an extremely wide array of issues. The claim to absolute truth as well as logical certitude suggests that the person of ideas will be steadfast in his actions, even under pressure…and because logical certitude, along with comprehensiveness, implies an exceptional degree of coherent order, an ideologue's belief should be highly predictable. Because an overriding problem in presidential politics…is how to achieve control of appointees in an environment where confusion is part of the job…the ability to work independently yet with steadfastness of purpose and predictability…makes the person of ideas a potentially influential force in the post-New Deal presidency.[17]

II. How Sensitive are Presidents to Ideologues? Creating a Framework

Although ideologues have existed in and around all U.S. governments, the way presidents relate to their influences varies as a function of different factors, such as the president's personality and the context in which he exercises his mandate. Florig argues that every administration is the object of cross pressures from ideologues and interest groups.[18] Different presidents from the same party respond in different ways to the various ideological cross pressures on different issues. While "some presidents are very self-conscious about defining a consistent public philosophy that justifies the choices they make, others are almost anti-ideological in their attempts to avoid being seen as outside the political center. Ronald Reagan and FDR are examples of presidents with distinct ideologies to legitimate their policies….Jimmy Carter and Dwight Eisenhower, on the other hand, stand out as presidents who tried to avoid ideological labels and commitments."[19]

In order to establish a comprehensive framework capable of explaining, or even predicting, the degree to which presidents are influenced by ideologues, one should consider both the personal characteristics of the chief of state and the circumstances in which he exercises his mandate. The foremost determinant of the way he will react to an ideologue's influence lies in the president himself, his personality and beliefs, or, to use the specialized terminology of well-known academics, his "operational codes" and his "presidential character." Beyond that, other determinants reside in the way a president defines his working organizational model (what Pfiffner, among others, referred to as the "presidential style"[20]), and in the context within which he will exercise his presidential powers. Regarding this last point, it is important to consider

both permanent and provisional aspects of that context. In that sense, one should acknowledge what Skowronek called the "political times,"[21] but also pay attention to more 'impermanent' (sometimes unpredictable) episodes, such as the reaction of other political actors (Congress, the Judiciar, and the media), and the possibility of a consequential "catalyzing event" (such as September 11th).

Presidential operational code and ideologues

The idea of an "operational code," capable of determining options and choices of a decision-maker, evolves from Nathan Leites' original analysis of the Soviet politburo,[22] as well as from Milton Rokeach's concept of "belief systems," defined by the author as representing "the total universe of a person's beliefs about the physical world, the social world, and the self."[23] Its current meaning derives from the typology proposed by Alexander George, who isolated the cognitive aspects of the operational code suggested by Leites and simultaneously systematized some of the elements of Rokeach's proposition. In George's version, the operational code became a "set of generalized principles about political life that an individual acquires and applies in information processing for the purpose of exercising judgment and choice in decision-making."[24] According to this author, knowledge of the beliefs of political actors serves to "clarify the general criteria, requirements, and norms the subject attempts to meet in assessing opportunities…in estimating the costs and gains associated with them and in making…calculations."[25] As pointed out by George, however, while the existence of 'operational codes' is critical in identifying why leaders behave in certain ways, they are "general guidelines that do not unilaterally determine choice. It is important to remember that other factors, including personality, domestic constraints, national interest…also affect the decision-making process."[26]

Building upon George's concept, it is possible to argue that a president will be more sensitive to an ideologue's influence to the extent to which their 'operational codes' are similar, or at least compatible. As we will see, this compatibility existed in the cases of both Presidents Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush, although, in the first case, it was less far-reaching than one might think.

Presidential character and ideologues

In a book first published in 1972,[27] James David Barber defined a psychological typology that he applied to U.S. presidents, in the belief that it would help to explain their performances (and predict that of those to come). His classification was composed of four basic character patterns:

- **Active-Positive**: Barber sees a consistency between "much activity and the enjoyment of it, indicating relatively high self-esteem and relative success in relating to the environment." Active-positive presidents show an orientation toward productiveness as a value and an ability to "use his styles flexibly, adaptively."

- **Active-Negative**: Barber identifies a contradiction between "relatively intense effort and relatively low emotional reward for that effort." The activity has a "compulsive quality," as if the president is trying to make up for something or to escape from anxiety into hard work. An active-negative president is ambitious, striving upward, power-seeking. His stance toward the environment "is aggressive [as] he has a persistent problem in managing his aggressive feelings." His self-image is vague and discontinuous, "hampered by the condemnations of a perfectionist conscience."
- **Passive-Positive**: Barber identifies this type as a "receptive, compliant, other-directed character whose life is a search for affection as a reward for being agreeable and cooperative rather than personally assertive." There is low self-esteem, but also "a superficial optimism." A hopeful attitude "helps dispel doubt and elicits encouragement from others."
- **Passive-Negative**: Barber sees a passive-negative president as "someone who does little in politics and enjoys it less." The fact that some passive-negatives are in politics and sometimes get to the presidency is explained by a "character-rooted orientation toward doing dutiful service," which "compensates for low self-esteem." Once in office, passive-negative presidents have trouble being good leaders, as "they lack the experience and flexibility to perform effectively.…Their tendency is to withdraw, to escape from the conflict and uncertainty of politics by emphasizing vague principles and procedural arrangements."[28]

By applying Barber's typology, one can try to predict the probability of a president being prone to ideological influences. Langston and Sanders came to the conclusion that active-positive presidents are less open to ideological influences,[29] whereas passive presidents "will be influenced by ideology to the extent that ideologues predominate in the policymaking environment (particularly in the context of a strong party system that dictates the composition of key advisors)."[30] As for active-negative presidents, they "perceive themselves in a lonely struggle in a dangerous world…in which loyalty to ideals becomes more important than the calculation of results." In that sense, "it is easy to see how ideologues might buttress the conviction of such a president in a favored policy."[31]

Presidential style and ideologues

Roger Porter[32] defined a typology of organizational models the president has at hand in order to deal with the inherent difficulties of his tasks—difficulties that derive from the "interrelatedness of issues" the president deals with and the "fragmented" nature of the executive branch he oversees. According to Porter, a president can chose between an 'adhocracy,' "which minimizes regularized and systematic patterns of providing advice and instead relies heavily on the President distributing assignments and selecting whom he listens to and when," 'centralized management,' which

"emphasizes heavy reliance on White House staff and entities within the EOP" This "reliance…is grounded in a desire for analysis and recommendations from individuals who share the President's perspective," or 'multiple advocacy,' "an open system designed to expose the President systematically to competing arguments and views advanced by the advocates themselves," and which, therefore, relies heavily on the talent of an honest broker, whose role is to "ensure that the interested parties are represented and that the debate is structured and balanced."[33]

It may be inferred from the application of Porter's model to our study that presidents who adopt "adhocracy" and multiple advocacy organizational models are less likely to be influenced by a single ideological voice. In the first case (particularly when the "adhocracy" is of a competitive nature), the system is deliberately conceived in order to prevent a single voice (or advice) to be predominant in 'the president's ear.' In the second case, the model's main purpose is to ensure that as many voices as possible will be heard. On the other hand, presidents who rely on a centralized management model could easily be the subject of direct influences of ideologues, especially if they are among the president's close advisers.

Presidential times and ideologues

In his book *The Politics Presidents Make*,[34] Stephen Skowronek established a typology of what he called "recurrent structures of presidential authority." In his view, a president's political identity necessarily fell into one of four types:

- Politics of Reconstruction: in this situation, a president is elected as a direct result of dynamics of direct repudiation of previous ideologies or interests, deemed as "failed or irrelevant responses to the problems of the day." In this situation, the president will preach "from the opposition to the previously established regime." His presidency will become "a kind of political interregnum." The election will "reflect a general political consensus that something fundamental had gone wrong in the high affairs of state," though it will not convey a clear message about what exactly should be changed.
- Politics of Disjunction: This situation is defined by Skowronek as the "step back" of the reconstruction politics. An "impossible leadership situation," the 'politics of disjunction' will be one where a president is affiliated with a set of established commitments that have been considered "failed or irrelevant responses to the problems of the day." In this situation, to affirm those established commitments is to "stigmatize oneself as a symbol of the nation's problems." Nevertheless, political instinct will, in this context, frequently work against the survival of a political regime, as it will dictate a reaffirmation of those old beliefs even in times of crises.
- Politics of Articulation: Skowronek identifies those situations as "moments in political time when established commitments of ideology and interest are relatively resilient, providing solutions, or legitimate guides to solutions, to the governing problems of the day." Presidents in office in those times are "orthodox-innova-

tors," who "galvanize political action with promises to continue the good work of the past and demonstrate the vitality of the established order."

- Politics of Preemption: This situation occurs when a president who does not belong to the 'regime party' wins an election because of a peculiar electoral process brought on by some temporary scandal or disruption in the majority party. Such presidents "have the freedom of their independence from established commitments, but unlike presidents in a politics of reconstruction, their repudiative authority is manifestly limited by the political, institutional, and ideological supports that the old establishment maintains."[35]

Applying Skowronek's typology, one could argue that the least ideological presidency would be the "preemptive" one, in which, because of a peculiar electoral process brought on by some temporary scandal or disruption in the majority party, a president who is not part of the regime party is able to win (such as Clinton, Eisenhower, etc.).[36] On the other hand, periods of reconstruction (Reagan, FDR) or disjunction (Carter, Hoover) are by definition times of societal stress, when ideologues usually are more numerous and well-organized. However, presidents of disjunction frequently lack the political legitimacy necessary to lead an ideological offensive. Presidents of reconstruction, on the contrary, need "warrants for positive action" in order to justify their "mandate for destruction" of the old system. "Ideologues [are] especially helpful to such presidents in as much as they seek to answer this question: What is the grand new world that is being built on the ashes of the discredited old order?"[37] Presidents of articulation, finally, find themselves in a peculiar situation. As followers of a regime "reconstructor," "they are expected to finish whatever major policy revisions remain in the agenda."[38] In that sense, their presidency could be ideologically more intense than a preemptive or a disjunctive one, but not more than one of reconstruction. Besides, new issues may emerge ("mid-course issues") that would prompt political (or even ideological) debates, giving therefore more leeway to ideologues. As we will see, this is precisely what happened in the case of George W. Bush.

Presidential context and ideologues

Beyond Skowronek's typology, it is important to consider, as part of the "presidential context," the overall political environment in which a president is ruling. Langston and Florig agree that the permeability of American governments to ideologies is to a great extent determined by the historical decline of political parties. The electoral reform of 1972 established a more direct relationship between candidates and voters. One of the consequences of those changes is that the personal views and ambitions of the presidential candidate became more important than partisan identities and the party ideology. The increasing difficulty for a critical partisan realignment that would set the boundaries for ideological maneuvering made it easier for an ambitious president to "leave a large personal stamp on the life of a nation."[39] And in doing so, the

president tends to "rely increasingly upon an elite suited to such an environment,"[40] i.e. the ideologues.

Going beyond the political environment, we should also consider the process by which ideologies are themselves created. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz argues that ideology "arises in times of stress"[41] (an idea that, in itself, is compatible with Skowronek's classification). It is an aspect of human thought, he asserts, that appears when social realities cannot be understood in terms of accepted norms or assumptions. Similarly, Mark Blyth argues that situations of high uncertainty, i.e. situations regarded as unique events, where agents are unsure as to what their interests are and how to realize them, are especially prone to the arrival of new ideas[42] and ideologies. As the case of the Bush administration shows, the significance of context in the ideological character of a Presidency is indeed great. Unique events can sometimes come in the form of a "catalyst," a concept used by Inderjeet Parmar in a paper recently published about the impact of September 11th on U.S. foreign policy.[43]

III. Applying the Framework: The Cases of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush

Reagan and Bush are frequently referred to as two of the most ideological presidents in recent American history. It is not the objective of this paper to verify whether or not this is true. Rather, the goal is to examine, on the basis of the above-mentioned proposition, the role played by ideologues in those two Administrations. The decision to compare Reagan and Bush's responsiveness to their ideologues is justified not only by the fact that they belong to the same party and the same 'political regime,' but also by the fact that they share similar ideas and operational codes, to the point that Reagan is often cited as a 'model' by Bush. This section will focus specifically on the influence of neoconservative ideologues in shaping U.S. foreign policy under those two presidents.

Operational Code

Reagan and Bush brought to the presidency "operational codes" that were similar in many regards, both being conservative Republicans, with an "outside the beltway" attitude (though Bush clearly has never been a total outsider), favoring values rather than political compromises, although Reagan was more of a 'principled man,' while Bush is a rather religiously 'moral' person. Both promoted supply side economics and advocated a political "moral clarity." Both favored tax cuts and small government, although, during the Bush Administration, government's role has greatly expanded with the creation of new bureaucracies aimed at dealing with security. Both defended an increase in military spending as part of a larger plan to advance the United States' interests and leadership in the world.

Reagan, however, saw this leadership against the backdrop of the Cold War, a situation that emphasized the threats posed by the Soviet Union and the opportuni-

ties to reduce and manage or, as he preferred, eliminate the enemy. Bush came to see it, after 9/11, as a moral crusade against forces that did not represent a terminal threat (in the sense that the USSR did), but rather an unpredictable, irrational, and uncontrollable one.

According to Richard Allen,[44] despite having had no previous experience in the matter, Reagan arrived at the White House with a clear idea of what he wanted to do in foreign policy. Being a 'reconstruction president,' he acted accordingly, displaying, from the beginning, a predisposition to boldness and ambition, and an inclination to confront Communism, rather than simply manage it. Thus, Reagan took the country into a confrontation with the Soviet Union. "But he did so intentionally, deliberately, and in slow motion. Moving to confront the adversary in this way, Reagan followed a plan that he had thought through over many years." During the primary campaign of 1976, years before becoming president, Reagan already showed his propensity for confrontation and an intense disdain towards the policy of *détente*, which he saw as a mere reaffirmation of containment. When he took office, he brought this old conviction and, with it, people who thought the same way he did. Among those were former Democrats who, disappointed with the way their party was handling foreign policy, particularly after the McGovern campaign, gradually distanced themselves from the mainstream Democratic rhetoric (for a while, they were called the 'Scoop Jackson' Democrats, before being labeled 'neoconservatives'), who finally closed ranks with what they saw as a stronger, more resolute and principled government.

Bush's inexperience in foreign policy generated a different attitude. During the 2000 campaign, while he surrounded himself with 'tutors' (the so-called "Vulcans"[45]), Bush revealed a modesty in international affairs that was sometimes viewed with disdain or derision by journalists and academics. He spoke of "humbleness," and saw the 21st as the "century of the Americas," availing himself of the single concrete international experience he had had as a politician: Mexico. A willingness to disengage the country from multilateral entanglements and affection for the idea of 'national interest' were already part of his mind frame, but he had no clear strategy for promoting the role of the United States in the world. In that sense, 9/11 was a revelation, and offered him a concrete template with which to frame and develop his moral vision of the world. 9/11 thus represented an opportunity for neoconservative ideologues to develop, within the limits of this framework, clear and resolute strategies.

Presidential character and style

Barber defined Reagan as a 'passive positive,' a category which, in Langston and Sander's typology, corresponds to presidents who "will be influenced by ideology to the extent that ideologues predominate in the policymaking environment."[46]

Reagan's personality was indeed a determinant of his presidential style. As noted by Pfiffner, particularly during the first term, "Reagan's passivity and penchant for delegation made his staff crucial to his presidency in a way that was not true of

Roosevelt, Kennedy, or Bush."[47] It is important to observe, however, that precisely because of this 'style,' no ideologue monopolized his attention. Indeed, no single voice had exclusive access to Reagan's ear; at the highest level, that privilege was shared by Jim Baker, Michael Deaver and Edwin Meese, who had "the responsibility…to ensure that contrasting views were brought to the president's attention. In the first term this was ensured…because the rivalries among the staff and the struggle between conservatives and moderates could not be entirely suppressed."[48] Among those staffers was the group of neoconservative ideologues, who came to occupy positions that, though important, were not directly related to Reagan or the White House: Jeanne Kirkpatrick was U.S. Permanent Representative to the UN; Richard Perle became Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy; Eugene Rostow and Kenneth Adelman, in succession, heads of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation to the negotiations on nuclear and space arms with the USSR; and Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

Reagan's passivity did not inhibit him from having opinions. He had them, particularly with regard to foreign policy and the economy. And, as pointed out by Allen, these were genuinely Reagan's ideas, which he brought along from California, and which were precisely the reason why so many neoconservatives felt lured by his election and eventually came to work under his leadership, even though some, as Richard Perle, kept their affiliation to the Democratic Party (the first to leave the party was Elliott Abrams, who declared that he would rather "switch than fight."[49])

Interestingly, it was precisely Reagan's attachment to some of these ideas that led a number of those same neoconservatives, a few years later, to declare their disappointment with him. As pointed out by Deudney and Ikenberry, "Reagan's irony" was that his "anti-nuclearism" (which was "as [genuine and] strong as his anti-communism") was profoundly at odds with the beliefs of many in his administration, notably neoconservatives such as Perle, Rostow and Adelman. "There is abundant evidence that Reagan felt a deep antipathy for nuclear weapons and viewed their abolition to be a realistic and desirable goal."[50] Although Reagan accepted the idea of a military buildup as part of the confrontation with the Soviets, the impasse was only broken when he found in Mikhail Gorbachev the same skepticism with regard to the role of nuclear weapons. Deudney and Ikenberry argue that convergence between the two leaders was clearly expressed "at the November 1985 Geneva summit…and at the October 1986 Reykjavik summit, when [Reagan and Gorbachev] came close to agreeing on a comprehensive program of global denuclearization that was far bolder than any seriously entertained by U.S. strategists since the Baruch plan of 1946."[51]

The president's views, which clearly conflicted with those of his neoconservative advisers, created tensions among members of the Washington security establishment. Eventually, Reagan's arms control diplomacy was successful because "Secretary of State George Schultz picked up on [the president's] strong convictions and deftly

sidestepped hard-line opposition to agreements"[52] (among them Perle, who eventually left the Department of Defense in 1987).

But even before some of Reagan's accredited "*neocons*" became 'disappointed,' many of their thoroughbred colleagues, who chose not to be lured by the perspective of a position in government, were dedicated to the task of bashing the president and his 'inconsistencies." The angriest of them was Norman Podhoretz, editor of the magazine *Commentary*. Podhoretz saw U.S. policies towards the USSR as the "litmus test of ideological purity, strength and consistency"—a test that, in his opinion, Reagan was failing. In January of 1981, as President Reagan took his oath, Podhoretz wrote about his "truly historic opportunity to reverse American decline." A little more than a year later, he bitterly affirmed that "Reagan had not established sufficiently strong policies toward the Soviet bloc." He argued that political pressures "from appeasers, pacifists and isolationists were forcing [the president] to engage in arms talks." At the end of Reagan's first term (and, therefore, even before the Geneva and Reykjavik summits), Podhoretz was forced to admit what many took for granted: i.e. despite his strong ideas and principles, Reagan "was more politician than ideologue."[53]

Bush's psyche was not scrutinized by Barber, whose book was published in the eighties. However, Langston and Sanders offer a partial account of the president's personality in their paper. Bush is classified as an 'active negative,' and his intimacy with neoconservative ideologues is explained as a possible consequence of that. According to their speculation, the president "has perhaps embraced the neoconservative ideology because it provides intellectual and philosophical justification to the pursuit of [a] war…he, as other active-negative presidents [have] embraced as part of the struggle with evil enemies."[54] The conjecture goes on, and briefly alludes to the president's religious background: "Bush's [personality] has deeply religious overtones. When the president said, in the Oval Office, October 7, 2001, 'I'm here for a reason,' he suggested that he was, literally, on a mission from God."[55] Whether or not the President really meant what he said, the fact is that his identification with (or sensitivity to) the neoconservative ideologues is possibly not a direct result of his religious conviction, as *neocons* are historically known to be strangers to religious raptures.

Possible connections exist, however, between the president's spirituality and the neoconservative agenda. The first one is rather concrete: as an evangelical Protestant, Bush may feel compelled to protect the "Holy Land" of Israel, a country that happens to be central in the geo-strategic view of the *neocons* (many of whom have had direct ties with the Israeli government[56]). The second one is possibly intangible, but nonetheless important: as a person who was "born again" to religion at the age of 40, and who was born to politics a few years later, President Bush may have developed a sense of destiny (or fatality) that is stronger than in ordinary men. Such a person, when confronted to a 'catalyzing event' such as 9/11, will probably react in a way others would not. The idea of "mission from God" reported by Woodward refers precisely to this. As the president discovered his "mission" in the tragedy of 2001, he

needed not only a rationale to explain it, but also a strategy to implement it. This is exactly what some neoconservative ideologues were offering: i.e. the concreteness of a "Doctrine."

A brief word on President Bush's style: although little has been written about his organizational model, it is interesting to observe the dominant role played by Vice President Richard Cheney in government affairs. The selection of Cheney was seen by many as a 'smart move' dictated by the need to offer Bush's candidacy a level of reliability that was undermined by the then-Governor's inexperience. Cheney's reputation as a Washington insider (he was Gerald Ford's Chief of Staff, George H.W. Bush's Secretary of Defense, and a Congressional leader) was meant to offset that handicap. The point, however, is that this prominent role served as a direct channel through which neoconservative ideologues were brought into the nerve center of U.S. political power. Cheney himself is frequently referred to as a *neocon* (though some prefer to classify him as a "Jacksonian" realist.[57]) His signature is behind many of the documents produced in the 1990s that summarized the neoconservative rationale and agenda post-Cold War (PNAC, DPG, etc.). He is, above all, a firm supporter of many of the neoconservative ideologues who worked (and still work) in the government, some of whom he has worked with on different occasions (e.g. Paul Wolfowitz). Through Cheney, and sometimes with his enthusiasm, those ideologues had privileged access to the president's ear.

Presidential times and context

Skowronek considered Reagan a classic case of "reconstruction president," as Roosevelt before him. Unlike Roosevelt, however, Reagan had to face, and deal with, enormous opposition, both domestically and abroad. His assertive foreign policy generated strong reactions from Congress, which was still partially controlled by Democrats (the House of Representatives), as well as from those Podhoretz caustically referred to as "appeasers, pacifists and isolationists." This fierce opposition restrained the president's conservative impetus in more than one occasion, to the great disappointment of his neoconservative advisers.

Stephen Knott enumerates some of those episodes[58]:

(1) Reagan's famous 1982 speech at the British Parliament (in which he spoke of the launching of a 'crusade for freedom') was met with great skepticism by both the U.S. and British press.[59]

(2) Reagan's rhetorical assault on the Kremlin, which reached its peak with the 'Evil Empire' speech (March 1983), brought about intense reaction from the two sides of the political spectrum: Strobe Talbott "accused [the President] of bearing the bulk of responsibility for worsening U.S.-Soviet relations by not accepting military parity as the basis of relations with Moscow," whereas Richard Nixon "rejected Reagan's belief that the Soviet Union could be weakened through external pressures."

(3) Reagan's military buildup, and particularly the decision to deploy Pershing II missiles in Western Europe, caused a "massive nuclear freeze campaign on both sides of the Atlantic, a campaign described by Speaker of the House Thomas P. O'Neill as 'one of the most remarkable political movements I have ever seen during my years in public service'." Perhaps most worrisome for him was the support for the freeze among the U.S. Catholic bishops, who, in 1982, issued a statement calling U.S. nuclear strategy 'immoral.'

(4) The president's decision to support the Afghan resistance against the Soviet occupation was treated with great skepticism by experts and journalists.[60]

(5) The policy towards Nicaragua inspired even more resistance and skepticism. Many in Congress referred to it as 'the next Vietnam.' Democrats in the House offered systematic opposition.[61] Many members of the president's own party also had doubts about it.[62] Knott believes this resistance may have undermined Reagan's determination to directly confront the Sandinistas, which caused a strong reaction on the part of some hardliners, such as Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Caspar Weinberger.[63]

(6) Finally, his decision to invade Grenada not only cost him the criticism of the overall international community (the UN General Assembly denounced the invasion in a 108 to 9 vote; Margaret Thatcher herself strongly condemned the action), but a fierce reaction in the House, where a group of Democrats even tried to impeach him.

Being an "articulation president," and especially one elected under difficult circumstances (in 2000), George W. Bush could reasonably expect to face opposition, skepticism, and even discredit when revealing to the world the nature of his "mission." However, as noted above, the very discovery of that mission came through a tragedy that was, at the same time, a "catalyzing" and a "rally-around-the-flag" event. As a catalyst, September 11th prompted a complete overhaul of American foreign policy. As a rally-around-the-flag event, it created a bipartisan dynamic that virtually silenced all opposition and inhibited criticism, including criticism from the press and part of the academy.

The disturbing events of September 2001 were instrumental in the development of President Bush's worldview. As noted above, he entered the presidency without experience in foreign affairs and with a very limited understanding of the way the international environment worked. During the first months of his government, Bush's foreign policy lacked clear focus. The United States turned away from global engagement, while taking a tough stance with regards to Russia and China, and announcing disengagement in the Middle East. This lack of focus is attributed by some experts to the "inexistence of an enemy."[64]

E. Matthews argues that "during the Cold War, identifying the enemy was relatively easy. The forces opposing U.S. goals and interests emanated from the Soviet Union and Communism. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the demonstrated failure of communism, the bitter enemy was lost."[65] In her opinion, the

importance of the "enemy" derives from the fact that it frequently represents a target (a theme), around which the foreign policy of a country is organized.

September 11th offered Bush that target (or "enemy"). After the terrorist attacks, he "completely revamped his administration in response; he changed its entire foreign-policy agenda. The Administration has become more engaged with Russia, China, the Middle East peace process, and of course, fighting terrorism, which has emerged as the new central focus of his presidency...assuming the primary position in U.S. foreign policy, as combating Communism was during the Cold War."

The attacks also granted him the full support of the population, the media, the academy, and the press. Bush's popularity reached a peak of almost 90 percent. In Congress (already controlled by the GOP), initiatives such as the Patriot Act were approved in record time, with very little resistance (or even inquiry). When the focus of the "War on Terrorism" finally shifted towards Iraq, a majority of the population supported Bush, as well as Congress, which authorized "the use of force," and the media (with a few exceptions, such as *The New York Times*[66]). In fact, it is interesting to observe that international opposition to the war (starting with the United Nations, but especially among the French and Germans) incited U.S. chauvinism and gave Bush even greater domestic support. The only real contentious debate occurred within the administration, between opposing neoconservatives and more moderate actors (such as Secretary of State Colin Powell and Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage).[67]

Unlike Reagan, whose vision of the world galvanized intense domestic opposition, Bush's "mission" suffered almost no censure. This situation gave the president ample latitude to implement the ideas whispered by his neoconservative ideologues.

IV. Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to understand the relationship between presidents and their 'ideological' assistants (their "men of ideas," as Langston puts it). In order to achieve this goal, a framework was established, using concepts borrowed from Skowronek, Barber, George, Langston, Florig, Geertz, Blyth, and Porter, among others. This framework was then tested against the cases of Presidents Reagan and George W. Bush, who are both considered to be among the most 'ideological' U.S. presidents. A focus was placed on their relationship with the neoconservative ideologues who, during their first terms in office, dealt with issues related to foreign policy. Although Reagan and Bush have comparable operational codes and ideological backgrounds (to the point that Reagan is frequently referred to as a 'model' to Bush—sometimes by Bush himself), they did not relate to their 'men of ideas' in the same way.

Reagan brought to the White House clearly defined ideas and convictions about, if not the mechanics of, international affairs, at least the role he wanted the United States to play in the world and its relationship with the USSR. It was precisely these ideas that captivated some neoconservative ideologues who came to work under his

leadership, even though many were still affiliated Democrats. In that sense, it is reasonable to say that those men were led by Reagan, even if they frequently tried to influence him. Bush, on the other hand, seems to have come to the White House without a clear vision of the world and the role of the United States. During his campaign, he was tutored by a group of scholars, gathered by Dick Cheney, some of whom can be described as neoconservative ideologues. This tutoring offered the President a framework which helped him plan his 'mission' after September 11.

For Bush, as for the entire country, the terrorist attacks were what Parmar called a 'catalyzing event,'[68] one that led him to identifying the United States' "enemy," and to giving U.S. foreign policy a new focus. In doing so, Bush met no serious domestic opposition, except for internal debates within the government, between neoconservatives and moderates, a debate that was eventually won by the former. In the case of Reagan, the "enemy" was known from the beginning, as were the objectives of the president: to confront, and ideally roll back communism. Reagan experienced no 'catalyst.' To some extent, in fact, one can argue that he saw himself as the catalyst. The strategy to achieve his goals, however, evolved over time, due to the opposition the President faced, his pragmatism, and even his anti-nuclearism. This strategy, which initially had the support of the neoconservatives, eventually came to be criticized by some of them as being too pragmatic or too soft (and, therefore, less ideological).

While Reagan was a passive-positive in Barber's scheme, his governing style (in the first term) allowed for a variety of voices and opinions to reach him. Bush, on the other hand, (an active-negative, according to Langston) adopted an organizational model centralized in the office and person of the Vice President, which gave some of Cheney's neoconservative 'protégés' privileged access to the president's ear.

Endnotes

1.Smith, James Allen, *The Idea Brokers: think tanks and the rise of the new policy elite*, p. xvi.

2. *Ibid*., p. xvii.

3. Whiting, Allen S.: "The Scholar and the Policy-Maker", in: *World Politics*, Vol. 24, Supplement (Spring 1972), p. 229-247.

4. According to Thomas Langston, "in managing executive branch operations, [Roosevelt] seems not to have paid the slightest attention to the potential net influences of his ideological helpers" – in Langston, Thomas S., *Ideologues and Presidents: from the New Deal to the Reagan Revolution*, 1992, p. xvii.

5. Pfiffner, James P.: *The Modern Presidency*, 4th edition, 2005, p. 58/9.

6. Hicks, Sallie; Theodore Couloumbis, Eloise Forgette. "Influencing the Prince: a Role for Academicians?" in: Polity, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Winter 1982), p. 279-294.

7. Whiting, Allen S., Op. Cit.

8. Newsom, David D., *The Public Dimension of Foreign Policy*, 1996, p. 122-127.

9. Smith, James Allen, Op. Cit., p. xviii.

10. Florig, Dennis. (1992) *The Power of Presidential Ideologies.*

11. *Ibid*. p.1

12. Langston, op. cit. p.1

13. *Ibid*. p. 18.

14. Florig, op. cit.

15. *Ibid*. p. 5

16. *Ibid*. p. 9

17. lbid p.3.

18. "While the general ideological tenor of an administration can usually be predicted by the party of the president, the exact actions presidents will take on specific issues [and the degree to which these actions will reflect ideologies] cannot." - Florig, op. cit. p. 65.

19. *Ibid*. p. 9.

20. Pfiffner, James P., Op. Cit. p.59.

21. Skowronek, Stephen., (2003) "Presidential Leadership in Political Time", in *The Presidency and the Political System*, Michael Nelson (Ed.) pp. 111-157

22. Leites, Nathan, (1951) *The operational code of the Politburo.*

23. Rokeach, Milton, (1968) Beliefs, Attitudes and Values.

24. George, Alexander L., "The Causal Nexus between Cognitive Beliefs and Decision-Making Behavior: The Operational-Code Belief System" in Lawrence S. Falkowski (Ed.)(1979) *Psychological Models in International Politics.*

25. George, Alexander L., "The Operational-Code: A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making", in *International Studies Quarterly*, 13:2 (June 1969).

26. George, Alexander L., "The Causal Nexus between Cognitive Beliefs and Decision-Making Behavior: The Operational-Code Belief System", Op. Cit.

27. Barber, James D. *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House*, (1985) (3rd Edition).

28. *Ibid*. pp. 9-10.

29. "The active-positive might make use of ideologues but is too open-minded to be captivated for long by their rigid perspectives" - Langston, Thomas and Elizabeth Sanders. "Predicting Ideological Intensity in Presidential Administrations," a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, August 2003.

30. Langston and Sanders, op. cit. p. 8.

31. *Ibid*. p. 9.

32. Porter, Roger. (1980) *Presidential Decision Making.*

33. *Ibid*. pp.229-252.

34. Skowronek, S., (1993) *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to George Bush*.

35. *Ibid*. pp. 36-44.

36. "Such Presidents, out of their time, are compelled to embrace aspects of the majority party's ideology in order to try reelection". Langston and Sanders, op. cit. p. 12.

37. Langston, Thomas op. cit. p. 18.

38. Langston, Thomas op. cit. p. 19.

39. It can be inferred from Langston's model that the Congress (and the parties within the Congress) can play the role of ideological counterweight to a President. The decision-making process in Congress is such that the legislative branch is usually less influenced by ideological excesses. Congress can, therefore, be an element of political moderation.

40. Langston, Thomas op. cit. p. 18-19.

41. Geertz, Clifford. (2001) *The Interpretation of Cultures.*

42. Blyth, Mark. (2002) *Great Transformations: economic ideas and institutional change in the Twentieth Century.*

43. Parmar, Inderjeet, "Catalyzing Events, Think Tanks and American Foreign Policy Shifts: A Comparative Analysis of the Impacts of Pearl Harbor 1941 and 11 September 2001", in *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 40:1 (January 2005).

44. Allen, Richard V., "The Man who Changed the Game Plan", in *National Interest* Summer 1996, issue 44.

45. See Mann, James. (2004) *Rise of the Vulcans: the history of Bush's war cabinet*.

46. Langston and Sanders, Op. Cit.

47. Pfiffner, James P., (2005) *The Modern Presidency* p. 174.

48. *Ibid*. p. 177.

49. Quoted in Winik, Jay, "The Neoconservative Reconstruction", in *Foreign Policy*, No. 73 (Winter 1988-89) p. 139.

50. Deudney, D. and Ikenberry, G.J., "Who Won the Cold War?", in *Foreign Policy* No. 87 (Summer 1992).

51. *Ibid*.

52. Don Oberdorfer, "The Turn: From the Cold War to a New Era", *The Washington Post* (1991), quoted in Deudney, D. and Ikenberry, G.J., Op. Cit.

53. Quoted in Ehrman, John, (1995) *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs 1945-1994*. pp. 146-48.

54. Langston and Sanders, op. cit. p. 24.

55. *Ibid*. p. 25. Bush's quotation comes from Bob Woodward's (2005) *Bush at War*, p. 205.

56. Richard Perle and Douglas Feith wrote a strategic study for the Israeli goverment at the end of the 90s - *"A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm"* The ties between Perle and the Likud Party are well know, especially his close personal connection with Benjamin Netanyahu.

57. Mead, Walter R., (2001) *Special Providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*.

58. Knott, Stephen F., "Reagan's Critics", in *National Interest* (issue 44, Summer 1996)

59. *The Daily Mail* dismissed the speech as an "oversimplified view of the world"; *The Times* ridiculed it as "Ronald Reagan's Flower Power"; *The New York Times* considered it one of the "dark points" of his trip.

60. *Newsweek* reported in 1984 that "the mujaheddin can never be strong enough to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan." *The U.S. News and World Report* considered in 1985 that "defeating the Soviet Army is an impossible dream," while the *Washington Post* denounced the same year that "we are covertly supplying arms to guerrillas who don't stand the slightest chance of winning."

61. Speaker Tip O'Neill went so far as to describe the U.S. supported 'Contras' as "butchers and maimers."

62 Congresswoman Lynn Martin is quoted as having said: "I'm a conservative who's been with them all the way, but Vietnam is a lesson."

63. "Reagan has been criticized [by conservatives] for not being sufficiently overt in his opposition to the Nicaraguan regime, perhaps even resorting to a conventional assault. But there is simply no way that Reagan, even at the peak of his communicative skills, could have sold that option to the American people."

64. Elizabeth G. Matthews develops this idea in her paper "The Search for an Enemy: A Psychological Explanation of George W. Bush's Post-September 11 Foreign Policy" (prepared for the 2003 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association).

65. *Ibid*.

66. *The Washington Post*, considered a liberal newspaper, published an editorial on the day of the invasion supporting (without enthusiasm) the decision to invade.

67. This debate is beyond the scope of this paper. See, however, Daalder, Ivo and James Lindsay, *America Unbound: the Bush revolution in foreign policy*, Brookings Institution, 2003; Woodward, Bob, *Bush at War*; and Dolan, Chris and David Cohen, *The War about the War: advocacy coalitions, bureaucratic conflict, and the politics of national security in the G.W. Bush administration*, paper presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

68. Parmar, op.cit.

Bibliography

Allen, Richard V. 1996. "The Man who Changed the Game Plan," in *National Interest* nº 44.

Barber, James D. 1985. *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall).

Blyth, Mark. 2002. *Great Transformations: economic ideas and institutional change in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Deudney, D. and Ikenberry, G.J. 1992. "Who Won the Cold War?" in *Foreign Policy* nº 87.

Florig, Dennis. 1992. *The Power of Presidential Ideologies* (Connecticut: Praeger Publishers,).

Geertz, Clifford. 2001. *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Basic Books).

George, Alexander L. 1979. "The Causal Nexus between Cognitive Beliefs and Decision-Making Behavior: The Operational-Code Belief System" in Lawrence S. Falkowski, ed. *Psychological Models in International Politics* (Westview Press).

--------. 1969. "The Operational-Code: A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making," in *International Studies Quarterly*, 13:2 (June).

Hicks, Sallie, Couloumbis, Theodore, and Forgette, Eloise. 1982. "Influencing the Prince: a Role for Academicians?" in *Polity*, Vol. 15, No. 2.

Knott, Stephen F. 1996. "Reagan's Critics," in *National Interest*, No. 44.

Langston, Thomas S. 1992. *Ideologues and Presidents: from the New Deal to the Reagan Revolution* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press).

Langston, Thomas and Sanders, Elizabeth. 2003. "Predicting Ideological Intensity in Presidential Administrations." (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia).

Leites, Nathan. 1951. *The operational code of the Politburo* (New York: The Rand Corporation.

Mann, James. 2004. *Rise of the Vulcans: the history of Bush's war cabinet* (New York: Viking.

Matthews, Elizabeth G. 2003. "The Search for an Enemy: A Psychological Explanation of George W. Bush's Post-September 11 Foreign Policy" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia).

Mead, Walter R. 2001. *Special Providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Newsom, David D. 1996. *The Public Dimension of Foreign Policy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Oberdorfer, Don. 1991. "The Turn: From the Cold War to a New Era," in *The Washington Post*. Quoted in Deudney, D. and Ehrman, J. 1995. *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs 1945-1994* (Yale University Press).

Parmar, Inderjeet. 2005. "Catalyzing Events, Think Tanks and American Foreign Policy Shifts: A Comparative Analysis of the Impacts of Pearl Harbor 1941 and 11 September 2001", in *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 40:1.

Pfiffner, James P. 2005. *The Modern Presidency*, 4th edition (Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth).

Porter, Roger. 1980. *Presidential Decision Making* (Cambridge University Press).

Rokeach, Milton. 1968. *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.).

Skowronek, Stephen. 2003. "Presidential Leadership in Political Time," in *The Presidency and the Political System*, Michael Nelson, ed, (Washington DC: CQ Press).

----------. 1993. *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to George Bush* (Harvard University Press).

Smith, James Allen. 1991. *The Idea Brokers: think tanks and the rise of the new policy elite* (New York: The Free Press).

Whiting, Allen S. 1972. "The Scholar and the Policy-Maker", in: *World Politics*, Vol. 24, Supplement (Spring).

Winik, Jay. 1988-89 "The Neoconservative Reconstruction", in *Foreign Policy*, No. 73 (Winter).

Woodward, Bob. 2005. *Bush at War* (New York: Simon and Schuster), p. 205.