

**BRAZIL AND UNITED STATES RELATIONS DURING
THE EARLY TWENTIETH
CENTURY**

**BRAZIL AND UNITED STATES RELATIONS DURING
THE EARLY TWENTIETH
CENTURY**

By

JOE HENRY KING

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1941

Submitted to the Department of History
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

1947

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY
DEC 8 1947

APPROVED BY:

T. H. Reynolds
Chairman, Thesis Committee

Alfred Levin
Member of the Thesis Committee

T. H. Reynolds
Head of the Department

W. G. M. Tuttle
Dean of the Graduate School

205207

PREFACE

In the following pages, the author has attempted to give a brief and accurate survey of political and economic relations between Brazil and the United States during the early twentieth century. The expansion of commercial activities between the two countries has been a vital factor in the promotion of friendly relations. In this thesis, the writer has tried to develop the political and economic trends in chronological sequence; also, it is hoped that the charts used in illustration and comparison of imports and exports between the two countries will more explicitly convey their commercial relations.

The material for this subject was obtained from the library of the Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College (mainly Foreign Relations and the House and Senate documents of the United States), and the privately-owned Latin American library of Dr. T. H. Reynolds.

In assembling material for this thesis, the author has been greatly aided by Miss Grace Campbell, document librarian, and her staff of assistants, and their valuable and courteous assistance is greatly appreciated. The writer is extremely grateful for the patient guidance and supervision of Dr. T. H. Reynolds, Head of the History Department of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, and of Dr. Alfred Levin, in the preparation and compilation of this material.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	111
CHAPTER ONE:	
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS	1
CHAPTER TWO:	
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RELATION DURING THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY	10
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Chapter One

Brazil, for the most part, lies east of the United States with an area of 3,275,500 square miles, and is larger than the United States plus an area almost the size of the state of Texas. It is one nation that has an empire and colonies existing under the same geographical roof.¹

Today, Brazil is one of the richest raw material producing areas in Latin America. Her fertile soil will produce almost every crop known to man² which yields fabrics, food, and oils, only to be matched by the combination of the production from the Dutch East Indies, Cuba, Alabama, California, and Minnesota. There are still millions of acres awaiting the plow.³ She has turned from the production of sugar to rubber, from rubber to coffee, which is still the most important crop.⁴ It grows in many areas, and the entire country of Brazil produces almost three-fifths of the world's total crop.⁵

Among the nations of the South, Brazil's development has been different from that of the other Latin countries. The territory was settled by Portugal instead of Spain. Brazil was the only South American country to have a monarchic form of government for any length of time.

¹Herring, Huber, Good Neighbors Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Seventeen Other Countries (New Haven, 1941), p. 137.

²Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil 1939-40 An Economic, Social and Geographic Survey (Rio de Janeiro, 1940), pp. 13-32.

³Herring, op. cit., p. 111.

⁴Humphre, Robin A., "Latin America," Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs No. 39 (Oxford, 1941), p. 24.

⁵Herring, op. cit., p. 111.

This form of government lasted from 1822, with their declaration of independence, until 1889, which was the Republican revolution.⁶

The significant part played by the United States in the relations with Latin America falls upon the political and economical trends.⁷ A background of these trends in their relation to the early twentieth century is reviewed in this chapter.

Brazil is a long-time friend of the United States of America. The government at Washington was the first to recognize her as a free nation.⁸ The establishment of early diplomatic relations between the United States and the revolted South American colony was one of the earliest friendly gestures made by the Northern country⁹. However, all of the early relations with Brazil have not been smooth.

At the close of 1825 a war broke out between Brazil and Argentina which strained relations existing between Brazil and the United States. Brazil declared a blockade on all Argentine ports. A crisis was reached on March 4, 1827, when an American vessel was seized by a Brazilian warship and its crew treated almost as pirates.¹⁰ During this period the

⁶James, Herman G., and Martin, Percy A., The Republics of Latin America, Their History, Governments and Economic Condition (New York and London), MCMXXII, pp. 110-157.

⁷Haring, Clarence H., South America Looks at the United States (New York, 1928), p. 1.

⁸Herring, op. cit., p. 137.

⁹Robertson, William Spence, Hispanic-American Relations With the United States (New York, 1923), p. 26.

¹⁰Miller, Hunter, Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America, 1776-1852 (Washington, 1933), Vol. 3, pp. 485-505.

United States minister, Roguet, had conducted himself very rudely, even to the point of asking for his passport. The American State Department informed the Brazilian government that Roguet's activities were without order and that a successor would immediately be appointed, and that he was sure that injuries inflicted upon American persons and property would be properly settled.¹¹

The American appointment of William Tudor proved excellent in all respects. By his tact and good judgment he placed relations between the two nations upon a firm basis of friendly understanding. He was successful in negotiating a treaty affecting commerce and navigation. This treaty, concluded on December 12, 1828, was to be in force for twelve years, and thereafter until notice of abrogation should be given.¹²

During this period, the relations of the United States with Brazil continued to be most friendly. In President Tyler's annual message of 1844 he said that:

the commercial intercourse between that growing Empire and the United States is becoming daily of greater importance to both, and it is to the interest of both that the firmest relations of amity and good will should continue to be cultivated between them.¹³

But in 1846 an incident occurred which developed into a complete break of friendly relations between the two countries for a short period.

¹¹Stuart, Graham H., Latin American and the United States (New York, 1922), p. 362.

¹²Malloy, William M., Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols and Agreements Between the United States of America and Other Powers, 1776-1909 (Washington, 1910), Vol. 1, p. 133.

¹³Richardson, James D., Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1908 (Washington, 1909), Vol. IV, p. 340.

Lieutenant Alonzo B. Davis of the U. S. frigate *Saratoga*, while on shore in Rio de Janeiro looking for deserters, found one of his sailors in a drunken brawl with two other American sailors. While going back to their ship the three American sailors were seized by a Brazilian guard, and after being severely beaten were put in prison. Davis, having protested, followed the patrol to the palace with a view of securing their release, but upon entering the palace he was imprisoned for two days. The American minister, Mr. Wise, learned of the episode and protested vigorously to the Brazilian government, demanding their release and punishment of the officer and soldiers of the Brazilian guard.¹⁴

The affair was not settled until Mr. Wise, foreseeing Brazil's intention of accusing him of misconduct, had asked the United States to recall him, after which the Brazilian minister at Washington made apologies.¹⁵

After the arrival of the new American minister, Mr. Tod, the North American government asked him to press settlement of damages received by United States citizens during the Brazilian and Argentine war which lasted from 1825 to 1828. An agreement was concluded on January 27, 1849, by the two governments when Brazil placed at the disposal of the United States 530,000 milris, about \$300,000, to reimburse the citizens of the Northern Republic.¹⁶

All efforts on the part of the United States failed in its attempts to arbitrate in a war that concerned Brazil and Argentina against Paraguay.

¹⁴Stuart, op. cit., p. 365.

¹⁵Stuart, op. cit., p. 368.

¹⁶U. S. Congress, House Executive Document 31st Congress 1st Session, 1849-1850 (Washington, 1850) (Serial No. 576), document no. 19, Vol. 7, pp. 1-7.

In fact, the offer was refused by both Brazil and Argentina.¹⁷

One of the most satisfactory favors of this period to the United States was the decree of the Emperor of Brazil on January 22, 1866, by which he opened the Amazon, San Francisco, and other rivers, to the merchant-vessels of all nations. Since 1850 the Northern Republic had striven to accomplish that result, on the basis that the Brazilian restricted policy, which that government persisted in maintaining concerning the navigable rivers of her country, was the relic of a past age, and that the United States merchant-ships had the right to use those routes, not because of treaty agreements, but that they were "natural...as much so as that to navigate the ocean...the common highway of nations."¹⁸

In 1882 Brazil and Argentina could not agree upon the boundary line concerning the region where the Jesuit fathers had sketched, by treaties of 1750 and 1777, the boundary line between the colonial possessions of Spain and Portugal. These governments signed a treaty in 1889 providing that in case of no agreement over the boundary dispute within a certain period, the United States would be asked to arbitrate the question.¹⁹

A letter from the president of Argentina dated April 12, 1892, was received by the president of the United States which requested him to act as arbitrator; and within three days the acting president of Brazil had addressed a similar letter to the president of the United States.²⁰

¹⁷Robertson, op. cit., p. 145.

¹⁸Moore, John Bassett, Digest of International Law (Washington, 1906), Vol. I, pp. 640-645.

¹⁹Robertson, op. cit., p. 2.

²⁰Ibid., p. 157.

On February 5, 1895, President Cleveland announced his decision which

was based upon the conviction that the rivers which Brazil claimed to constitute the boundary line were identical with the rivers that were located upon the colonial boundary in the latter part of the eighteenth century by commissioners of Spain and Portugal.

This final decision of President Cleveland was accepted by both nations, and settled a long-standing dispute between the two South American countries.²¹

Of these disputes which have arisen between Brazil and the United States, most of them were caused primarily from the results of property damages of United States citizens. A good example of such activity took place during the Brazilian and Argentine conflict in 1825, where the latter country declared the mouth of La Plata river blockaded, during which Brazil seized ships belonging to the United States citizens.²²

The settlement of the controversies with Brazil over the Davis affair ended by the Brazilian minister in Washington expressing his regrets.²³

The relations between the United States and Brazil have arisen in the course of a few decades during which period many of the questions were of a controversial nature. These disputes grew from various experiences, being of political, economical, fiscal, or accidental circumstances.

²¹Ibid., p. 158.

²²Ibid., p. 162.

²³Stuart, op. cit., p. 371.

To give background discussions in detail of all of the controversies of this nature that occurred during the nineteenth century is beyond the scope of this paper. The purpose of this introduction is to frame more adherently the early relations between Brazil and the United States by showing that the important breaks of friendship were finally absolved by diplomatic means.²⁴

The background for the Early Twentieth Century relations between the two nations would be incomplete unless some discussion was given to the economic field.

As early as 1807, before the monopolistic colonial government of Brazil was abolished, the United States had exported almost five thousand dollars worth of American goods to the Portuguese possession. After the European ruling dynasty had been transferred to the South American colony, foreign trade was further stimulated. The war of 1812 checked the United States trade with Brazil; however, the United States statistics of commerce show that exports to Brazil in 1816 of domestic products were \$262,489.00 and foreign products exported were \$150,920.00.²⁵

After Brazil gained her independence in 1822, the United States appointed a consular agent to that country.²⁶

The following chart shows the growth of Brazilian and United States commerce during the nineteenth century.

²⁴Robertson, op. cit., p. 145.

²⁵Ibid., p. 189.

²⁶Ibid., p. 193.

COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES WITH BRAZIL DURING THE 19TH CENTURY

Brazil	Imports into the United States			Exports from the United States		
	Free	Dutiable	Total	Domestic	Foreign	Total
Ending						
Sept. 30, 1825	\$ 939,360	\$1,020,159	\$ 1,959,519	\$ 1,641,296	\$ 654,115	\$ 2,295,411 ²⁷
Sept. 30, 1850	7,434,220	1,888,043	9,322,263	2,711,267	206,157	2,917,424 ²⁸
Sept. 30, 1875	39,255,527	2,772,336	42,027,863	7,631,865	110,494	7,742,359 ²⁹
Sept. 30, 1900	55,204,311	2,869,146	58,073,457	11,481,094	97,025	11,578,119 ³⁰
Total	102,833,418	8,549,684	111,382,102	23,465,522	1,067,791	24,533,313

²⁷Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 197

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 204.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 210.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 213.

The preceding table gives a summary of the growing importance of the commercial relations between Brazil and the United States throughout the nineteenth century. It fully indicates that commercial relations between the two countries were of great importance during the early history of the United States, and during the first part of the twentieth century. These relations are important because they laid the foundations of today's economical and political ties. ✓

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RELATION DURING THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

Chapter Two

Since the founding of the Republic of Brazil, relations between that country and the United States have been more cordial than the relations with any other South American country.¹ At the close of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, economic and political dealings show trends of cooperation and friendship. However, it could be expected that the United States would look with favor upon the new convert to republican institutions, and on February 19, 1890, the Senate and House of Representatives passed a joint resolution congratulating the people of the United States of Brazil on their adoption of a republican form of government.²

A desire for friendly relations on the part of the new republic was expressed by its newly formed congress when it extended its new trade-mark law from January 1 to February 28, 1900, which was an advantage to the buyers of the United States for making adjustments of their stocks according to prices. The trade-mark law was to prohibit the importation of merchandise bearing Portuguese labels which were written wholly or partly in that language.³ This law as first written was a contradiction to the

¹Stuart, Graham H., Latin America and the United States (New York, 1922), p. 328.

²U. S. Congress, Statutes at Large, 51st Congress 1st session, 1889-1890 (Washington, 1890) (Resolution No. 10), p. 669, p. 21. (Hereafter cited as United States Statutes at Large.)

³U. S. State Department, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1900 (Washington, 1902), p. 62. (Hereafter cited as For. Rel.).

agreement concerning trade-marks which was concluded September 24, 1878, between Brazil and the United States of America.⁴ That agreement provided that citizens or subjects of the two contracting parties should have in the territory of the other the same rights as belonging to native citizens or subjects in everything relating to property and marks of manufacture and trade.⁵

Further steps toward better friendship between the two nations, United States of America and Brazil, were indicated by a visit of a Brazilian ship, Benjamin Constant, a school ship of the Brazilian navy. It had been a long time since any Brazilian naval officers had had an opportunity to visit the United States.⁶

In 1901, at the Pan-American Exposition held at Buffalo, New York, the Brazilian government was represented by an appointed commission.⁷

The sacking of an American Baptist Church at Nitheroy on the night of April 14, 1901, by a mob which carried the Bibles, organ, and chairs belonging to the Baptist Missionary Association into the street and burned them was said to have been an act against the Protestant Mission. However, the Brazilian government was quick to make amends and offer an explanation. This uprising came from some Catholics and their associates

⁴Malloy, William M., Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols and Agreements Between the United States of America and Other Powers, 1776-1909 (Washington, 1910), Vol. I, p. 146.

⁵For. Rel., 1900, p. 63.

⁶For. Rel., 1901, p. 27.

⁷Hill, Lawrence F., Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Brazil (N. C., 1932), p. 292.

of Mitheroy, a small town near Rio de Janeiro, who were seeking revenge against an ex-priest who had denounced them. The President of the state expressed his regrets and promised to make quick reimbursements. He further denounced the act by saying it was the policy to advocate entire religious liberty in Brazil.⁸

However, the visit of the U. S. S. Wilmington, a light gun boat, to the upper Amazon in 1899, aroused some criticism from Brazil. The vessel had orders from the United States government to visit ports of Brazil. Because of its smallness it was thought that such a boat could easily be handled in shallow water; then, too, its size was understood to show friendship and not power.⁹ Although the vessel had permission to visit Brazilian ports, it was learned that to ascend the "King of Rivers"¹⁰ a special permit should have been obtained from that government. After the exchange of several communications, the two governments arrived at an adjustment.¹¹ This matter of punctilious misunderstanding would have amounted to very little except for the American interest in rubber exploitation in the Acre territory.¹² The Acre Territory,

⁸Ibid., pp. 28-29.

⁹U. S. Congress, House of Representatives 56th Congress 1st session, 1899-1900 (Washington, 1901) (serial no. 3898), document no. 1, Vol. 1, pp. 115-124.

¹⁰Hill, Lawrence, F., Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Brazil (N. C., 1932), p. 285.

¹¹U. S. Congress, House Representatives 56th Congress 1st session, 1899-1900 (Washington, 1901) (serial no. 3898), document no. 1, Vol. 1, pp. 115-124.

¹²Hill, op. cit., p. 285.

an area on the borderlands of Bolivia, rich in rubber, caused much excitement in Brazil. The Bolivian government and the Bolivian Syndicate, composed of American and English, mostly American, entered into a contract whereby the Syndicate was the Financial Administrator in the territory. In order to be more effective, the company was given the right to organize an armed force. This included war vessels to navigate the rivers. Too, on all of the government land in the region, the company was granted an option.¹³

Opposition in Brazil was aroused. The newspapers expressed sympathy for the Philippines and Cubans, newly acquired territories from Spain, and warned the people of Brazil of the dangers from the north. One paper stated that during the previous year an American ship, Wilmington, had taken arms up the Amazon River to the forces of Bolivia.¹⁴ After the first conference of the American minister and the Brazilian Foreign Offices to settle the question, announcements were made by President Roosevelt that the United States had no intentions of acquiring any of the Acre Territory. For a time the press of Brazil was calm.¹⁵

During this period, the Brazilian Foreign Minister held conferences with the Bolivian Representative at Rio de Janeiro in which he denounced the Bolivian government for granting such concessions that were and could be a great handicap to Brazil. However, the conference failed to secure

¹³Ibid., p. 285.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 286.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 286.

any favorable results for Brazil. Therefore, it withdrew from the Chamber of Deputies a treaty concerning free navigation of certain tributaries of the Amazon which extended into Bolivia. This was a blow to the Bolivian Syndicate as well as to Bolivia, for the company was resorting to all possible means to bring about the ratification of the treaty. Interestingly enough, the American State Department was using its influence to get the treaty ratified. Another point here, which may have made little difference, was that W. E. Roosevelt, the cousin of President Roosevelt, was among the capitalists who composed the organization.¹⁶

After Brazil entered upon a course of reprisal against Bolivia by suppressing the freedom of navigation of the Amazon, the two countries concluded the Treaty of Petropolis on November 17, 1903,¹⁷ by which Brazil purchased all of Bolivia's rights in the Acre Territory. One of the preliminaries in the settlement with Bolivia was that the Brazilian government purchase from the Syndicate all rights and claims under the concession, which, therefore, completely nullified the Syndicate.¹⁸

The Brazilian Press criticised Roosevelt's policy, and showed strong resentment of the Monroe Doctrine. This attitude is expressed in an editorial from the *Carreio da Manha* of Rio de Janeiro on March 30, 1903, which reads as follows:

¹⁶Ibid., p. 287.

¹⁷U. S. Congress, House of Representatives 58th Congress 3rd session, 1904 (Washington, 1905) (serial no. 4780), document no. 1, Vol. 1, pp. 104-107.

¹⁸Moore, John B., A Digest of International Law (Washington, 1906), Vol. VI, p. 441.

The Monroe Doctrine as such has no value whatever. At best it is simply another document for the benefit of those who would determine the characteristic psychology of the North American. Such a doctrine passes not only for a work very original and very Yankee, but also as being without substance as a whole. The Government of the United States can invoke it and put it into force when it is to its advantage to do so and whenever it is able to give to the formula the unanswerable validity and strength of cannons.¹⁹

Concerning President Roosevelt's message of December 6, 1904, especially the portion of it dealing with foreign affairs,²⁰ a comment came from Rio de Janeiro that

this document shows once more the capacity of Mr. Roosevelt to look at questions from a purely American (meaning the United States) point of view, and his profound faith in the future of his country and in its destiny.²¹

The friendship and cooperation between the two nations during this period seemed to be on a decline, but evidences of cordiality between the two nations were expressed on various occasions. This trend obviously was promoted from the economical point of view since the United States was the greatest consumer of Brazil's coffee.²²

Steps were taken to strengthen their friendly relations and to aid the administration of justice by the repression of crimes and offences committed in their jurisdiction. The two nations entered into the Treaty of Extradition of Criminals which was duly ratified by

¹⁹U. S. Congress, House of Representatives 58th Congress 2nd session, 1903 (Washington, 1905) (serial no. 4627), document no. 1, Vol. I, p. 26.

²⁰Richardson, James D., Messages and Papers of the Presidents 1789-1908 (Washington, 1909), Vol. X, p. 832.

²¹Hill, op. cit., p. 291.

²²Stuart, op. cit., p. 382.

both governments and were exchanged in the city of Rio de Janeiro on April 18, 1903.²³ One year later Brazil built a beautiful palace of granite and marble for exhibition at the St. Louis Exposition, which was later moved to Rio de Janeiro for use as a meeting place for international conferences and similar gatherings. It is interesting to note that during the third Pan-American Conference held in Rio de Janeiro, July 31, 1906, Secretary Root gave his memorable address in the building while acting as Honorary President. At the close, Baron do Rio Branco, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil announced that henceforth the palace would be known as the Monroe Palace. Today it stands at the head of the street, Avenida Do Rio Branco, in memory of Brazil's most illustrious Foreign Minister.²⁴ In 1905, the two nations raised their respective legations to the rank of Embassies. This act was enthusiastically approved in Brazil and further expressed in President Dr. Francisco de Paula Rodrigues Alves' message to the Brazilian Congress, Rio de Janeiro, May 5, 1905.²⁵

Further evidences of efforts of the two governments to promote better unity between their people were applied in 1906 when the Brazilian government attempted to counteract the evil effects issued by several Brazilian newspapers toward the United States government. One

²³U. S. Congress, House of Representatives 58th Congress 2nd session, 1903 (Washington, 1904) (serial no. 4627), document no. 1, Vol. 1, p. 27.

²⁴Stuart, op. cit., p. 382.

²⁵U. S. Congress, House of Representatives 59th Congress 1st session, 1905 (Washington, 1906) (serial no. 4941), document no. 1, Vol. 1, p. 102.

of the papers published a discourse entitled "Brazil, the United States, and Monroeism". The work appeared as written by J. Penn, although there was little doubt that the real author was the Brazilian Foreign Minister, Baron Rio Branco. The author chose to review early relations of positive nature from 1822 to that period in order that he might stimulate a better friendship and good will.²⁶

The visit of Secretary Elihu Root to Brazil from July 27 to August 7, 1906, and presiding as Honorary President of the Third Pan-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, gave added strength to the feelings of friendship which bound the two nations together. His address²⁷ and conduct during the conference was that of a statesman. There can be no question but that his visit was of great material benefit to the political and commercial interest of the United States. A practical result of his visit was expressed the very next month when a bill was introduced in the Chamber of Deputies which provided for a 20 percent reduction of all merchandise imported into Brazil from countries which import more than 4,000,000 sacks of coffee, and admit it free of duty. Since the United States was the only country whose consumption falls into this category, the action seemed to be for the benefit of the Northern Republic.²⁸ By a presidential decree, this tariff was renewed annually until 1911 at which time the reduction on flour was increased to 30 percent.²⁹

²⁶For. Rel., 1906, Vol. 1, pp. 116-139.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 127-129.

²⁸Ibid., p. 135.

²⁹For. Rel., 1911, p. 30.

In 1906 an unprecedented coffee crop of 20,000,000 sacks was harvested in Brazil. The world's annual consumption was about 17,000,000 sacks, and Brazil had to compete with other countries in supplying the market. This forced Brazil to store her surplus. The state of Sao Paulo faced financial ruin unless aid was obtained. Huge loans were floated in the United States and European countries; also, a super tax of three francs per bag on exports helped the state to pay its interest charges and a poor crop the following year helped the state to sell its surplus at a profit.³⁰

The Acting Secretary of State, Huntington Wilson, received a dispatch dated December 28, 1908, from the American Consul General at Rio de Janeiro concerning the arrest and imprisonment by the police authorities of the two American seamen, Otto Anderson and A. Eriksen, during the time their ship, an American vessel Margaret Thomas, was in a Brazilian port. The arrest of the seamen was made by a Brazilian revenue officer who at that time was on board the American ship and who did not approve the action of the vessel's captain in placing one of the men in irons who was in a state of intoxication and considered to be dangerous. However, the men were released at the request of the Consul General.³¹

Previously, there seemed to be no agreement entered into by the United States and Brazil concerning the governing of offenses committed on board a vessel belonging to either country while in the port of the other; therefore, the question seemed to be a much disputed one. The

³⁰Stuart, op. cit., pp. 383-384.

³¹For. Rel., 1909, p. 41.

Acting Secretary, Huntington Wilson, stated a decree of November 8, 1851, which regulated the jurisdictional authority of consuls in Brazil and conceded to them cognizance in certain civil and criminal matters arising between their respective countries and crew members of a vessel. The decree reads as follows:

When a foreign merchant vessel shall be lying within any of the ports of Brazil, the criminal and police jurisdiction of the respective consular agents shall not extend to high crimes or to those that may in any manner disturb public tranquillity or particularly affect any inhabitant of the country.³²

Whether this concession would or would not be construed as a partial or complete surrender of jurisdiction to the consular officers by the local authorities, seemed not to be well settled; but when the seamen were turned over to the Consul General upon his demand that they be released, the local officers appeared to have recognized the consular officer's authority according to the decree as cited above. The consul's action, therefore, seemed to have been proper under the circumstances.³³

The Acting Secretary, Huntington Wilson, decreed that this matter be mentioned to the Brazilian foreign office, in order that an undesirable precedent might not be claimed for the arbitrary act of the Brazilian revenue officer in forbidding the captain of the American vessel to place the dangerous man in irons. The seamen were taken from the Captain's jurisdiction by the police upon the request of the revenue officer, without judicial process, and were promptly returned to the vessel when

³²Ibid., p. 42.

³³Ibid., p. 42.

the circumstances were made known to the proper authorities. By such act, the United States Department of State considered that that was sufficient amends; and the American Ambassador, Dudley, was requested to advise the Brazilian government that the action as performed by the Brazilian officers was accepted by the United States Department of State, since the seamen were returned to the Captain's jurisdiction, and the course of action was recognized by the above international law, that the incident was satisfactorily ended and that the case should not, from any point of view, be deemed to create a precedent for similar unwarranted activities in the future.³⁴

The American Ambassador, Irving B. Dudley, delivered the message to the Brazilian foreign office, calling attention to the point of preventing the actions taken by the Brazilian officers from becoming a precedent, which was accepted.³⁵

When the President of Brazil, Alfonso Penna, died, June 14, 1909, the American Ambassador to that country sent the following message:

"President Penna died this morning". The following day, President Taft telegraphed his condolence as follows:

In the name of my countrymen, and my own, I offer heartfelt condolence to the stricken family and to the Brazilian people in their great personal and national bereavement.³⁶

A reply of appreciation from the Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Rio Branco, for the Brazilian government and the former President's family was expressed in the following telegram:

³⁴Ibid., p. 42.

³⁵Ibid., p. 42.

³⁶Ibid., p. 43.

The Brazilian government and the family of the lamented President, Offonso Penna, are profoundly grateful for the condolences and the words of sympathy which, by direction of President Taft and in the name of the Government and the people of the United States, your excellency addressed to them in a telegram of the 15th instant in my care. We are honored by the part the great Republic took in our affliction.³⁷

The following year, 1910, Brazil suffered the loss of another government diplomat, the Brazilian Ambassador, Joaquim Nabuco, to the United States of America. Telegrams of condolences were expressed by the United States governmental officials.³⁸

The appreciation of the Brazilian government was acknowledged by their President, Nilo Peconha, in his message to the Brazilian National Congress on May 3, 1910, which reads as follows:

Among the great collaborators of the Government in its international policy we have to lament the loss of Ambassador Joaquim Nabuco, who died at Washington on the 17th of January, last. His death was not bemoaned only by his fellow citizens. The Government of the United States of America, associating itself with our mourning, saw fit to give to the memory of the Brazilian ambassador significant testimony of its affection, transporting the body in one of its powerful warships of its fleet to rest on Brazilian soil.³⁹

A naturalization convention between the United States of America and Brazil was signed by each country on April 27, 1908. However, it was April 2, 1910, when it was proclaimed. The convention was concerned with the establishing of the status of naturalized citizens who again wanted to take up residence in the country of their origin.⁴⁰

³⁷Ibid., p. 44.

³⁸For. Rel., 1910, pp. 110-111.

³⁹Ibid., p. 118.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 113-115.

The President of the United States and the President of Brazil desired to conclude an arbitration convention from which differences might arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which would be impossible to settle by diplomacy. Therefore, the Arbitration Convention between the two countries was proclaimed August 2, 1911. Any differences in diplomacy were to be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, established at the Hague, providing that the vital interests, the independence, or honor of the two high contracting parties were not concerned with the interests of the third parties. If so effected, they were to elect a friendly state to act as arbitrator.⁴¹

During the Third International American Conference, at Rio de Janeiro, August 23, 1906, the American Nations agreed to establish an International Commission of Jurists and each country would be represented by one delegate.⁴² Later it was agreed that two delegates from each country could attend but only one would have the power to vote. Seventeen states were represented in the Congress.⁴³

Besides the preparatory, inaugural and closing sessions, the International Commission held six ordinary sessions. The American member, John Bassett Moore, was elected chairman of the International Law

⁴¹For. Rel., 1911, pp. 305-336.

⁴²For. Rel., 1906, Vol. II, p. 1601, for the text of the Convention establishing the Commission; For. Rel., 1908, p. 2, for its ratification.

⁴³For. Rel., 1912, p. 19.

division which was to draft codes for maritime war and the rights and duties of neutrals.⁴⁴

The United States delegates, Jon B. Moore and F. Van Dyne, related in their report to the United States State Department that they could not express too strongly their appreciation for the warmth and cordiality given to them by the Brazilian government.⁴⁵

The meeting was of little success due to the failure of the various governments since they did not furnish their representatives with the necessary instructions to make decisions concerning the two codes.⁴⁶

Shortsightedness concerning international relations seemed to prevail on the part of the Brazilian government in 1913 when it denounced the Extradition Treaty of 1897 and Protocols of 1898 and 1903 between the United States and that country. The South American country also asked the government of the United States to waive the clause of its Extradition Treaty with Brazil which provided that the treaty should continue in force until six months after the contracting parties notified the other its intention to terminate it.⁴⁷

The United States government in reply stated that the government's power to waive the request failed to exist, and asked if the Brazilian

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 26.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 28.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 43.

⁴⁷For. Rel., 1913, p. 29.

government had overlooked the fact that the United States could not surrender a fugitive from Brazil upon request of that nation since the United States could not grant extradition in the absence of such a treaty.⁴⁸

No further immediate negotiation to bring forth a relative treaty was taken, except at the close of 1913 when the Brazilian government proposed to enter into a special agreement with the United States by which some method of prosecution of counterfeiters could be agreed upon. The United States replied that

no treaty agreement would be required to secure the prosecution and trial of Brazilians or other foreigners violating the provisions of these laws

since they had revised the Penal Code of the United States and it was approved March 4, 1909.⁴⁹

When the United States' political leaders in 1913 tried to bring forth a settlement against the Brazilian coffee growers, the relations between the two countries passed through a less friendly period. For Brazilian retaliation there has been mentioned the temporary suspension by that country of the preferential tariff on the United States' goods, which caused heavy losses to the Yankee exporters. Also, it was considered that Brazil's denouncing of the Extradition of 1897 and the Protocols of 1898 and 1903 was a further step of revenge. But at the beginning of Wilson's administration, he took steps to repair small

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 29.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 38.

misunderstandings between the two nations.⁵⁰

Shortly after Wilson's inauguration, he declared: "The United States has nothing to seek in Central and South America except the lasting interest of the people of the two continents."⁵¹

Later an invitation was extended to Dr. Lauro Muller, Brazil's Minister of Foreign Affairs, to repay the visit made in 1906 to that country by Elihu Root.⁵² The invitation was accepted and was highly received by the United States. His visit lasted for more than a month in the United States during which time he traveled from New York to San Francisco.⁵³ Marshall Hermes R. Da Fonseca revealed his appreciation of the honor shown their minister by the United States in his message to the Brazilian Congress on May 3, 1914, which read as follows:

The Brazilian Government is deeply gratified with, and takes this opportunity officially and publicly to indicate to the people and Government of the United States of America its lively recognition of the brilliant and cordial manner in which Doctor Lauro Muller, our Minister for Foreign Affairs, was received, and of the expressions of appreciation and friendship that were shown him on his visit to that great country as an official representative of our Government and in return for the visit which Mr. Elihu Root, the then Secretary of State, made to Brazil in 1906.

That nation and its Government having received the sincerest proofs of our consideration and friendship, has given us in turn the most positive and undoubted proofs of the reciprocity of those sentiments. This official visit has certainly contributed toward strengthening the bonds which unite the two nations, which the previous visit of the distinguished statesman, Mr. Elihu Root, had done so much to form.⁵⁴

⁵⁰Hill, op. cit., pp. 300-301.

⁵¹Stuart, op. cit., p. 49.

⁵²For. Rel., 1913, pp. 67-68.

⁵³Stuart, op. cit., p. 385.

⁵⁴For. Rel., 1914, p. 31.

Harvard University added its part to strengthen the friendship between the two nations by conferring upon Dr. Muller the usual honorary degree.⁵⁵

The South Americans were impressed by the sincerity of President Wilson's new policy, and in general encouraged their government to take advantage of the opportunity of cooperation and friendship with the government of the United States. Brazil was in the forefront of the South American nations which sought to build stronger ties of friendly relations.⁵⁶ During the Mexican Veracruz confusion⁵⁷, which was set off by the incident of Tampico,⁵⁸ the A. B. C. Powers (Argentina, Brazil, and Chile) offered their efforts to settle the conflict which was accepted by the United States. The representatives from the three arbitrators with the United States and Mexican representatives met at Niagra Falls, Canada and arrived at a peaceful settlement.⁵⁹

Through the sincere efforts of the Brazilian Ministers of Canada and Mexico, the United States was given much aid in protecting their American citizens. The Brazilian Minister arranged for their protection and transportation to safety. This act of good will was greatly appreciated.⁶⁰

⁵⁵For. Rel., 1913, pp. 67-74.

⁵⁶Hill, op. cit., p. 302.

⁵⁷Muzzey, David Saville, A History of Our Country (Boston, 1936), p. 628-632.

⁵⁸Rivas, Carlos J. Arangua, "La Intervencion; Doctrine De Monroe, Drago Y Tobia", in Thomas Harrison Reynolds, ed., As Our Neighbors See Us, p. 69.

⁵⁹Muzzey, op. cit., p. 630.

⁶⁰For. Rel., 1914, pp. 673-680.

The Brazilian attitude toward World War I further showed her friendship for the United States.⁶¹ She promoted and identified her efforts with that of the United States and the Allies. Brazil, among other South American Republics, entered the war as a full belligerent. The defense of her national honor, the vindication of international law, and her belief in the principles of American solidarity permitted her to aid the Allies.⁶²

Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Brazil would be entirely inadequate unless it included the commercial phase during the same period. American agents were concerned with the unfavorable balance of trade between the two countries.⁶³ In the early part of the twentieth century the United States imported from Brazil five times the amount exported to that country--this being valued in dollars.⁶⁴

⁶¹Hill, op. cit., p. 302.

⁶²Martin, Percy Alvin, Latin America and the War (Baltimore, 1925), p. 30.

⁶³Hill, op. cit., p. 294.

⁶⁴U. S. Dept. of Commerce and Labor, For. Com. and Navigation of the U. S. 1903, (Washington, 1904), p. 7 and p. 297.

The unfavorable balance of trade between the United States and Brazil during the early part of the twentieth century is illustrated by the following chart:

Year	Exports to Brazil from United States	Imports from Brazil to United States
1900	\$ 11,578,119 ⁶⁵	\$ 58,073,457 ⁶⁶
1905	10,985,096 ⁶⁷	99,843,094 ⁶⁸
1910	22,897,890	108,154,491 ⁶⁹
1915	25,629,555	99,178,728 ⁷⁰
1920	156,740,365	227,587,594 ⁷¹
Total	227,831,025	592,837,364

⁶⁵U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1903 (Washington, 1905) Vol. 2, p. 297.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 7.

⁶⁷U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1905 (Washington, 1906), Vol. 1, p. 45.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 44.

⁶⁹U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Statistics, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1910 (Washington, 1911), p. 51.

⁷⁰United States Department of Commerce, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1915 (Washington, 1916), p. XIV.

⁷¹Ibid., 1920, p. X.

In 1897 Congress passed the Dingley Tariff Act⁷² which was approved July 24, 1897. The articles free of duty were different from the articles of the "Tropical List". Of the new ones included on the list subject to tax were coffee, tanka, tea, and vanilla beans, while molasses, sugar, and hides were omitted. The President of the United States was authorized the power to put a duty on the new list of articles except those above mentioned which were free of entry. Because of the unimportant nature of the products involved, this action proved of little value.⁷³

Since the termination of the tariff act of 1894, no commercial treaty of any kind existed between Brazil and the United States; however, there was the reciprocity agreement of July 31, 1891. A tariff preference upon a number of important articles was granted South American countries beginning in 1904; but there was an exception from January 1, 1905, to July 1, 1906.⁷⁴

The following table indicates most of the imports to the United States from Brazil which were free of duty.

Year	Tariff Act in Effect	Free of Duty		Dutiable		Total	
		Act of:	Amount	% of Total	Amount		% of Total
1900	1897		\$55,204,311	95.1	\$2,869,146	4.9	58,073,457
1911	1909		100,457,075	99.6	410,109	.4	100,867,184
1915	1913		96,910,776	97.7	2,267,952	2.3	99,178,728

75

⁷²United States Statutes at Large, 1897-1899, Vol. XXX, pp. 151-215.

⁷³Williams, Benjamin H., Economic Foreign Policy of the United States (New York, 1929), p. 272.

⁷⁴United States Tariff Commission, Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties (Washington, 1919), p. 285, (Hereafter cited as Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties).

⁷⁵Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, p. 285.

In 1897, the United States urged Brazil to try reciprocity once more. The South American country was reminded that the United States was importing more than sixty million dollars worth of her products. Ninety-five per cent of these articles were admitted duty free. At the same time Brazil was importing over \$13,000,000, of which eighty-seven per cent was charged a heavy duty. Too, after entry, the goods from America were subject to heavy freight rates from port to the consumer.⁷⁶

However, an exceedingly important agreement was promoted. The consistent urging of the United States resulted, in 1904, in bringing a considerable duty reduction on the products from the United States entering Brazil. Since Brazil sold more than fifty per cent of her coffee production in the United States and there was threat of a penalty tariff on the product, great concern was aroused in Brazil. On a number of manufactured articles as well as American wheat and flour, a reduction of twenty per cent was made. Nevertheless, there were objections from the flour-milling interests of Brazil and by the Brazilian Congress. The president had acted under an old law which gave him the power to place reductions upon products from any country which admitted coffee free of duty. The reduction helped the American exporters of flour to compete with the Brazilian millers and Argentine exporters to Brazil.⁷⁷

The Brazilian Congress met in December, 1904, at which time the question of preference extended to the United States was discussed. Each house not only voted against renewing the policy for the coming

⁷⁶Hill, op. cit., p. 294.

⁷⁷Williams, op. cit., p. 272.

year but revoked the power of the president to make such concessions to any country without first putting it before the Congress. This was a reaction from the president's step of the previous year at which time he took the authority to empower a twenty per cent preference on any articles coming from a country admitting Brazilian products free of duty. This, naturally established a measure of preferential treatment for the United States products, chiefly flour. Too, it is interesting to note that the English had invested large amounts in Brazil.⁷⁸

In 1905 the cost of wheat production in the United States was higher than in Argentina and any tariff would have made it impossible to have sold there. However, the antagonism from the milling interests toward the United States was weaker and the President of Brazil succeeded in December of that year in renewing the preferential concessions granted to the United States in 1904. To return the favor, the United States government added five more products--windmills, typewriters, refrigerators, pianos, and scales-- to its previous list of concessions.⁷⁹

This agreement was renewed annually by Brazilian presidents until 1911 when the preferential arrangement on flour was increased to thirty per cent. The increase disturbed Argentina to the extent that she threatened retaliation by increasing the rates on certain products; such as petroleum, lumber, and other staples imported in that country from the United States. The negotiations resulting between Washington and Buenos Aires was that the United States would give that country a six

⁷⁸Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, p. 286.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 286.

month's notice before seeking further preferential treatment from
Brazil.⁸⁰

Since 1906 this preferential arrangement had been authorized by the Brazilian government; however, there have been numerous debates in their congress and in the press. During 1907 cash registers and linotypes were added to the preferential list. In 1908 and 1909 there were no modifications made.⁸¹

The United States Department of State was made acquainted with the Argentine intentions by a memorandum dated June 9, 1911, which stated:

The Congress, supported by the press of best standing, believes that the menace placed upon the exportation of Argentine flour by the advantages gained by the Government of the United States of America for its flour imported into Brazil has brought occasion for the Argentine Government to defend itself by increasing the import duties on petroleum, lumber, and other staples of American imports.⁸²

When the United States passed the Tariff Act of 1909,⁸³ it brought an essential change in the tariff system. It left an extremely high scheme on rates, but it showed an extremely intolerant attitude on foreign trade.⁸⁴ Immediately the State Department opened negotiations

⁸⁰Stuart, op. cit., pp. 382-383, and For. Rel., 1911, pp. 30-34. For the 20 per cent preferential tariff concessions in favor of American products see For. Rel., 1906, Vol. I, pp. 113-116; and For. Rel., 1907, Vol. 1, pp. 90-94; For. Rel., 1911, pp. 30-34.

⁸¹Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, p. 286-287.

⁸²For. Rel., 1911, p. 32.

⁸³United States Statutes at Large, 1909-1918, Vol. XXXVI, Part 1, pp. 11-118.

⁸⁴Taussig, F. W., The Tariff History of the United States, 6th ed. (New York, 1914), p. 407.

with Brazil in order to secure a tariff on American products which would justify the president to extend to imports from Brazil the rates of the minimum tariff. After requests from the American representatives, the Brazilian government granted a reduction on articles imported from the United States such as the following: dried fruits, desks, cement, corsets and school furniture.⁸⁵

At this time (late 1911 & 1912) political factions in the United States caused some concern over the valorization scheme of the United States government toward Brazil. It was claimed that the United States consumed 40 per cent of the world's total output of coffee. Therefore, a rise of six cents per pound would mean \$57,000,000 per year to the people of the United States. Also, it was claimed that the valorization scheme had brought about an increase of six cents per pound.⁸⁶

The Attorney-General in the District Court of New York went so far as to bring suit against the Committee on Coffee Valorization of the State of Sao Paulo. This immediately caused the Brazilian Ambassador to protest. The president of Sao Paulo declared that this action jeopardized the legal status of Brazilian coffee stored in New York.⁸⁷

As a result of this controversy, the Brazilian government suspended the Preferential Tariff Agreement at the close of 1912. However, an early settlement of diplomatic relations restored commercial relations.⁸⁸

It is easy to see why the settlement of a controversy of this nature

⁸⁵Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, p. 287.

⁸⁶Stuart, op. cit., p. 284.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 284.

⁸⁸Hill, op. cit., p. 297.

was to the benefit of any country, such as Brazil, when her exports to a foreign country, especially the United States, were more than twice her imports from that country.⁸⁹

Since January 1, 1911, when the preference in favor of American flour was increased from twenty per cent to thirty per cent, there was no change either in the list of preferred articles or the extent of the preference. However, in 1916, the decree was worded so as to cover only the products manufactured or grown in the United States. Previous to this, articles were included whether or not they were products of the latter and enjoyed the advantage of the tariff reduction. In 1917, by authorization of the Brazilian law, Section I of Article II of Law No. 3213 of December 30, 1916, the concessions made were as follows:

There is hereby continued in force the authority given to the Government to adopt a different tariff in favor of one or more articles of foreign production, the reduction (on other articles) being limited to 20 percent, as on wheat flour to 30 percent, made in exchange for concessions to articles of Brazilian production, especially rubber and tobacco.⁹⁰

It is interesting to see that the power of the Brazilian president was not limited to any specified articles, but rubber and tobacco products, in which Brazil was most interested in having favored, were mentioned. When the preferential agreement by Brazil in 1904 was first applied to American products, only coffee was mentioned. In the budget for 1911, sugar and alcohol were added; for 1912, herua matte (yerba mate); and tobacco, cocoa, and cotton were included for 1913. The articles of

⁸⁹Report of the Second Pan American Commercial Conference, Pan American Commerce, Past-Present-Future (Washington, 1919), pp. 400-401.

⁹⁰Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, p. 287.

America to be included in the preference agreement were specified in the Presidential Decree No. 12334 of January 1, 1917, which read as follows:

The President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil, decrees:

ARTICLE I. During the current year, to count from the first day of the present month, the articles mentioned hereinbelow, when produced in the United States of America, shall enjoy the following reductions in import duties; 30 per cent on wheat flour and 20 per cent on condensed milk, manufacturers of rubber under Schedule 1033 of the tariff, clocks and watches, paints and inks under Schedule 183 of the tariff (except writing inks), varnishes, typewriters, refrigerators, pianos, scales, windmills, Portland cement, corsets, dried fruits, school furniture, and desks.⁹¹

The preference for the year of 1918 was renewed without change by Presidential Decree No. 12812 of January 9.⁹²

In summarizing the economic relations between Brazil and the United States, the following analyses are separate studies appearing in table form concerning commodities upon which a preferential reduction was established. The exports from the United States to Brazil of articles upon which the preference was granted, April 16, 1904, are compared in the following table with the total Brazilian imports. The imports of the preferred articles from the United States decreased from 1902 until 1906. After 1907 the preferential rates were again effective and a gradual recovery began to exist.

⁹¹Ibid., pp. 287-288.

⁹²Ibid., p. 288.

PREFERENTIAL ARTICLES IMPORTED INTO BRAZIL

The Percentages of Grand Total Are Compared

(Preferential effective April 16, 1904, to December 31, 1904, and since July 1, 1906)

All Articles

Year	Grand Total From All Countries	From the United States	
		Value	Percent of Grand Total
1902	\$113,491,392	\$ 13,894,208	12.24
1903	117,778,973	13,298,550	11.29
1904	126,096,621	14,050,119	11.14
1905	147,600,240	15,276,827	10.35
1906	161,968,695	18,557,971	11.46
1907	197,157,468	25,161,983	12.76
1908	172,734,213	20,920,200	12.11
1909	180,708,583	22,375,651	12.38
1910	231,577,204	29,740,518	12.84
1911	257,481,615	34,342,673	13.34
1912	308,624,285	48,168,710	15.61
1913	326,831,508	51,353,003	15.71
1914	169,117,807	30,686,725	18.15
1915	145,749,024	46,968,238	32.23
1916	194,582,153	76,238,664	39.18

⁹³Ibid., p. 290.

Before 1890 the United States was by far the leading exporter of wheat flour to Brazil. However, it was not long before the fertile lands of Argentina were producing a bountiful surplus of wheat. Because of the long distance to the European markets, the Argentine government could make adjustments on prices of that product when sold to a neighbor. Soon the Argentine wheat imported by Brazil surpassed that which was imported from the United States. The following table gives an interesting comparison of imports of wheat flour to that country:

IMPORTS INTO BRAZIL OF WHEAT FLOUR, 1902 to 1916

Year	Value of Total Imports of Wheat Flour	From the United States		From Argentina	
		Value	% of Total	Value	% of Total
1902	\$ 5,797,097	\$ 2,692,929	46.45	\$1,868,688	32.24
1903	6,049,774	2,283,662	37.75	3,144,595	51.98
1904	7,651,985	2,212,425	28.91	4,546,311	59.41
1905	8,130,939	1,551,338	19.08	5,802,829	71.37
1906	8,677,099	1,573,654	18.14	6,632,073	76.43
1907	9,689,530	1,974,624	20.38	6,789,350	70.07
1908	9,026,659	1,938,723	21.48	6,144,662	68.07
1909	9,315,693	2,207,236	23.69	6,268,483	67.29
1910	9,930,392	3,126,265	31.48	6,163,884	62.07
1911	9,721,079	3,334,987	34.31	5,694,019	58.57
1912	11,762,690	4,016,953	34.16	6,288,019	53.48
1913	10,388,040	3,955,024	38.07	5,821,418	56.05
1914	8,266,969	4,583,574	55.44	3,165,152	38.28
1915	9,639,973	6,055,830	62.82	3,198,846	33.18
1916	8,797,685	3,855,544	43.82	4,035,450	45.87

94

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 293.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

A. United States

Congressional Publications:

- House Executive Document 31 Cong., 1 sess., VII, No. 19, 1850.
- House of Representatives 56 Cong., 1 sess., I, No. 1, 1901.
- House of Representatives 58 Cong., 2 sess., I, No. 1, 1905.
- House of Representatives 58 Cong., 3 sess., I, No. 1, 1905.
- House of Representatives 59 Cong., 1 sess., I, No. 1, 1906.
- Statutes at Large 51 Cong., 1 sess., I, 1890.
- Statutes at Large 55 Cong., 1 sess., XXX, 1897-1899.
- Statutes at Large 61 Cong., 1 sess., XXXVI, 1909-1911.

Department of Commerce Publications:

- Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1915.
Washington, Government Printing Office, 1916.
- Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1920.
Washington, Government Printing Office, 1921.

Department of Commerce and Labor Publications:

- Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1903. Vol.
II. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1904.
- Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1905. Vol.
I. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906.
- Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1910. Vol.
I. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1911.

Department of State Publications:

- Foreign Relations of the United States, 1900. Washington,
Government Printing Office, 1902.
- Foreign Relations of the United States, 1901. Washington,
Government Printing Office, 1902.
- Foreign Relations of the United States, 1906. Washington,
Government Printing Office, 1909.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1908. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1912.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1909. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1914.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1910. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1915.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1911. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1918.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1912. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1919.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1913. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1920.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1914. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1922.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1915. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1924.

Department of State Miscellaneous Publications:

Malloy, William M. Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements Between the United States of America and Other Powers, 1776-1909, Vol. I, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910. (61 Cong., 2 sess., S. doc. 357).

Miller, Hunter. Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America, 1776-1852, Vol. 3, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1933.

Moore, John Bassett. Digest of International Law, as Embodied in Diplomatic Discussions, Treaties, and Other International Agreements, International Awards, the Decisions of Municipal Courts, and the Writings of Jurists, and Especially in Documents, Published and Unpublished, Issued by Presidents and Secretaries of State of the United States, the Opinions of the Attorneys General, and the Decisions of Courts, Federal and State, Vol. I, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906. (56 Cong., 2 sess., doc. 551).

Richardson, James D. Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the President, 1787-1897, Vol. II, Washington, Gov. Printing Office, 1909. (53 Cong., 2 sess. H. Misc. doc. 210).

Tariff Commission Publications:

Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, 1919. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1919.

B. Brazilian

Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

Brazil 1939-40 An Economic, Social and Geographic Survey. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1940.

Secondary Source

A. Books

- Haring, Clarence H. South America Looks at the United States. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1928.
- Herring, Hubert. Good Neighbors Argentine, Brazil, Chile, and Seventeen Other Countries. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1941.
- Hill, Lawrence, F. Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Brazil. Duke University Press, Durham, N. C., 1932.
- James, Herman G., and Martin, Percy A. The Republics of Latin America, Their History, Governments and Economic Condition. Harper and Brothers, New York and London, MCMXXII.
- Muzzey, David S. A History of Our Country. Ginn and Co., Boston, 1936.
- Reynolds, Thomas Harrison. ed. As Our Neighbors See Us. 1940.
- Robertson, William Spence. Hispanic-American Relations With the United States. Oxford University Press, New York, 1923.
- Stuart, Graham H. Latin America and the United States, 2nd ed. The Century Co., New York, 1922.
- Taussig, Frank W., and Joslyn, C. S. The Tariff History of the United States, 6th ed. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1914.
- Williams, Benjamin H. Economic Foreign Policy of the United States. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1929.

B. Miscellaneous

- Humphre, Robin A. "Latin America," Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs No. 39. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1941.

Typist: Mrs. R. W. Steele