

Project summary

South-South Cooperation and Foreign Policy Agendas: comparing the cases of Brazil, China, India, Mexico, South Africa and Turkey

This project aims to produce an analytical framework that shall contribute to the understanding of the hard and soft institutions of international development cooperation policies of six countries (South Africa, China, India, Mexico, Brazil and Turkey). The timing is particularly conducive to debate about this topic, since such countries have begun to invest as emerging donors, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in several development sectors (public health, formal education and university cooperation, non-formal education, technical assistance projects, agricultural development, etc.) and in partnership with countries from different regions of the world (especially in Africa, Asia and Latin America region). Therefore, because these “new powers” have started to play an increasingly important role in South-South cooperation, there is a need to understand more fully the reality of changes within the international development cooperation regime, especially regarding practices, discourses, visions and institutional constructions of these “rising states”. As a consequence, this project aims at drawing an analytical framework for the understanding, based on a qualitative and comparative perspective, of the hard and soft institutions (organizations, norms, discourses, visions, practices) of south-south development cooperation policies built so far by the six selected countries.

Based on comparative methods, our central research question could be phrased as follows: how do “new powers” integrate SSC strategies in their foreign policy agendas? The category “new powers” here refers to states that must react to the international hierarchy within a broad commitment to some change in *status quo*. These countries do not accede to a Western-centric order, and they do not consider that they benefit from the established liberal international order, which does not necessarily imply a foreign policy of fundamental rejection. This category includes a series of six states which may have a clear non *status quo* foreign policy behavior (Brazil, China, India, South Africa), may be revisionist states (China, India), middle powers (Mexico, Turkey) or global players (Brazil, China, India). They all share a past political history directly or indirectly related to the non-

alignment movement, the Third World diplomacy and the New International Economic Order debates within the United Nations. The six selected countries can also be considered “rising states”, since they are regional or global powers, part of the intermediate *per capita* revenue list of countries, and members of the G20.\

Table 1 presents four analytical dimensions that must be explored:

Research questions	Dependent variable	Dimensions and independent variables
<p>MAIN RESEARCH QUESTION: how do “new powers” conceive and implement their south-south development cooperation strategies?</p> <p>RELATED RESEARCH QUESTIONS: how are such strategies linked to foreign policy agendas? Can the six selected rising powers, through their SSC strategies, step up and accept leadership, as well as collective commitment and shared decision making? Do these countries challenge the cooperation for development system (OECD, World Bank) with innovative practices and new rules of the game? Have they learned from past mistakes made within the framework of traditional North-South Cooperation strategies?</p>	<p>Profile of SSC-D of the six selected countries in post-1989 world order:</p> <p>- The nature of the development cooperation: donation/grants, loans on concessional basis; technical cooperation; commercial subsidies; amounts allocated; sectors and public policies involved (health, culture, infrastructure, education, etc.); emphasis on multilateral or bilateral cooperation.</p> <p>- The norms of the development cooperation: patterns, values, concepts; analysis of emblematic projects.</p>	<p><u><i>Historical (contextual and formative variable):</i></u> how have SSC strategies been historically integrated in national foreign policy agendas? (foreign policy priorities and diplomatic history; political autonomy and new coalitions; multilateral experience)</p>
		<p><u><i>Geopolitical (contextual and constitutive variable):</i></u> what are the geopolitical and economic motivations of SSC-D strategies? What are their implications? (links to international and collective security; links with regional integration processes, trade and investment priorities; relationship with internationalization of business and market access to national companies)</p>
		<p><u><i>Institutional (independent variable):</i></u> what are the hard and soft institutions established in the field of SSC in each country? (establishment of an aid agency; decision-making process; the role of advisors; the role of the ministry of external relations and other ministries or agencies - bureaucratic politics; subnational entities; features of leadership)</p>
		<p><u><i>Domestic politics (independent variable):</i></u> what are the main actors and agendas of current SSC-D policies? (social legitimation; non institutional actors; public opinion)</p>

Table 2: Qualitative analytical matrix (source: elaborated by the author).

- a) *Dimension 2* - The constitutive dimension of regional and global geopolitics, as the SSC-D is linked to regional priorities and global foreign policy? As the SSC-D is related to the priorities of global collective security and regional integration processes? SSC-D follows the strategies of economic investments (public and private) conducted by the six countries selected?
- a) *Dimension 1* - The historical contextual dimension of South-South Development Cooperation (SSC-D) in the foreign policy agendas of each of the selected countries: what is the legacy of North-South cooperation in the selected countries? What are the main pitfalls and critical limits of the North-South cooperation that should be avoided in the SSC-D (in the field of public health, the environment, for example)? How does the SSC-D on the agendas of Brazilian foreign policy and selected countries?
- b) *Dimension 3* - The institutional dimension of SSC-D: What are the speeches, agendas and practices of the countries studied in CSS? There are agencies specifically designed to implement these agendas? How to articulate the institutional actors (federalism, bureaucratic politics)?
- c) *Dimension 4* - The size of domestic politics: what is the "place" of the agendas of non-governmental Brazilian SSC-D? What are their perceptions about the SSC-D of their respective countries? How to articulate the economic operators and social actors on the agendas of SSC-D in the case of Brazil and in comparative perspective? There would be tensions between public and private interests in the implementation of these agendas SSC-D, particularly in Latin American and African?

The main assumptions of this research project are the following:

- (i) The legacy of North-South relations, the fight for a new international economic order in the sixties and seventies, among other independent variables, play a significant historical role (a) in the framing (social representation, national history) of international problems and (b) in the conception of viable alliances and coalitions among developing countries.
- (ii) The definition of SSC-D strategies follows a complex decision making process in which geopolitical and economic factors work as key intervening variables. SSC strategies implemented by "new powers" also depend on their national and collective capabilities (material and economic strength), geographical location (regional priorities), and cultural affinity (being part of a community).
- (iii) SSC-D strategies are not homogeneous: they may assume the specific shape of technical cooperation, may be more focused on bilateral cooperation, and also the result of the internationalization of public policies. There is a need to empirically analyze such development cooperation schemes and set up empirical

typologies so as to reveal distinct country profiles in terms of political behavior and soft power projection.

- (iv) Institutional experience is heterogeneous, and is related to (a) the national political and bureaucratic relevance of each ministry of external relations, (b) the existence and relative autonomy of an aid agency, (c) the multilateral experience of each country, (d) the support to self-determination and sovereignty in international relations, and (e) the demands of domestic actors (professionalization, transparency).
- (v) Democratization and internationalization of bureaucracies and societies are key variables for political participation in SSC decision-making. The politics of domestic actors in each country influences the negotiation and implementation behavior of States. Leaders, their personalities and beliefs also play a relevant role in this process. Government changes (dramatic regime change or change through elections) have effects on foreign policy agendas and SSC strategies.

References

AKRICH, Madeleine; CALLON, Michel; LATOUR, Bruno. *Sociologie de la traduction: textes fondateurs*. Paris: Presses des Mines/ParisTech, 2006.

ALEXANDROFF, Alan S.; COOPER, Andrew F. (eds.). *Rising States, Rising Institutions: challenges for global governance*. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010.

AMIN, Samir. *O desenvolvimento desigual: ensaio sobre as formações sociais do capitalismo periférico*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1976.

ANTONINI, B.; HIRST, M. Pasado y Presente de la Cooperación Norte-Sul para el desarrollo. *Documentos de Trabajo de la Cooperación Sur-Sur*, Buenos Aires: Ministerio de las Relaciones Internacionales, Comercio Exterior y Culto, 2009, p. 9-72.

AYALA, Citlali ; PEREZ, Jorge A. (eds.). *México y los países de renta media en la cooperación para el desarrollo: ¿hacia dónde vamos?* México: Instituto Mora, 2009.

AYLLÓN PINO, Bruno. *South-South Cooperation and multilateral governance of the aid system: the implications for the Spanish aid*. FRIDE (Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior), Comment, p. 1-9, June 2009.

BADIE, Bertrand & HERMET, Guy. *La Politique Comparée*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2001.

BARA, Judith; PENNINGTON, Mark (eds.). *Comparative Politics*. Londres: Sage Publications Ltd., 2009.

BEASLEY, Ryan; KAARBO, J.; LANTIS, J.; SNARR, Michael T. (eds.). *Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective: domestic and international influences on state behavior*. Washington: CQ Press, 2002.

BLONDEL, Jean. L'analyse politique comparée et l'institutionnalisation des parties.

Revue Internationale de Politique Comparée, vol. 10, n. 2, p. 247-264, 2003.

BREUNING, Marijke. *Foreign Policy Analysis: a comparative introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

CAPORASO, James. Across de the Great Divide: Integrating Comparative and International Politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 41, n. 4, 1997, p. 563-591.

CERNY, Philipp. Globalization and the Logic of Collective Action. *International Organization*, 49 (4), 595-625, 1995.

CHIN, Gregory. China's Rising Institutional Influence. In: Alan S. Alexandroff; Andrew F. Cooper (eds.), *op. cit.*, 2010.

CHISHOLM, Linda; STEINER-KHAMSI, Gita. *South-South Cooperation in Education and Development*. New York/London: Teachers College Press, 2009.

COLLIER, David. Understanding Process Tracing. *Political Science and Politics*, 44 (4), p. 823-830, 2011.

COMELIAU, Christian. *Les relations Nord-Sud*. Paris: La Découverte, 1991.

COOKE, Bill & KOTHARI, Uma. *Participation, The New Tirany*. New York: Zed Books, 2001.

CORREA, Marcio Lopes. *Prática Comentada da Cooperação Internacional: entre a hegemonia e a busca de autonomia*. Brasília: Edição do Autor, 2010.

DEGNBOL-MARTINUSSEN, John; ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, Poul. *AID Understanding International Development Cooperation*. Londres/New York: Zed Books, 2003.

DOGAN, M. & PELASSY, D. *Sociologie politique comparative: problèmes et perspectives*. Paris: Economica, 1981.

DOGAN, Mattei; KAZANCIGIL, Ali (eds.). *Comparing Nations: concepts, strategies, substance*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

DOLOWITZ, David P.; MARSH, David. Learning from Abroad: the role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance: an international journal of policy and administration*, vol. 13, n. 1, January 2000, p. 5-24.

DOMINGUES, José Maurício. *Global Modernity, Development, and Contemporary Civilization*. London: Routledge, 2012.

ESCOBAR, Arturo. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2005.

GAZIBO, Mamoudou. La démarche comparative binaire: éléments méthodologiques à partir d'une analyse de trajectoires contrastées de démocratisation. *Revue Internationale de Politique Comparée*, vol. 9, n. 3, p. 427-449, 2002.

GUIJT, Irene & SHAH, Meera Kaul. *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1998.

HASSENTEUFEL, Patrick. De la comparaison internationale à la comparaison transnationale: les déplacements de la construction d'objets comparatifs en matière de politiques publiques. *Revue française de science politique*, vol. 55, n. 1, 2005, p. 113-132.

HAYTER, Teresa. *Aid as Imperialism*. Londres: Penguin Books, 1971.

HILL, Christopher. *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

HIRST, Monica. Países de renda média e a cooperação Sul-Sul: entre o conceitual e o político. In: Maria Regina Soares de Lima; Monica Hirst (eds.), *Brasil, Índia e África do Sul: desafios e oportunidades para novas parcerias*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2009.

HOPKIN, Jonathan. Comparative Methods. In: MARSH, D. & STOKER, G. (eds). *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2nd edition, pp.249-67, 2002.

HUNTINGTON, Samuel P. Foreign Aid for What and for Whom. *Foreign Policy*, n. 1, 1970-1971), p. 161-189.

HURRELL, Andrew. Brazil : What Kind of Rising State in What Kind of Institutional Order ? In: Alan S. Alexandroff; Andrew F. Cooper (eds.), *op. cit.*, 2010.

IGLESIA-G., Manuel. *El impacto económico y social de la cooperación para el desarrollo*. Madri: UCM, 2005.

INSTITUTO DE PESQUISA ECONÔMICA APLICADA (IPEA); Agência Brasileira de Cooperação (ABC). *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional 2005-2009*. Brasília: IPEA/ABC, 2010.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (IDA). *Aid Architecture: an overview of the main trends in official development assistance*. Washington: IDA/The World Bank, 2007, 54 p.

KENNAN, George. Foreign Aid as a National Policy. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, vol. 30, n. 3, 1971, p. 175-183.

KOPSTIN, Jeffrey; LICHBACH, Mark. *Comparative Politics. Interests, Identities, and Institutions in a Changing Global Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

LANCASTER, Carol. *Foreign Aid: diplomacy, development, domestic politics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

LASCOUMES, Pierre; LE GALÈS, Patrick. *Sociologie de l'action publique*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2007.

LIJPHART, Arend. Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 65, n. 3, 1971, p. 682-693.

LIMA, Maria Regina Soares de. A política externa brasileira e os desafios da cooperação Sul-Sul. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, v. 48, n. 2, 2005, p. 24-59.

MARCOVITCH, Jacques (org.). *Cooperação Internacional: estratégia e gestão*. S. Paulo: EDUSP, 1994 (1er, em prioridade, os caps. escritos por Peter Könz e Antonio Cachapuz de Medeiros).

MAVROTAS, George; NUNNENKAMP, Peter. Foreign Aid Heterogeneity: Issues and Agenda. *Review of World Economics*, vol. 143, n. 4, dezembro de 2007, p. 585-595.

MENY, Yves e SUREL, Yves. *Politique Comparée*. Paris: Montchrestien/ Domat Politique, 2009.

MILANI, Carlos R. S. Discursos y mitos de la participación social en la cooperación internacional para el desarrollo: una mirada a partir de Brasil. *Revista Española de Desarrollo y Cooperación*, v. 22, p. 161-182, 2008.

MILANI, Carlos R. S.; LANIADO, Ruthy N. Transnational Social Movements and the Globalization Agenda: a methodological approach based on the analysis of the World Social Forum. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 10-39, 2007.

MILL, John Stuart. *Two Methods of Comparison*, selection from his *A System of Logic*, New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1888, pp. 278, 279-283.

MORAES, Reginaldo Carmello Correa de. *Estado, Desenvolvimento e Globalização*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2006.

MORGENTHAU, Hans. A Political Theory of Foreign Aid. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 56, no. 2, junho de 1962, p. 301-309.

NADKARNI, Vidya; WILLIAMS, J. Michael; International Relations and Comparative Politics. *The International Studies Encyclopedia*. Denmark, Robert A. Blackwell Publishing, 2010. Blackwell Reference Online: http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781444336597_chunk_g9714443365979_ss1-15. Access: 18 April 2011.

NARLIKAR, Amrita. *New Powers: How to Become One and How to Manage Them*. New York: Columbia, 2010.

NAYLOR, Tristen. Deconstructing Development: the use of power and pity in the international development discourse. *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 55, n. 1, 2011, p. 177-197.

NOLTE, Detlef. How to Compare Regional Powers: Analytical Concepts and Research Topics. *Review of International Studies*, no 36, 2010

PANKAJ, Ashok Kumar. Revisiting Foreign Aid Theories. *International Studies*, vol. 42, n. 2, 2005, p. 103-121.

PEREIRA, João Márcio Mendes. *O Banco Mundial como ator político, intelectual e financeiro 1944-2008*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2010.

RAGIN, Charles. *The Comparative Method: moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Berkeley (California): University of California Press, 1987.

RANDALL, Vicky. Using and Abusing the Concept of the Third World: Geopolitics and the Comparative Political Study of Development and Underdevelopment. *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 25, no 1, pp. 41-53, 2004.

RIST, Gilbert. *Le développement, histoire d'une croyance occidentale*. Paris: Presses de Sciences-Po, 1996.

SARTORI, Giovanni. Compare why and how, comparing, miscomparing and the

comparative method. In: DOGAN, Mattei; KAZANCIGIL, Ali (eds.). *Comparing Nations: concepts, strategies, substance*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994, p. 14-34.

SCHMITTER, Philippe C. The nature and future of comparative politics. *European Political Science Review*, vol. 1, n. 1, p. 33-61, 2009.

STOKES, Susan; BOIX, Charles (org.). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

STONE, Diane. Learning lessons, policy transfer and the international diffusion of policy ideas. *Working Paper*, University of Warwick, Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, 2001, 21 p.

TILLY, Charles. *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1984.

TILLY, Charles; GOODIN, Robert E. (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

VARELA, Manuel. *Organización Econômica Internacional*. Madri: Pirâmide, 1991.

WALKER, R. B. J. *Inside/outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel. *O Universalismo Europeu, a retórica do poder*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

WALTZ, Kenneth. International Politics is not Foreign Policy. *Security Studies*, vol. 6, no 1, pp. 54-57, 1996.