Global Affairs

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rgaf20

De-westernization, democratization, disconnection: the emergence of Brazil's post-diplomatic foreign policy

Dawisson Belém Lopes

To cite this article: Dawisson Belém Lopes (2020): De-westernization, democratization, disconnection: the emergence of Brazil's post-diplomatic foreign policy, Global Affairs

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2020.1769494

Published online: 11 Jun 2020.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rgaf20

GLOBAL AFFAIRS
https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2020.1769494

De-westernization, democratization, disconnection: the emergence of Brazil's post-diplomatic foreign policy

Dawisson Belém Lopes

Department of Political Science, The Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Brazil

ABSTRACT

For some time, foreign policy as an expression was perfectly interchangeable with diplomacy, given the degree of leverage enjoyed by diplomatic corps in Brazil's political system. However, there has arguably been some degree of discontinuity in this trajectory, which is noticeable from a couple of trends: Brazil's strategy toward Western powers vis-à-vis the rise of Asia,on the one hand, and democratization of foreign policymaking and the resulting tumultuous relationship between the foreign ministry and the presidency of the country, on the other. I posit that, from Fernando Henrique Cardoso to Jair Bolsonaro, this combination of factors prompted an epochal shift in Brazil's external relations, whose bottom line might be Itamaraty's demise as chief formulator while other governmental bureaucracies, political parties and individuals take over as the gravity centre, turning the contents of Brazil's foreign policy more responsive to social inputs, however less predictable and coherent over time.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 17 November 2018
Accepted 9 May 2020

KEYWORDS
Brazil; foreign policy; diplomacy; democracy; West

Introduction

In the opening session of the 18th United Nations General Assembly in 1963, Brazil's Ambassador João Augusto de Araújo Castro uttered one of the most famous speeches in the history of Brazilian foreign policy. By way of an expression loaded with Cold War concerns and representative of ancestral traditions of Brazil's diplomatic thought, yet original in form, Araújo Castro synthesized through three keywords – *disarmament, decolonization*, and *development* – a considerable chunk of the developing country's foreign policy agenda at the time. The Cuban Missile Crisis astounded the world just the year before that speech, around the same time Algeria declared independence from France – following nearly a decade of conflict. Back then, developmentalism, a structuralist politico-economic theory inspired by UN-ECLAC (United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean) scholars, had grown deep roots in the subcontinent (Araújo Castro, 1963).

Thirty years on, it was time for Brazil's foreign minister Celso Amorim, a known admirer of Araújo Castro, to recover this "3 Ds" motto, and also at the United Nations pulpit, introduce a new set of values into the country's international discourse. *Democracy, (sustainable) development* and *defense* would then make up the novel holy trinity of

CONTACT Dawisson Belém Lopes dawisson@ufmg.br
© 2020 European International Studies Association

Brazil's foreign policy (Amorim, 2013). In September 1993, Brazil's constitutional democratic order was newborn, yet to complete five years of promulgation after a long dictatorial winter. One year earlier the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit) had taken place in Rio de Janeiro and entailed important normative improvements for the field of global environmental governance. Moreover, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the issue of international security took on less belligerent and dramatic connotations – at least that is how it looked then. Amorim was not just making an appropriate recording of the *Zeitgeist*, but a vindication of the contents that would orientate the Brazilian foreign policy afterward.

As one can truthfully claim about twentieth-century Brazil, *foreign policy* in its practical expression seems perfectly interchangeable with *diplomacy*, given the degree of leverage enjoyed by a professional diplomatic corps inside the country's political system (Belém Lopes, 2014).[1] For the majority of Brazil's foreign policy commentators, the centrality of Itamaraty – short for Brazil's Foreign Ministry – has been a given. Take for instance this following passage coined by Arlene Tickner:

> Few would dispute that the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations, Itamaraty, harbors one of the most effective and professional diplomatic corps in the world. *The fact that Itamaraty has been largely in charge of steering Brazil's international course, and that it has enjoyed extremely high degrees of domestic legitimacy, makes the Brazilian case somewhat unusual compared with other countries*. (Tickner, 2012, p. 369, emphasis added)

By recognizing the uniqueness of this arrangement for foreign policymaking, the author concludes that "As a result, [Brazilian] foreign policy exhibits a series of principles, objectives, and traditions that have remained largely unaltered throughout time and across governments of dramatically different ideological orientations" (*Ibid.*). This strand is widely shared and voiced out by other influential thinkers on Brazil's international affairs (Cervo & Bueno, 2002; Mares & Trinkunas, 2016; Pinheiro, 2004; Saraiva, 2011; Soares de Lima & Hirst, 2006; Stuenkel & Taylor, 2015). However, there has been some clear-cut discontinuity in this trajectory during the two last decades – that is the position I will tentatively defend in the next pages. In his most recent book, Sean Burges contends, in disagreement with Tickner's above-stated reasoning, "In a situation seen in nearly every other country increasingly the [Brazilian] foreign ministry's authority and capability on a whole range of issues is being challenged" (Burges, 2017, p. 22). For him, Itamaraty could be the one to blame for Brazil's ailing international strategy and inability to seize great opportunities in times of economic globalization, especially in the realm of foreign trade and investment (Burges, 2012–2013). In an even more critical vein, Roberto Mangabeira Unger, a former secretary for strategic affairs under President Dilma Rousseff, declared in an interview to *O Globo* that Brazil's diplomatic corps is "an anomaly in the world", since it enjoys too much leeway in foreign policy formulation, a feature that is simply inconsistent with the nation's and the state's best interests, besides being largely incompatible with a functional democratic regime (Unger *apud* Cantanhêde, 2015).

This piece seeks to forward a more accurate diagnosis of the initiatives put to practice by a diverse set of agents and the circumstances shaping the first years of the twenty-first century. I claim that Brazil's deep change concerning foreign policy is relatable to two trends: Brazil's new strategy toward Western powers vis-à-vis the rise of Asia and the

prospect of "Easternization" of international relations (Rachman, 2016) on the one hand, and the democratization of foreign policymaking and the implications to Brazil's once omnipotent diplomatic machinery, which ultimately lead to a tumultuous relationship between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Presidency of the country, on the other. I additionally argue that, from Fernando Henrique Cardoso to Jair Bolsonaro, this combination of factors has prompted an epochal shift in Brazil's external relations, whose bottom line might be Itamaraty's demise as the chief formulator while other governmental bureaucracies and political parties, not to mention individuals with no institutional standing whatsoever, take over as the gravity centre in the process of policymaking, turning the contents of Brazil's foreign policy slightly more responsive to social inputs, however less predictable and coherent over time. One should not infer, though, that increased permeability to a greater gamut of social actors necessarily develops into enhanced democratic institutions at the service of the country's foreign policy.

Therefore I assume that, consequent to an *aggiornamento* of Araújo Castro's "3-Ds diplomacy", there might be a new academic equation that fully captures twenty-first-century Brazilian foreign policymaking – which could be stated like this: *De-Westernization* plus (some degree of) *democratization* equals *disconnection* between foreign policy formulators (various agents, old and new, with different interests at stake) and traditional implementers (mostly diplomats). From this very disconnection a new modality of foreign policy – *the post-diplomatic one* – is possibly born in Brazil. This essay is dedicated to a thorough assessment of this idea.[2]

In the next section, I aim to discuss the hesitating still inevitable re-orientation of Brazil's foreign policy towards Asia and other non-traditional partners in the last decades, as the world looks ever less Western-centric. A practical development grows out of this dynamic: The advent of new sources of conflict as Brazil's foreign policy stakeholders also vary and multiply, which brings about meaningful effects to old-time patterned, and closed policymaking. In the following section, I recall the process of institutional and social democratization of Brazil and take away the most relevant consequences to shift foreign policy-making as we now know it today. The fourth section of the article is devoted to gluing together the pieces of my puzzle and evoking some comparative cases around the globe to gain a wider perspective about the phenomenon. Some of my preliminary conclusions follow suit.

West is past, East is risky? Changes in Brazil's international alignments

Ambassador José Guilherme Merquior managed to solve one conspicuous problem in Brazilian international thought: *Modernism* was often mistaken for *modernization*. Differently from European modernism, associated with *Kulturpessimismus* or the Freudian notion of civilizational *malaise,* when modernism first arrived in Brazil, it was celebrated as the "wave of the future". It felt like an obligation for local elites to emulate the West and their intellectual fashion. Merquior himself made his stance: We could be another kind of Westerners – "poorer, more mysterious, even troublesome, nonetheless still Westerners" (Merquior, 1990, p. 87). Gelson Fonseca Jr., also a career diplomat, dubbed Eurico Gaspar Dutra's administration (1946–1951) "orthodox Occidentalism", using as the main indicator for his assessment Dutra's diplomacy's proclivity to an unconditional alignment with the United States. Foreign policies put forth by Juscelino Kubitschek (1956–1960)

and Getulio Vargas (1951–1954) stand out as moderate versions of Occidentalism (or Westernism), whereas Jânio Quadros' and João Goulart's (1961–1964) and Ernesto Geisel's (1974–1979) would fit well in what Fonseca called "heterodox Occidentalism". Yet nuanced, the unswerving commitment with Western values remained rooted amid exponential figures of the Brazilian diplomacy. Civil liberties, open market capitalism, democracy, identity elements such as religion and culture, etc., all of which served to symbolically bond time and again Brazil with the West (Fonseca, 1998). Even when those rights and liberties were denied in practice, as it was the case for most Latin American countries with the rise of U.S.-backed military dictatorships across the continent during cold war years (Weyland, 2018).

Ironically enough, there is an observable tendency on the part of North Americans and Europeans to deny the status of "Westerners" to Latin Americans. I refer to the way academics from the North Atlantic region have historically conceived of Brazil and its neighbours as "non-Western peoples". It is not hard to find out an academic division between capitalist societies from the centre and industrial latecomers from the periphery, where the richer ones are treated as "universal" trendsetters in moral, educational and scientific matters, whereas the poorer ones are commonly presented as "regional" case studies (Mignolo, 2002; Souza, 2015). In a nicely critical framework, Silviano Santiago depicted the "cosmopolitanism of the poor" – an archetypical behaviour in which peripheral countries must omit themselves and their traits, as they abide by the rules imposed by Western powers (Santiago, 2004). It is way too symptomatic, therefore, the omnipresent talk of "autonomy" in Brazil's (and Latin American countries') foreign policy (Pinheiro & Soares de Lima, 2018). Would that be a compensatory plea for a set of practices that is not always emancipated from the European and North American tutelage (*i.e.* the "Western agenda")? (Hey, 1993) In Brazil, the autonomist drive received many names in the academic milieu and assumed multiple forms in the course of her diplomatic history. For instance, myriad scholars referred to autonomy *in dependence* (Moura, 1980), *through contradiction* (Jesus, 2011), *through distance* (Fonseca, 1998), *through modernization* (Casarões, 2014), *through participation* (Fonseca, 1998), *through diversification* (Vigevani & Cepaluni, 2007), etc. This cry against subordination commuted, through various roads, on the historical mission and mantra of the Brazilian foreign policy since the foundation of the Republic in 1889. Brazil never actually got a divorce from such hemispherical identity, though – not at the time of Bandung and the Non-Aligned Movement (Nasser, 2012), nor on the heyday of Brazil's military dictatorship in the 1970s, not even on the immediate end of the Cold War (Fonseca, 1998).

The growing tensions between "Occidentalists/Westernists" and "de-Westernizing autonomists", so to speak, emerged more visibly and violently in the beginning of the 2000s, as the main political parties in Brazil back then – PT (Workers' Party) and PSDB (Brazilian Social Democracy Party) – began to express their positions on international matters and to publicly stand up for them. Celso Lafer and Celso Amorim, the masterminds of Brazilian foreign policy in the early twenty-first century, represented the juxtaposition mentioned above during the presidencies of Cardoso (1995–2003) and Lula da Silva (2003–2011). For the first wing, Brazil should pursue adequacy (Lafer, 2001), while for the second, revisionism (Pinheiro Guimarães, 2006). Global politico-economic establishment celebrated Cardoso as the re-inventor of Brazil, seen as the one who, after several flawed attempts, managed to finally modernize the country's public

administration and national finances, putting it back on track for progress and sustainability (Giambiagi, Reis, & Urani, 2004). Notwithstanding, he was also accused of mimicking Western practices, and uncritically incorporating a series of international treaties that unfavourably regulated sensitive areas of national interest, such as human rights, the environment, and nuclear non-proliferation (Cardoso, 2003). Lula da Silva, on the other hand, was perceived as a trailblazer of the Global South, capable of putting to practice a "brave and solidary" foreign policy, opposing the supposedly prevailing cynicism of *Realpolitik* (Pimenta de Faria & Goulart Paradis, 2013). Even so, he was reputed as ideological on the running of international relations – and said to be putting at risk the (Westernized) pantheon of Brazil's old-time diplomatic traditions (Ricupero, 2010).

The discussion on the de-Westernization of Brazilian foreign policy still remains on a very introductory stage in academia. Lilia Schwarcz e Heloisa Starling, in a recent struggle to theorize over it, have identified a trace of *Bovarysme* in the erratic conduct of the Brazilian diplomacy, since it was strongly aligned with the Europeans (Portugal, England, France) in the nineteenth century, and unwavering allies with the United States (in times of war and peace) throughout most of the twentieth century, but places bets in the twenty-first century on an alternative grouping of countries, the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) (Schwarcz & Starling, 2015). Octavio Amorim Neto has diagnosed a shift on the Brazilian posture at the United Nations between 1946 and 2008, as national diplomacy began to diverge more and more from the U.S. delegation – a point whose demonstration lies in the Brazilian and American voting patterns at the UN General Assembly (Amorim Neto, 2011). Notwithstanding, Andrea Steiner and her colleagues reasonably stated that among the so-called emerging countries (or economies), Brazil probably is the one who maintains the most Westernized habits, customs, and traditions in foreign policy (Steiner, Medeiros, & Lima, 2014).

With the benefit of hindsight, social scientists and historians in the future will face the task of assessing the first years of this current century and saying whether they hinted at a rupture with the long-lasting primary allegiances of Brazil's foreign policy or not. Take the Brazilian leadership, starting from the year 2004, on an intervention in Haiti under the institutional umbrella of MINUSTAH (UN Mission for the Stabilization of Haiti), or the alleged interference of Brazil in Honduran domestic politics in 2009, on the occasion of a diplomatic shelter given to deposed president Manuel Zelaya at the Brazilian embassy in Tegucigalpa (*Ibid.*), or the signing of a declaration on nuclear cooperation with Turkey and Iran in 2010 with no mediation of Western powers, aiming to monitor the reserves of enriched uranium in Teheran (Belém Lopes, 2013a), or yet, the coinage of the principle of "responsibility while protecting" (RwP) as a qualified reaction to Ban's doctrine (also known as "R2P") in 2011, with unhidden intention to block the interventionist attitude from the Western bloc (Saliba, Belém Lopes, & Vieira, 2015): Do all these facts and figures embody an unequivocal *de-Westernizing* tendency in Brazil's foreign policy for the years to come?

Not so sure, not so fast. Brazil's China policy gives a good counterfactual example in this regard: As the current American president in office, Donald Trump denies access to Latin American goods and people into the U.S.' territory, while pushing the stigmatization of Latinos – who were verbally associated with "drug dealers" and "rapists" by Trump during his presidential campaign – and practicing deportation based on ethnic and racial criteria during the first months of his government.[3] In reaction to this, some analysts in

Brazil and abroad believe that the country should seriously reconsider its strategic partnership with Washington and embrace Beijing as a new ally (Hsiang, 2017; Stuenkel, 2016). After all, China shines as the fastest growing economy in the world during the last 30 years and accounts for 26.7% of Brazil's total foreign trade, against 12% of Brazil-US bilateral commerce (Brazilian Ministry of Development, Industry, and Commerce, 2018). The top position at gross domestic product rankings in terms of purchase power parity since 2015 (World Bank, 2015), bound for nominal leadership in US dollars sooner than 2050 (Price Waterhouse Coopers, 2017), China's figures related to demographics, military expenditure, and politico-institutional apparatuses look impressive. Almost every Latin American country today – and Brazil since the year 2009 – has China as a main commercial partner. Not to mention Chinese massive infrastructural investments all over the continent, with a clear emphasis on connectivity – seaports, airports, roads, bridges, tunnels, telecommunication engineering and so on – under the "Belt and Road Initiative" rubric (Dollar, 2017; Jaguaribe, 2018; Maçães, 2018).

Nevertheless, it feels unnatural for most Brazilian officials and average citizens to embrace the Beijing option. Current President of Brazil, Jair Bolsonaro embodies this resistance to entertain a deeper relationship with China, as his constant negative references to the People's Republic during his winning presidential campaign would easily prove.[4] The reasons partly lie in soft power – or the lack thereof. There is no socially disseminated concept such as "the Chinese way of life" in Brasília, São Paulo or Rio de Janeiro. Despite heavily investing in cultural diplomacy – there are more than 450 Confucius Institutes around the globe now, in addition to hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars being spent on CGTV and Xinhua News Agency, two public media outlets run from Beijing (Munich Security Conference, 2017) – the country fails in winning hearts and minds in South America. Unlike South Korea and Japan, the Chinese pop industry makes neither noise nor profit beyond national borders. There is China's diplomatic stance too. Beijing hardly considers Brazil a preferential target, be it for geopolitical or economic motives. Being presented with a vast menu of strategic items, China can choose whether or not to involve in troublesome zones. Take the case of Brazil's campaign for a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) permanent seat (Vargas, 2010): Despite all the rhetoric on South-South cooperation and third-world solidarity, China has given no endorsement to Brasília's candidacy (Belém Lopes, 2017a). One can rest assured that, if an ecumenical and pragmatic path in foreign policy is to prevail, Chinese diplomats will not commit themselves to any particular position or single nation on Earth. Nor will it collide with the United States – one can predict on the grounds of the "peaceful emergence doctrine" upheld by Xi Jinping (Zhang, 2015).

Brazilian diplomats, on the other hand, seem unprepared in many respects to engage in fierce negotiations with their Chinese counterparts and make the most of such encounters. If a bit of an exaggeration, David Shambaugh claims that, while every Chinese ambassador posted to a Latin American capital city will most certainly speak fluent Spanish and/or Portuguese, barely a dozen Brazilian career diplomats have adequate knowledge of Mandarin or Cantonese (Shambaugh, 2013). Débora Terra digs deeper and argues that there is still a huge gap between the parties – Brazil and China – when perceptions about one another are considered (Terra, 2018). Daniel Cardoso reminds that, in the absence of a clearer orientation from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about Beijing, Brazil's China policy is largely designed and driven by a network of actors, chiefly businessmen and

private enterprises, whose idea of the "national interest" does not encompass much more than profit-seeking and market sharing (Cardoso, 2016).

It accrues to this state of affairs that Brazilian foreign policy under Temer has taken a turn in the direction of realigning with Western powers, namely the US and Europe, to the relative detriment of initiatives from the Global South and their institutional derivatives – BRICS, IBSA, Unasur, Mercosur, etc. The ongoing Brazilian attempt to join OECD as a full-fledged member arguably is the materialization of Temer's foreign policy masterplan.[5] Therefore, to refer to a psychoanalytical jargon, one could even say that the *alter ego* of Brazil's hesitating de-Westernization is Brazil's tentative re-Westernization.

In Brazil, foreign policy is what democratization makes of it

Differently from the idea of *democracy*, brought up by Celso Amorim on his 1993 speech referencing the Brazilian transition of the political regime in the 1980s, *democratization* embeds the notion of a work in progress. To cope with the polysemy of the term "democracy" (or "democratization"), and to avoid interpretive misunderstandings, my analytical grounds must first be clarified: Every manifestation of Brazil's foreign policy polyarchization which occurs under the guidance of democratic institutions and the Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988 should be taken into consideration.[6] Thus, in a very basic rendition, the democratization of foreign policy represents the adequacy of a policy – which is public – to the political regime at play in the country. This process chronologically coincides with the end of the Cold War and all that happened afterward, bearing as a corollary the emergence of new actors (beyond the state and its agencies), new themes (beyond matters of security and defense), and new dynamics (beyond the more or less sporadic interactions of diplomatic bodies or the armed forces). In Brazil today, it is reasonable to think of the roles played by businesspersons, unions, press, non-governmental organizations, charitable entities, and churches on the definition of foreign policy agendas. Along the same lines, novelties on the government's end such as transparency and access to public information, wider press freedom, the fragmentation of international relations across the country (and the creation of international secretaries at the level of municipalities and federal states), amongst others, might feature as a trend, despite some persistent obstacles (Belém Lopes, 2013b).

There is an alternative reading for the ongoing democratization of foreign policy, which equals to a managerial decentralization of external relations at the level of the Executive branch. One should recall that by 1912, year of the decease of the Baron of Rio Branco (Brazilian diplomacy's patron), there were only seven ministries in the Republic of Brazil (one of which was the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), whereas in 2015, 39 ministries were fully operating. A century ago, foreign policy subjects belonged almost exclusively to the Foreign Ministry (Devin & Thornquist-Chesnier, 2011) whilst around 90% of the ministries in Brazil were equipped with departments and advisors on foreign affairs in the year 2015 – which has as probable collateral effects dispersion, segmentation and "horizontalization" of Brazilian foreign policymaking (França & Sanchez Badin, 2015). Making the state's international machinery work properly requires now admirable coordination among the agents, as well as a set of bargains and compromises, with a view at avoiding redundancy and contradiction in public administration. That said, the prime role of the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has also changed nowadays – from being the

gatekeeper and virtual monopolist of international matters to becoming the principal intra-governmental articulator of potentially conflicting interests and agendas of most variegated stakeholders (Pimenta de Faria, 2012).

Thirdly, the democratization of foreign policy in Brazil correlates with the new underpinnings of modern capitalism. For no longer being organized in estates or castes, the new dynamics of social classes have possibly started to interfere with the making of diplomacy. A striking piece of evidence was the appearance of Sinditamaraty, a labour union for diplomats and other MFA public servants whose affiliation exponentially rose in the last 5 years, within a context of losses for Itamaraty's clerks.[7] Unexpectedly then, Brazil's aristocratic diplomatic corps, which used to operate only inside state apparatuses, now engage in social struggles as it openly rivalled the Workers' Party (PT) (Belém Lopes, 2017b) during the years of Rousseff's presidency. By all that has been exposed before, the diplomatic career in Brazil may also be losing some of its historical prestige and glamour.[8] There is good evidence that, over the past 15 years or so, pompous family names in Brazil's foreign service are giving place to more *Silvas* and *Souzas* – common names that are indicative of a less privileged origin. There are now more women in the diplomatic career (23% of the total population of diplomats in 2018), which helps to counter the "gentleman's-club" format. North, Northeast, and especially Mid-West Brazil, while more impoverished than South-Southeast Brazil and not much present in the Republic's diplomatic history (Rodrigues, 1965), began to increasingly contribute *cadres* to Itamaraty (Lima & Oliveira, 2018). New academic degrees and institutions of origin of incoming members at Rio Branco Institute have come to compose a mosaic of specialties, mitigating the belletrism that was prevalent in past generations.[9]

Fourthly, there was an intention to create the National Council on Foreign Policy (CONPEB, in the Brazilian Portuguese acronym), an idea that came up at the beginning of Lula da Silva's first presidential term, put forth by people associated with or sympathetic to the Workers' Party, and gained traction and some enthusiasts even outside of the governmental sector.[10] In theory, a consultative body of this kind could be useful as an instrument for state legitimation, in addition to being found around the world in many countries. However, serious doubts are raised on which shape would this entity take on.[11] The reaction of "old schoolers" from Itamaraty was, as expected, not very positive, given that a probable implication of this council coming into being would be the division of competences on foreign policymaking among an expanded group of stakeholders. By the way, under President Rousseff there were at least two simulacra of democratic and participatory foreign policy conferences being carried out – the "National Conference on the New Foreign Policy" organized by the University of ABC in 2013, and the "Dialogues of Foreign Policy" convened by the MFA in 2014 – which did not fulfill the vows for better communication and integration with social actors interested in diplomacy. The promise to elaborate and publicize for the first time the Brazilian White Papers on Foreign Policy – an official series of documents containing operational guidelines for Brazil's national diplomacy – is yet to be brought to life (Conectas Direitos Humanos, 2015).

Fifthly, under President Michel Temer there was the consecutive nomination of two ministers of foreign affairs with strong political backgrounds and affiliation to PSDB – one of the parties to join Temer's government coalition. One, Mr. José Serra, a former candidate to the presidency of Brazil in 2002 and 2010, who currently holds a senatorial

mandate, has seized the head of Itamaraty for nine months, leaving no substantive legacy to this particular democratization process. Two, Mr. Aloysio Nunes Ferreira, a former speaker of the Commission for External Relations and National Defense (CREDEN) at the Brazilian Senate, has taken over right away, expressing on the occasion of his inauguration speech the intention to treat foreign policy as public policy (Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2017) – a mantra that brought about little practical result.

As Jair Bolsonaro – an open admirer of US President Donald Trump – has come to the office, there has been some conceptual approximation between foreign policy and religion, under the claim elaborated by his foreign minister Ernesto Araújo that the people who voted for Bolsonaro in 2018 expected Brazil to democratically represent their most salient traits on the international scenario, being Christian religious fervour and a morally-driven conservative attitude the two most instrumental elements for this purpose (Belém Lopes, 2019).

Itamaraty-presidency gap grows ever wider in today's Brazil

As it has been discussed, the terms *foreign policy* and *diplomacy* are used in a commutable way in Brazil. The main reason for that, according to historians who have studied the formation of Brazil (many of whom are career diplomats), is that diplomatic corps would have played a decisive role during the entire process (Ricupero, 2017). Briefly speaking, if the Portuguese *navegantes* (sailors) were commissioned by the Crown to reach the Americas, and the *bandeirantes* (pathfinders) headed West to colonize Brazil's vast territory, it was up to steward diplomats the negotiation and delimitation of the nation's borders (Goes, 2015). This might have been a most remote source for the terminological overlap in Brazil between *foreign policy* – a state policy to be implemented by a potentially large group of actors – and *diplomacy* – a specific role of the modern state, run by trained agents with their means of recruitment and socialization. Notwithstanding, even if we understand the centrality of diplomacy (an instrument) to foreign policy (an end in itself) as an indisputable fact, the connection between these two categories is not always smooth and natural – and lately has become more and more difficult to make.

Since the professionalization of Brazilian diplomacy, which dates back to the late 1930s and early 1940s, Itamaraty has developed and nurtured a particular organizational culture, generating a strong sense of corporatism. The aristocratic ethos mingled into the emerging *esprit de corps*, easily recognizable when one sees the clan-like character of families who have been taking up the seats of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1822 (Patriota de Moura, 2000). All this symbolic and institutional cohesion is also due to the doctrinaire capacity of the Foreign Service, whose diplomatic academy, the Rio Branco Institute (IRBr), just celebrated 70 years of age in 2015. The number of former alumni from IRBr who came to seize headship positions in prominent intergovernmental organizations, international courts, ministries, and other high-level state positions is not irrelevant (Farias, 2015).

The germ of a progressive disconnection between diplomacy and foreign policy in Brazil probably dwells on the MFA's relative autonomization ensued in the second half of the twentieth century. Already in the 1950s, when President Getulio Vargas began to develop Brazil's nuclear programme, Itamaraty manifested a different understanding from his. The majority of Itamaraty, led then by João Neves de Fontoura, defended the

abidance of nuclear cooperation with the United States, contrasting the autonomist posture by Admiral Álvaro Alberto, president of the newly founded National Research Council (CNPq in the Brazilian Portuguese acronym) (Jesus, 2013). In the 1960s, one can recall minister San Tiago Dantas who, after elaborating an ingenious plan to autonomously position Brazil at the Punta del Este Summit in 1961, managed to avoid phone calls from Prime Minister Tancredo Neves and President João Goulart (Ricupero, 2017), which allowed him to avoid making concessions to the United States, whose interests were being articulated by Lincoln Gordon, then America's ambassador to Brazil. There's also the occasion where Araújo Castro was the foreign minister and chose not to follow some of João Goulart's orientations – and his attitude was celebrated among his colleagues from the MFA. On the iconic rally at Central do Brasil station on 13 March 1964, Castro was the only minister not to respond to the presidential calling-out (Batista, 2010). In the first half of the 1970s, it is worth mentioning the dissension between the military and diplomats regarding the Africanist policy of Brazil. Whilst the military favoured Portugal's Antonio Salazar's colonialism, Itamaraty called for decolonization and, according to it, subtly advocated the interests of Lusophone Africa (Santos, 2014). In the following decade, which was recurrently referred to as a "lost decade" by several economists and political scientists, Brazil's economic bureaucracy was leading negotiations on the country's massive foreign debt, while the MFA was relegated to ostracism. If one cannot claim that there were substantial disagreements between the two parties, it is indeed noteworthy this operational divorce between the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Planning and the Central Bank, on the one side, and members from the diplomatic bureaucracy, on the other (Cervo & Bueno, 2002).

None of which, however, could even be compared to the 2000s. If Itamaraty and the Executive's headship were fairly connected under the Brazilian military dictatorship (especially under Geisel and Silveira) (Spektor, 2009) and in the 1990s, throughout Cardoso's two mandates (who, even before becoming president, was already familiar with the functioning of Itamaraty, having served as foreign minister during Itamar Franco's presidency), since Lula da Silva's coming to power, the gap between foreign policy and diplomacy grew bigger. Despite having promoted an important institutional reform inside the MFA, welcomed by career diplomats as primal to Brazil's robust international projection (Pimenta de Faria, Belém Lopes, & Casarões, 2013), President Lula, a supporter and practitioner of "summit diplomacy" himself, sailed all alone. This disconnection achieved a new level of paroxysm during Dilma Rousseff's time in office. That was less associated with her political party or the ruling coalition backing her government, and more with personal grievances involving the chief of state and diplomatic personnel, not to mention deep epistemic divergences between them.[12] As a consequence, Rousseff's foreign policy aidés were given leeway and decision power to the detriment of career professionals from Brazil's foreign service and state secretariat (Author, 2017). To the point where, in 2014, on her presidential campaign for reelection, roughly 9 out of 10 Brazilian diplomats would simply reject Dilma Rousseff in the ballot box – including those vastly favoured by the reforms Lula da Silva and the PT put forward just a few years back (Belém Lopes & Pimenta de Faria, 2014).

Under Michel Temer, once again Brazil's foreign ministry has publicly clashed with the recently re-founded Secretariat for Strategic Affairs (SAE) – an agency linked to the President's Office – in the context of a working paper released by the latter (Presidência da

República do Brasil, 2018), where sharp criticism of the Brazilian diplomatic corps was found, as Itamaraty was treated as a historical lacklustre and a politically self-serving body. This report triggered a prompt reaction on the part of Itamaraty, whose retired diplomats came to the defense of the two-century-old institution on media outlets, and accused SAE of being ill-prepared and misinformed about Brazil's international affairs (Barbosa, 2017). It comes as no surprise that one of the divisive issues in the public debate on Brazil's international relations – the attempt by Brazil's government of acceding to OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] as a full member – has also opposed SAE and the Itamaraty, since many Brazilian career diplomats appear not to share the same mindset of the bureaucrats who work at the presidential palace and the finance ministry (Freitas, 2017).

Against this backdrop, President Jair Bolsonaro's coming to power in January 2019 possibly represents a new and critical chapter in the history of disarticulation between foreign policy and diplomacy in Brazil's *Nova República*.[13] His first days in the office already hint at the multiplication of foreign policy official and semi-official formulators (a collateral effect of democratization, one could arguably tell), which inevitably leads to gross confusion, unpredictability, and diplomatic inertia, as the Itamaraty is arguably rendered "useless" (Alencastro, 2019; Casarões, 2019). Just to give the taste of what is yet to come: Whereas Brazil's vice-president Hamilton Mourão, a retired Brazilian Army general, holds daily conversations with diplomats and businesspersons from every corner – including Chinese leaders –, Bolsonaro's foreign minister, Mr. Ernesto Araújo, himself a career diplomat, wages a rhetorical crusade against "globalism" while vehemently opposing, in the realm of values and morals, the de-Westernization of Brazil's foreign policy (Belém Lopes, 2019).

Itamaraty surely accommodates inside some diversity of opinions. Even if the so mentioned plurality faces serious limitations within the straightjacket of Rio Branco's traditions, it is possible to diverge, more occasionally than structurally, in terms of practices and ideas. Yet, as the literature shows, the most protruding feature of Brazil's MFA as an institutional actor is cohesion, to the extent that there has been some insulation in relation to social actors since it was founded (Cheibub, 1985). In a context of globalization and democratization of foreign relations, the sustenance of Itamaraty's historical consistency emerges as a tremendous challenge. I would go as far as to affirm that the political disjunction between foreign policy and diplomacy is more of a widespread evolutionary trend than an anomaly of the latest governments in Brazil. My hypothesis draws on thick descriptions by scholarly heavyweights from five other countries whose foreign policymaking has seemingly undergone a similar transformation in the last couple of decades: The United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, India, and the People's Republic of China.

According to Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, to properly assess the process by which the US projects its values around the world, it is necessary to consider all the foreign policy instruments a president can mobilize for a given purpose. In the capacity of the commander-in-chief, he or she will, in theory, be in charge of a vast array of tools – spanning diplomatic, military, and economic ones. In so being, international trade, economic aid, immigration, geopolitical aid, sanctions, domestic military spending, and military deployments are only other names for US foreign policymaking (Milner & Tingley, 2015, p. 22). For Christopher Hill, social classes, interest groups, and public opinion do affect decision-

makers' calculations both in the United Kingdom and the European Union, be it through their leverage or via other abstract constructs. In a sentence, "any nation-state, particularly of a democratic and capitalist character, is in a perpetual state of tension between the need for a cohesive identity and diverging definitions of the 'national interest'" (Hill, 2013, p. 3). Still more straightforwardly, Christian Duquesne argues that French foreign policy, whose making was associated with the historical role played by the Quai d'Orsay, can no longer manage the whole complexity of it all alone. French diplomats know that final decisions rarely lie in their hands, since public officials with a democratic mandate have assumed heightened influence. All ministries other than the Quai d'Orsay have stakes in foreign policy these days, just like international bodies and non-governmental organizations. In a word, diplomats do not cultivate illusions concerning their centrality in France's political system anymore (Duquesne & Boniface, 2017).

In emerging countries, the situation does not seem to be much different. The former foreign minister of India, Shashi Tharoor affirms that New Delhi is underequipped in diplomacy, granted that only 900 careers diplomats [were] responsible for representing the country's interests abroad.[14] Indrani Bagchi, a commentator from *The Times of India*, points out that "[even if they were] the smartest people alive, it's impossible to expect them to ruminate one policy [and take] strategic initiatives" (Bagchi *apud* Tharoor, 2013, p. 319). As a consequence, David Malone gives his verdict: "[Indian diplomacy] reflect[s] only a fraction of the rich reality of international relations today and of Delhi's actual international interests" (Malone *apud* Tharoor, 2013, p. 319). In this regard, the case of China stands out as the most interesting and thought-provoking one. Despite the non-democratic nature of China's government, a surprisingly heterogeneous set of stakeholders may have a say on Chinese foreign policy topics. That is what one infers from David Shambaugh's narrative on China's going global. Besides senior leaders and state ministers from the Chinese Communist Party, official think tanks, intelligence bodies, companies, local leaderships, and societal representatives can also play minor roles in foreign policymaking. Following vice foreign minister Cui Tiankai, whom Shambaugh has interviewed in 2010,

> Diplomacy is no longer the business of a few people. It is increasingly embedded in the public and public opinion. Even within the government, there are so many voices – the PLA [People's Liberation Army], companies, ministries, scholars. This makes the process of decision making extremely complicated. This is very new and very challenging for the Foreign Ministry. *China is now just like the U.S. in terms of the numbers of players in the process*. This is an irreversible process. We cannot stop it. We must manage it. (Tiankai *apud* Shambaugh, 2013, p. 66, emphasis added)

Brazil's Celso Amorim has also given some thought on this emerging trend. On the occasion of Lula's international adviser Marco Aurélio Garcia's passing, Amorim was interviewed by *Nexo Jornal* and cited Sarkozy's France as an example of the increasing "division of labor" on international affairs in contemporary states, as he recalled that the president's aidés, not the French foreign minister at the time, Mr. Bernard Kouchner, were responsible for discussing and taking decisions over France's participation in the UN Mission for the Stabilization of Haiti. Amorim still evoked the example of the United States, where the national security advisor can be as important and visible as the secretary of state, to make the case for a nascent (post-diplomatic) foreign policy

pattern. That would stem from the level of sophistication reached by a country and its society, where political parties grow mature and start formulating about foreign policy (Charleaux, 2017).

Conclusion

In times of great excitement and political polarization at the national domestic front, foreign policy does not remain immune to the democratic dynamics and ends up being contaminated by an atmosphere of ideologization. The differentiation between two foreign policy stances in Brazil gets more and more evident every day – one associated with the "globalist" political left and centre, the other with "nationalist" right-wing parties, whose representatives are not afraid of standing up and making their vociferous claims against multilateralism, global institutions, and international law. But there is also room, beyond the strictly partisan sphere, for processes of relevance and magnitude, whose manifestation may touch upon everyone. I allude to changes at the structure of Brazilian foreign policy-making machinery in the beginning of the twenty-first century: stakeholders abound, both inside and outside of government agencies, new global trends and international regimes are underway, as a myriad of unprecedented topics come to the fore, and bureaucracies have to be reimagined to absorb ever-mounting pressures for greater social legitimacy. In sum, by the time a new federal government is installed in Brasília and a post-diplomatic foreign policy appears to be gaining ground, the prospects for the elaboration of a solid and coherent Brazilian strategy to navigate the world are not the most encouraging.

Notes

1. This terminological conflation of foreign policy and diplomacy is neither semantically nor historically accurate. The literature tears the two academic concepts apart, as the latter refers to only one of the means through which the former might manifest. To put it concisely, *diplomacy* consists of the formal techniques and strategies modern states have developed, over the last four centuries, to deliver their views and pursue their interests on the global scenery, usually by way of specific protocols, institutes, and well-trained professional personnel, whereas foreign policy covers the whole range of behavioral possibilities – both formal and informal – one state is commonly entitled to bring to life for the purposes and needs of international representation. Brian Hocking still adds to this conceptual thread another layer: "diplomacy focuses on interactions between actors rather than the actors themselves, which is the focus of foreign policy" (Hocking, 2016, p. 67).
2. Ricupero (2017) was probably the one Brazilian diplomat who paired the concepts of foreign policy and diplomacy and approached the case of Brazil's historical evolution (from 1750 to 2016) in a more convincing and erudite way, as he delivered this argument in a lengthy book titled *Diplomacy in the Construction of Brazil*. But he was not the only one – take, for instance, the works by two other diplomats – Danese (1999) and Goes (2015) – to be representative of this strand.
3. For a detailed account, please see "ICE deportation arrests soar under Trump administration, drop in border arrests" at https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/ice-deportation-arrests-soar-under-trump-administration-drop-border-arrests-n826596, accessed on 18 October 2019.
4. For more, please see "Discurso anti-China de Bolsonaro causa apreensão sobre negócios com o país", available at https://noticias.uol.com.br/politica/eleicoes/2018/noticias/reuters/2018/

10/25/discurso-anti-china-de-bolsonaro-causa-apreensao-sobre-negocios-com-o-pais.htm, accessed on 2 July 2019.

5. The Brazilian bid to become a full member of OECD was put forth by president Temer's minister of finance, Mr. Henrique Meirelles, according to whom this membership, were it ever attained, would fit in a grand strategy to resuscitate Brazil's shrinking economy by, bluntly speaking, promoting free trade with and receiving foreign direct investment from rich countries, as opposed to South-South cooperation tactics practiced by presidents Lula da Silva and Rousseff. For more details, please see "Meirelles diz que Brasil está bem posicionado para ser membro pleno da OCDE", *Agência Brasil*, available at http://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/economia/noticia/2018-02/meirelles-diz-que-brasil-esta-bem-posicionado-para-ser-membro-pleno-da-ocde, published online on 28 February 2018.
6. Polyarchy is a political regime in which a plurality of actors join a political process and openly diverge on their political choices at the public square. The greater the level of participation of citizens is, and the more open for contestation and political opposition the institutional settings are, the more polyarchical (that is, the more democratic, from a particular normative perspective) a political community will possibly be. This definition, forged by Dahl (2006), falls within the tradition of political pluralism in contemporary Political Theory and adequately translates into a concept the liberalization of Brazilian foreign policy over the last 30 years or so, under the "Nova República" regime.
7. In the words of Sandra Malta dos Santos, president of the national union of civil servants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Sinditamaraty): "In the last two months, the number of diplomats affiliated to the union doubled. (…) We had more affiliations of diplomats in the last two months than in the five years of our existence" (*O Estado de S. Paulo*, December 29, 2014).
8. See Solanas (2014) for a comparative outline of the situation of diplomats in France and Argentina.
9. Ongoing unpublished research work by the author, on the socio-economic and political-cultural aspects of the 2004–2015 cohort of diplomats recruited in Brazil. Note that during that time, Itamaraty was experiencing some important institutional reforms carried about under the presidency of Lula da Silva. For further information, see also Pimenta de Faria et al. (2013).
10. With special emphasis placed on the Reflection Group on International Relations (GR-RI), who in the group official blog (http://www.cartacapital.com.br/blogs/blog-do-grri) presents itself as the organ "that gathers representatives from social and union movements, parties, foundations, researchers and NGOs". Accessed on 17 October 2018.
11. South Africa's Council on International Relations, a collegial body made up of 21 members recruited from the private sector, academia, NGOs and labour unions to provide counsel on topical issues, under request from the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (equivalent to South Africa's foreign ministry), would do a role model for Brazil's council. However, this idea never actually came into existence.
12. President Rousseff was not herself the biggest fan of diplomatic approaches to foreign affairs, per narratives brought up by some of Brazil's top journalists who covered the Foreign Ministry under her presidency. Sergio Leo, a seasoned journalist who worked for *Valor*, once attributed the following catchphrase to Rousseff: "Itamaraty excels at diplomacy, but fails at foreign policymaking". For details, please see "A diplomacia perdeu espaço no governo Dilma?", available at https://www.bbc.com/portuguese/noticias/2013/08/130826_diplomacia_dilma_pai_jf, accessed on 4 July 2019.
13. From 1985 until the current date.
14. Although the problem persists, the actual number of Indian diplomats is approximately 1400 nowadays. For more information, please see Srijan Shukla, "With just 1400 diplomats, India's foreign influence is severely limited", *The Print*, 10 April 2019, available at https://theprint.in/diplomacy/with-just-1400-diplomats-indias-foreign-influence-is-severely-limited/219288/, accessed on 19 December 2019.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Carlos Aurélio Pimenta de Faria, Camilo López Burian, Guilherme Casarões and Mario Schettino Valente for their insightful comments on previous manuscript versions, and to Julia Carneiro for her competent research assistance.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Dawisson Belém Lopes is a professor of international and comparative politics at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG) and a researcher of the National Council for Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq) in Brazil. He has authored four books and dozens of peer-reviewed articles on topics related to international organizations, global governance and democracy, Latin American politics and Brazilian foreign policy, and served as visiting researcher at the German Institute for Global and Area Studies in Hamburg, Germany, and visiting professor at the Catholic University of Louvain in Mons, Belgium. He is the current deputy dean for international affairs of UFMG.

ORCID

Dawisson Belém Lopes http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1949-1001

References

Alencastro, M. (2019, January 21). Itamaraty blues. *Folha de S.Paulo*.

Amorim, C. (2013, December 27). Democracia, Desenvolvimento e Defesa. *O Globo*. Retrieved from http://oglobo.globo.com/opiniao/democracia-desenvolvimento-defesa-11160260

Amorim Neto, O. (2011). *De Dutra a Lula*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus.

Araújo Castro, J. A. Speech on September 19, 1963, on the opening session of the 18th UN General Assembly. Retrieved form http://blog.itamaraty.gov.br/onu/41-o-discurso-dos-tres-ds

Belém Lopes, D. (2013a). Diplomacia de macacão: a classe operária vai ao Itamarati. *Insight Inteligência* (Rio de Janeiro), *60*, 136–148.

Belém Lopes, D. (2013b). *Política externa e democracia no Brasil: ensaio de interpretação histórica*. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.

Belém Lopes, D. (2014). Da razão de estado ao republicanismo mitigado: uma narrativa Faoriana sobre a produção da Política Externa Brasileira. *Dados*, *57*, 481–516.

Belém Lopes, D. (2017a, September 17). Brazilian Malaise in the 'Asian Century'. *The Diplomat*, Tokyo, Japan.

Belém Lopes, D. (2017b). *Política externa na Nova República: os primeiros 30 anos*. 1. ed. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.

Belém Lopes, D. (2019, January 06). Deus e o diab na terra da política externa. *O Globo*.

Barbosa, R. (2017, June 13). A política externa e a crise poítica. O Estado de S.Paulo.

Batista, D. (2010). *Habitus diplomático: um estudo do Itamaraty em tempos de regime militar, 1964–1985*. Recife: Editora Universitária UFPE.

Belém Lopes, D., & Pimenta de Faria, C. A. (2014). Eleições presidenciais e política externa brasileira. *Estudos Internacionais*, *2*, 139–147.

Brazilian Ministry of Development, Industry and Commerce. *Comex Vis: Países Parceiros*. Retrieved from http://www.mdic.gov.br/comercio-exterior/estatisticas-de-comercio-exterior/comex-vis/frame-pais?pais=chn

Burges, S. W. (2012–2013, Dez/Jan/Fev). Seria o Itamaraty um problema para a política externa brasileira? *Política Externa*, *21*(3), 133–148.
Burges, S. W. (2017). *The international relations of a South American giant* (p. 22). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Cantanhêde, E. (2015, May 12). O Brasil não tem que fazer parte do clube dos poderosos, diz Mangabeira. *O Globo*.
Cardoso, A. (2003). *A Década Neoliberal e a Crise dos Sindicatos no Brasil*. São Paulo: Boitempo.
Cardoso, D. (2016, January/April). Network governance and the making of Brazil's Foreign Policy towards China in the 21st century. *Contexto Internacional: Journal of Global Connections*, *38*(1), Rio de Janeiro Epub May 17, 2016. doi:10.1590/S0102-8529.2016380100008.
Casarões, G. (2014). *"O tempo é o senhor da razão"? A política externa do governo Collor, vinte anos depois'* (Doctoral thesis). Political Science Graduate Program, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
Casarões, G. (2019). Eleições, política externa e os desafios do novo governo brasileiro. *Pensamiento Propio*, *24*, 231–274.
Cervo, A., & Bueno, C. (2002). *História da Política Exterior do Brasil*. Brasília: Instituto Brasileiro de Relações Internacionais/Editora da Universidade de Brasília.
Charleaux, J. P. (2017). Qual o papel de Marco Aurélio Garcia na política externa de Lula, segundo Celso Amorim. *Nexo Jornal*. Retrieved from https://www.nexojornal.com.br/entrevista/2017/07/29/Qual-o-papel-de-Marco-Aur%C3%A9lio-Garcia-na-pol%C3%ADtica-externa-de-Lula-segundo-Celso-Amorim?utm_source=socialbttns&utm_medium=article_share&utm_campaign=self
Cheibub, Z. (1985). Diplomacia e construção institucional: o Itamaraty em uma perspectiva histórica. *Dados*, *28*(1), 113–131.
Conectas Direitos Humanos. *Ainda em branco: Itamaraty descumpre promessa e atrasa publicação de Livro Branco da Política Externa em um ano*. Retrieved from http://www.conectas.org/pt/acoes/politica-externa/noticia/40490-ainda-em-branco
Dahl, R. (2006). *A preface to democratic theory*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Danese, S. (1999). A diplomacia no processo de formação nacional do Brasil. *Revista Política Externa, São Paulo*, *8*(1), 98–117.
Devin, G., & Thornquist-Chesnier, M. (2011). Burst diplomacy – the diplomacies of foreign policy: Actors and methods. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, *4*(2), 60–77.
Dollar, D. *China's investments in Latin America*. Foreign Policy at Brookings series (paper 4, January 2017). Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/fp_201701_china_investment_lat_am.pdf
Duquesne, C., & Boniface, P. (2017). *Ethnographie du Quai d'Orsay – 3 questions à Christian Lequesne*. Retrieved from http://www.iris-france.org/86979-ethnographie-du-quai-dorsay-3-questions-a-christian-lequesne/
Farias, R. (2015). *Filhos da Rua Larga: o processo de recrutamento da diplomacia brasileira (1930–1950)*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273377948_FILHOS_DA_RUA_LARGA_o_processo_de_recrutamento_da_diplomacia_brasileira_1930-1950
Fonseca Jr., G. (1998). *A legitimidade e outras questões internacionais*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
França, C., & Sanchez Badin, M. (2015). *A inserção internacional do poder executivo federal brasileiro*. São Paulo: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Retrieved from http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/brasilien/07917.pdf
Freitas, A. (2017, December 9). Os tropeços no caminho do Brasil rumo à OCDE. *Nexo Jornal*.
Giambiagi, F., Reis, J. G., & Urani, A. (orgs.). (2004). *Reformas no Brasil: Balanço e Agenda*. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira.
Goes, S. (2015). *Navegantes, bandeirantes, diplomatas*. Brasília: Funag.
Hey, J. (1993). Foreign policy options under dependence: A theoretical evaluation with evidence from Ecuador. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 25(3), 543–574.
Hill, C. (2013). *The national interest in question: Foreign policy in multicultural societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hocking, B. (2016). Diplomacy and foreign policy. In C. Constantinou, P. Kerr, & P. Sharp (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of diplomacy* (pp. 67–78). London: Sage Publications.

Hsiang, A. (2017, April 21). Trump makes China great in Latin America. *The Diplomat*. Retrieved from http://thediplomat.com/2017/04/trump-makes-china-great-in-latin-america/

Jaguaribe, A. (Ed.). (2018). *Direction of Chinese global investments: Implications for Brazil*. Brasília: Funag.

Jesus, D. (2011). Autonomia pela contradição: as políticas externa e nuclear de Vargas e JK. *Política Hoje*, *20*(2), 829–853.

Jesus, D. (2013). A contradição é nossa: as políticas externa e nuclear do segundo governo Vargas. In M. C. Lima (org.), *Os boêmios cívicos: a assessoria econômico-política de Vargas (1951–54)* (pp. 275–287). Rio de Janeiro: Centro Internacional Celso Furtado de Políticas para o Desenvolvimento.

Lafer, C. (2001). *A identidade internacional do Brasil e a política externa brasileira: passado, presente e futuro*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

Lima, R., & Oliveira, A. (2018, September/October). Manutenção e mudanças no Ministério das Relações Exteriores: Perfis do corpo diplomático e padrões na carreira. *Revista de Administração Pública*, *52*(5), 797–821. Rio de Janeiro.

Maçães, B. (2018). *Belt and road: A Chinese world order*. London: Hurst and Company.

Mares, D., & Trinkunas, H. (2016). *Aspirational power: Brazil on the long road to global influence*. Washington, DC: Brookings.

Merquior, J. G. (1990). Um outro Ocidente. *Presença*, *15*, 69–91.

Mignolo, W. (2002). The geopolitics of knowledge and the colonial difference. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *101*(1), 57–96.

Milner, H., & Tingley, D. (2015). *Sailing the water's edge: The domestic politics of American foreign policy* (p. 22). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Moura, G. (1980). *Autonomia na dependência: a política externa brasileira de 1935 a 1942*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Fronteira.

Munich Security Conference. *MSC report 2017*. Retrieved from http://report2017.securityconference.de

Nasser, F. (2012). A linha que não alinha: a política externa brasileira e o movimento dos não-alinhados. *Juca: Diplomacia e Humanidades*, *6*, 54–59.

Patriota de Moura, C. (2000). Herança e metamorfose: a construção social de dois Rio Branco. *Estudos Históricos*, *25*, 81–101.

Pimenta de Faria, C. A. (2012). O Itamaraty e a Política Externa Brasileira: Do Insulamento à Busca de Coordenação dos Atores Governamentais e de Cooperação com os Agentes Societários. *Contexto Internacional*, *34*(1), 311–355.

Pimenta de Faria, C. A., Belém Lopes, D., & Casarões, G. (2013). Itamaraty on the move: Institutional and political change in Brazilian Foreign Service under Lula da Silva's presidency (2003–2010). *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, *32*, 468–482.

Pimenta de Faria, C. A., & Goulart Paradis, C. (2013). Humanism and solidarity in Brazilian Foreign Policy under Lula (2003–2010): Theory and practice. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, *7*(2), 8–36.

Pinheiro Guimarães, S. (2006). *Desafios brasileiros na era dos gigantes*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.

Pinheiro, L. (2004). *Política Externa Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor.

Pinheiro, L., & Soares de Lima, M. R. (2018). Between autonomy and dependency: The place of agency in Brazilian Foreign Policy. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, *12*(3), e0003.

Presidência da República. *Relatório 01/2017 – Brasil: Um País em Busca de uma Grande Estratégia*. Retrieved from http://www.secretariageral.gov.br/noticias/copy_of_titulo-da-noticia-entre-35-e-90-caracteres-com-espaco/BrasilUmPasemBuscadeumaGrandeEstratgia.pdf

Price Waterhouse Coopers. (2017). *Global economy forecast for the year 2050, in USD*. Retrieved from https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/issues/economy/the-world-in-2050.html

Rachman, G. (2016). *Easternisation: War and Peace in the Asian Century*. Vintage Digital [kindle version].

Ricupero, R. (2010). À sombra de Charles de Gaulle: uma diplomacia carismática e intransferível. A política externa do governo Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003–2010). *Novos Estudos – CEBRAP*, *87*, 35–58.
Ricupero, R. (2017). *A Diplomacia na Construção do Brasil: 1750–2016*. Rio de Janeiro: Versal Editores.
Rodrigues, J. H. (1965). *Aspirações nacionais: interpretação histórico-política*. São Paulo: Fulgor.
Saliba, A., Belém Lopes, D., & Vieira, P. (2015). Brazil's rendition of the "Responsibility to Protect" doctrine: Promising or stillborn diplomatic proposal? *Brasiliana: Journal for Brazilian Studies*, *3*, 32–55.
Santiago, S. (2004). *O cosmopolitismo do pobre* (pp. 45–63). Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
Santos, V. (2014). Brasil e Moçambique nos anos 1974–1986: economia e política externa no diálogo Sul-Sul. *Revista de Ciências Humanas*, *14*(2), 277–301.
Saraiva, M. (2011). Causal beliefs in formulation and pragmatism in practice. In G. L. Gardini & P. Lambert (Eds.), *Latin American foreign policies: Between ideology and pragmatism* (pp. 53–66). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Schwarcz, L., & Starling, H. (2015). *Brasil: uma biografia*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
Shambaugh, D. (2013). *China goes global: The partial power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Soares de Lima, M. R., & Hirst, M. (2006). Brazil as an intermediate state and regional power: Action, choice and responsibilities. *International Affairs*, *82*(1), 21–40.
Solanas, F. (2014). Diplomáticos, Unión Europea y MERCOSUR: una primera comparación de los grupos profesionales de la integración en los casos de Argentina y Francia. *Cahiers des Amériques Latines*, *76*, 93–109.
Souza, J. (2015). *A tolice da inteligência brasileira* (p. 21). São Paulo: Leya.
Spektor, M. (2009). *Kissinger e o Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
Steiner, A., Medeiros, M., & Lima, R. (2014). From Tegucigalpa to Teheran: Brazil's diplomacy as an emerging Western country. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, *57*(1), 40–58.
Stuenkel, O. (2016, December 5). How Trump benefits China in Latin America. *The Americas Quarterly*. Retrieved from http://www.americasquarterly.org/content/how-trump-benefits-china-latin-america.
Stuenkel, O., & Taylor, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Brazil on the global stage: Power, ideas, and the new international order*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Terra, D. (2018). *Clash of Giants: Disclosing Chinese and Brazilian thinking on the other and their relationship* (PhD Thesis in the making, not defended yet).
Tharoor, S. (2013). *Pax Indica: India and the world of the 21st century*. New York: Penguin. 319 [kindle version].
Tickner, A. (2012). Rising Brazil and South America. In S. Smith, et al. (Ed.), *Foreign policy: Theories, actors, cases*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vargas, J. A. C. (2010). *Campanha Permanente: o Brasil e a reforma do Conselho de Segurança da ONU*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV.
Vigevani, T., & Cepaluni, G. (2007). A política externa de Lula da Silva: a estratégia da autonomia pela diversificação. *Contexto Internacional*, *29*(2), 273–335.
Weyland, K. (2018). Limits of US influence: The promotion of regime change in Latin America. *Journal of Politics in Latin America*, *10*(3), 135–164.
World Bank. *GDP rank, PPP based in 2015*. Retrieved from http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GDP-PPP-based-table
Zhang, J. (2015). China's new foreign policy under Xi Jinping: Towards 'Peaceful Rise 2.0'? *Global Change, Peace & Security*, *27*(1), 5–19. The Sixth Oceanic Conference on International Studies: Transitions in the Asia Pacific. doi:10.1080/14781158.2015.993958.