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Abstract

The traditional donors of international cooperation are now accompanied by a variety of other players engaged in addressing the problems of development. One of the most significant players in this context are the emerging economies that used to be recipients and now are increasingly becoming important providers of development cooperation.

Taking into account the increasing role of these middle powers in South-South Cooperation – financing projects and offering cooperation in different areas – this study aims to analyze comparatively the South-South strategies of 3 important emerging powers: Brazil, India and South Africa. It seeks to identify which are the interests, ideas and actors that influence the cooperation decisions and practices of these countries.
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Introduction

The term cooperation has no consensual definition in the field of international relations. According to Keohane and Axelrod (1985), neoliberal authors, cooperation can be defined as a process of policy coordination. It occurs when states coordinate their own policy and compromise with other states in order to come to an agreement. To Morgenthau (1962), one of the greatest exponents of Realism, international cooperation can be understood as a political action per se, an instrument of foreign policy directed to enlarge its power, its prestige and its economic gains. In contrast, Lumsdaine (1993), a constructivist author, affirms that cooperation is not related only to the political and economic interests of the donors, but also to their values and moral convictions. In his view the cooperation involves “an ethic of working together to promote essential and humanly beneficial change” (p.29)

Within the framework of International Cooperation, there is a specific mode of cooperation, called International Development Cooperation (IDC). The IDC can be understood as an integrated system that involves governmental and non-governmental actors, a set of norms and international organizations and the belief that the encouragement of solidarity actions for the development would be the most appropriate solutions to tackle inequalities and global issues (MILANI, 2012). The modalities of IDC includes the North-South Cooperation (NSC), the South-South Cooperation (SSC) and Triangular Cooperation.
The system of IDC started with the NSC, in the period of the Cold War. As mentioned by many authors, at this time the cooperation was used as an instrument to strengthen economic and political ties of the United States and the Soviet Union with the allied countries. However, the events of the time have imposed changes in the system of international cooperation. The emergence of new countries in Africa and Asia, the Bandung Conference, the creation of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and the articulation in the G-77 at the United Nations (UN) point to the earliest manifestations of a new form of cooperation that emerged in the international system, the South-South Cooperation (SSC).

In the 1970’s, SSC was strengthened with the establishment of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action at the United Nations (UN), which approached the Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries. Between the 1980’s and 1990’s there was a inflection phase in SSC, due to the economic crisis that hit many developing countries (XALMA, 2008). In this new century, the SSC was expanded, mainly due to the commitment of the developing countries to reinforce the SSC through coalitions and partnerships for development. Thus, there was a strengthening to the idea that these countries should promote a wider and effective cooperation to ensure political reforms and solve their development problems in conjunction (MILANI, 2012).

It is clear that from the 1950’s to the present days, the South changed its role in international politics. Despite the differences between North and South being very present in major institutions, such as the UN and the World Trade Organization (WTO), the relative weight of Southern countries has tended to expand in the international discussions and in power structures (VIEIRA; ALDEN, 2011). In this new scenario it can be highlighted the role played by Southern countries considered Regional Powers (ONUKI et al., 2006) or Middle Powers (SENNES, 1998). These countries seek to promote collectively and individually their interests at an international level, especially with the decline of USA power in recent years. Among these countries Brazil, India, South Africa, China, Mexico stands out.

With regards to the IDC participation, these important countries of the South are significant, funding a range of projects and offering cooperation in various areas such as education, health, agriculture, science and technology. In scholarly literature, these countries are often designated as "emerging donors" (ROWLANDS, 2008) due to the increasingly significant presence in IDC. The term is usually used to contrast with the countries members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). But the fact that they are labeled in this way does not mean that their cooperation policies are recent. It is important to highlight that these countries’ contributions to the IDC have quintupled in the last 5 years and it is estimated that by 2020 they will contribute with 20% of the total (CALLAN et al, 2013, p. 2). Despite this significant increase, some scholars emphasize that overall, “they account for an estimated 7-10 percent of global aid flows from donor countries” (CALLAN et al, 2013, p. 2).

For many years, the traditional donors dominated the agenda and the practice of IDC. Many studies have sought to understand the motivations, the geographical and thematic areas prioritized in their actions and how the international context and the domestic policy influenced the NSC. With the increasing presence of emerging countries in IDC, it is necessary to re-evaluate the cooperation in this new moment, understanding the role of these new actors and what are the interests and ideas that underlie their actions and the domestic actors that influence their policies in the field of cooperation. Thus, it is possible to understand in more detail the new face of the SSC and trends in this area.

Taking into consideration the scenario presented, this article aims to analyse the SSC for the development of three major emerging countries: Brazil, India and South Africa. The aim is to investigate what are the interests, ideas and actors influencing the decisions and practices of cooperation of these countries.

With respect to the selected countries it is necessary to emphasize that they have similarities and distinctions. Regarding the similarities, they are democratic countries, are Regional Powers, have similar demands in multilateral organizations, are emerging markets, face common challenges to development, seek a permanent seat on the UN Security Council and although they have expanded their roles as providers of cooperation, they are still recipients (to a lesser extent). They are also part of the IBAS Dialogue Forum, formed in 2003 to enhance policy coordination and cooperation on various issues (MOURA, 2008).

However, despite these similarities they do not form a homogeneous group with regard to the IDC. They have different experiences, different geographical and thematic areas prioritized, have different interests and ideas basing their policies of cooperation, and also have distinct organizational structures for planning and channel the IDC. These distinctions may enrich analysis, contributing to the comparative analysis of their experiences.
To investigate this topic, the methodology approach is case study. A case study consists of a deep investigation of one or more objects. The central criterion is the selection of cases that are relevant to the objectives of the research, because the evidence is used to understand the assumptions of the investigation (GEORGE; BENNETT, 2005). In this study the focus is to understand more comprehensively the SSC for development provided by India, Brazil and South Africa, focusing on the interests, ideas and actors that underlies their cooperation. The article also use the comparative method, understanding the similarities and distinctions present in their development cooperation policies.

Finally, in order to be able to understand the cases presented below, it is important to explain the meaning of South-South Cooperation used in this article. The concept of SSC is used frequently in academic literature to designate a range of relations between developing countries, ranging from the development of coalitions in multilateral negotiations, bilateral dialogue, private investment flows, regional integration until a specific modality of development cooperation (LEITE, 2010; PUENTE, 2010). In this research, the focus is the SSC related to concrete actions in the field of development cooperation. The providers of this cooperation are developing countries that give financial support and provide its expertise in technical areas to enhance the economic and social conditions of other developing countries (SMITH; ZIMMERMANN, 2011).

The following sections present the policies of SSC of India, Brazil and South Africa so that in the final section, it will be possible to offer a brief comparison of practices, interests, ideas and actors that influence their SSC initiatives.

The case of India: SSC as a foreign policy tool

India gained much international recognition over the past few years. The new international order, starting after the Cold War, enabled the country to alter its behavior in international relations. In these years, India went through a process of economic liberalization and diversification of partners in its foreign policy, focusing on the establishment with the U.S., China, South Asia and major developing countries.

During the period of the Cold War, India had a policy of non-alignment, avoiding to participate in the Cold War, prioritizing its activities in multilateral institutions and in NAM. In the post-Cold War scenario, the country adopted a strategy called poly-alignment, in which it seeks to maintain good relations with powerful states that are in competition, such as USA, Russia, China and the European Union. Moreover, from the
1990’s, Indian foreign policy seeks to benefit from economic and strategic relations with developed and developing countries, focusing on the construction of a multipolar world based on a consensus among the major powers (ROBINSON, 2011).

In this new context, India seeks to project its power, exercising its role as a Regional Power. The country wishes to obtain a permanent seat on the UN Security Council and project itself as one of the major providers of cooperation in the world. Thus, one of the instruments used by its foreign policy to project its influence in the region and in the world is its development cooperation policy.

India's experience in development cooperation is very similar to that of other developing countries. As well as Brazil and South Africa, India started its experience in the field of development cooperation as a recipient country. Since its independence in 1947 until 1992, the country has received about US$55 billion in foreign aid, becoming one of the countries that received more foreign aid during the decade of 1980’s (BIJOY, 2010). From the year 2000, the country has started to emerge as one of the leading providers of SSC, gaining greater relevance in this field.

This change in India’s behavior, from recipient to donor, is related to a modification of the country profile in international politics in recent years. The perception of India as an emerging country, the fierce competition with China for influence and energy resources in developing countries (particularly in Asia and Africa), and their economic growth and diplomatic activism (AGRAWAL, 2007), was accompanied by a change in its position within the IDC system.

Currently, foreign aid generates only about 0.2% of the country's GDP (AGRAWAL, 2010) and India is among the major providers of SSC. India does not want to be perceived as a country dependent on foreign aid, therefore it paid its debts with several countries. Nowadays, the country is a lender of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (AGRAWAL, 2007).

It is important to highlight that it is difficult to estimate the amount of resources that India invests annually in its actions of SSC. As Agrawal (2007) mentioned, not all actions of cooperation are carried out through mechanisms well-established or with a clearly defined budget. Moreover, various institutions within the Indian Government provide cooperation (such as the Ministry of External Affairs – MEA – and the Ministry of Finance) and many divide the costs of the actions, which makes it even more complicated to measure how much is invested in each cooperation project. This is a point in common with other developing countries, such as Brazil, where the system of
cooperation still have to be further developed, be better controlled and monitored to generate accurate and reliable information.

An important aspect to be mentioned, before presenting with more details the SSC provided by India, is that there is not a standard definition for their development cooperation. In general, the cooperation involves subsidies, credit lines, technical cooperation and humanitarian aid.

India's experience as a provider of cooperation began in 1950 with the provision of cooperation to Nepal and Myanmar (GROVER, 2010). At that time the country was also engaged in South-South Cooperation in a broader sense, attending the NAM and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), being part of the creation of the G-77 (VIEIRA; ALDEN, 2011).

In 1964, the Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation (ITEC) was structured. The ITEC officially started the Indian development cooperation, separating for the first time a budget for cooperation (AGRAWAL, 2010). The ITEC Program is centered on bilateral actions, but currently it is also been used in regional and multilateral context, as in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, the G-77 and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). The Special Commonwealth Assistance for Africa Programme (SCAAP) was added to ITEC, including countries of the African continent. These programs have evolved a lot over the years, benefitting 161 countries (from Asia, Africa, Latin America, among others). These programs offer cooperation in the following areas: training (civilian and defence); activities such as feasibility studies and consultancy services; deputation of Indian experts abroad; study tours; gifts/donations of equipment; aid for disaster relief.

In addition to these programs, there is also the Colombo Plan for development cooperation in the economic and social area for Asia and the Pacific. This plan was structured in 1951 and generates good results until today, involving 18 countries in the region. It is a program of technical cooperation in several fields, such as information technology, trade, rural development, medical sciences, among others.

These programs are part of the MEA of India, one of the central actors of India SSC. Until 2012, the MEA shared control of Indian SSC actions with the Ministry of Finance, which provides funds through the EXIM Bank (Export-Import Bank of India). However, after years of discussions and announcements of the establishment of an agency specialized in development cooperation, finally the Development Partnership Administration (DPA) was established in January of this year (2012).
According to the official website of the institution, the DPA is responsible for managing the development cooperation of India, taking care of its conception, initiation, execution and completion. The DPA is linked to the MEA and is composed by three divisions: (i) DPA I – deals with the credit lines and subsidies offered by the Government; (ii) DPA II – offers cooperation actions that are within the ITEC and SCAAP and provides humanitarian aid; (iii) DPA III – deals with the implementation of grant assistance projects.

This institution is still being structured, but shows an effort of the Indian Government to centralize their actions of cooperation, having greater control over its conception, implementation and results. This demonstrates the relevance of cooperation in Indian foreign policy and highlights that the country is seeking to make cooperation more strategic.

Inside the MEA there is another institution that provides Indian development cooperation, the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR). The ICCR was created in 1950 with the aim of strengthening cultural relations of India with other countries. The ICCR offers scholarships to foreign students and promotes cultural activities such as exhibitions, performances, seminars and festivals.

Recently was also created under the MEA, the Department of Investment Technology Promotion (ITP). The goal is to direct the economic diplomacy, working together with missions abroad and the Department of Trade and Investment to facilitate trade, investments and the acquisition of technology of the country (MEA, 2013). In the 2012-2013 Report, released by the MEA, they had no further information about the actions of this Department, as well as on the official website of the ITP.

Regarding the cooperation offered by the Ministry of Finance, it is promoted by the EXIM Bank which aims to promote exports of the country and integrate its foreign trade and investment with the world economic growth. Through this institution, the Indian Government offers credit lines, that are available for purchase of equipment, services, goods and infrastructure projects in India. Between 2012 and 2013 the country granted US$ 200 million to countries in Asia and Latin America and US$ 500 million to Myanmar (MEA, 2013).

Another action of the Indian Government is the forgiveness of debt of countries considered "Heavily Indebted Poor Countries" (HIPC), as Ghana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Guyana and Nicaragua (PRICE; HOUSE, 2004).
As it can be observed, India currently has several cooperation initiatives for development offered to Southern countries. Its actions in this field are quite various, focusing on infrastructure, energy, agriculture, health and education, with emphasis on training and courses, and credit lines (MEA, 2013; BIJOY, 2010).

The Indian SSC covers a range of partners. However, due to its dispute with Pakistan and their competition for greater influence with China, the focus of its SSC are neighbouring countries. In this regard, Bhutan, Afghanistan, Maldives, Nepal and Myanmar are the great recipients of cooperation (in this order).

Cooperation for Bhutan and Nepal is focused in the area of infrastructure, education and health. In that respect are highlighted hydroelectric construction projects. From the type of project, it is possible to realize that cooperation is driven by political and economical concerns. With respect to Bhutan, the country chose to participate in projects that bring direct benefits to India, since the energy from the hydroelectric plants will be sold to this country (BIJOY, 2010).

Cooperation for Bhutan and Nepal is focused in the area of infrastructure, education and health. In that respect are highlighted hydroelectric construction projects. From the type of project, it is possible to realize that cooperation is driven by political and economical concerns. With respect to Bhutan, the country chose to participate in projects that bring direct benefits to India, since the energy from the hydroelectric plants will be sold to this country (BIJOY, 2010).

The cooperation with Myanmar also gained increasing attention of India, once its territory has natural gas reserves. The cooperation destined for Nepal and Afghanistan has historical roots. In Nepal, there are many Indian residents. With respect to Afghanistan, many Indian companies operated in the country over the 1970’s and 1980’s (BIJOY, 2010). India also maintains cooperative relations with Sri Lanka, having worked actively in the country's recovery after the 2003 disaster. India also provides cooperation to countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Agrawal (2007) mentions that development cooperation offered by India in the region is often accompanied by military cooperation, which reinforces the idea that the country is seeking to expand its political influence, wanting to be recognized as a regional leader. With Maldives it stands out the cooperation in the field of Defense, as well as the development cooperation provided in the above mentioned areas.
Another important region to the Indian SSC is the African continent. Is reiterated by numerous authors that this cooperation is driven by political and commercial interests. According to Agrawal (2007), the country’s competition with China on this continent illustrates how their interests in Africa are important for Indian foreign policy. The competition is focused on diplomatic influence, oil reserves and commercial markets. As a consequence of this greater engagement, Indian companies have invested about US$ 400 million in the period of 2005-2006, increasing business with the countries of the continent. Besides cooperation undertaken through SCAAP, there is also the Techno-Economic Approach for Africa-India Movement (TEAM-9), through which India has granted credit of EXIM Bank for purchase of equipment and invested in infrastructure and agriculture. The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) was also another initiative that includes credits of India (BIJOY, 2010).

According to Bijoy (2010), the country has received about US$ 2 billion in grants and credit lines to African countries between 2005 and 2010, which were invested in infrastructure projects (such as construction of roads, rural electrification) and in information technology.

As exposed in 2012-2013’s Annual Report of Indian MEA, "development cooperation is an important component of India's Foreign Policy" (p. ii). This is clear when we analyse the Ministry’s 2012 budget, whereas 33% was destined for technical and economic cooperation with other countries (MEA, 2013).

Why the SSC to development is important? Which interests and ideas this cooperation allows the country to advance?

According to Ayyar (2010, p. 46), “strategic political and economic considerations drive the offer of Official Development Assistance”. Jobelius (2007) states that unlike other developed countries, that seek to cover the strategic interests in its actions of cooperation, Indian Government explicitly uses it as an instrument of its foreign policy, aiming to advance its interests. The initiative Indian Development and Economic Assistance Scheme (IDEAS) is a way of leveraging the interests of the country, expanding their exports by promoting economic relations with other developing countries, supporting its strategic interests (JOBELIUS, 2007).

It is clear that India, occupying a position of Regional Power, aims to expand its leadership in the region and achieve its political and commercial interests through partnerships in the area of SSC. With respect to cooperation with...
neighbouring countries, stands out the desire to exercise regional leadership and to keep the region under its political control. It is also highlighted by Jobelius (2007), the search for enhancing regional security, preventing separatist movements and terrorist activities in South Asia, ensuring the security of its own country. In relation to Africa, commercial and political interests are highlighted, as India wants access to new markets and natural resources, enhancing its diplomatic influence on the continent.

Furthermore, the SSC allows India to strengthen its partnerships with countries and expand relationships with non-traditional partners. It is also an instrument that magnifies the prestige and recognition of the country, leading India to play a more active role in international discussions. In this sense, Indian cooperation resembles the instrument of foreign policy defined by Morgenthau (1962) which helps the country to expand its prestige, economic gains and power.

The existing interests in relations of cooperation, do not imply a vertical relationship with the recipient countries. On the contrary, Bijoy (2010) highlights that India gives voice to recipients throughout the process of cooperation, focusing on promoting the local capacity and the sustained development by countries.

According to the Indian authorities:

“The ITEC programme, along with SCAAP […] is a visible symbol of India's role and contribution to South-South cooperation. South-South Cooperation is a partnership born out of a shared sense of solidarity and is entirely voluntary and free of conditionalities. It furthers national development priorities of our partners and has national ownership at its centre. India remains a staunch proponent and practitioner of South-South Cooperation which constitutes a fundamental pillar of India's foreign policy and diplomacy”.

In addition to these interests, it also guides India SSC some ideas and values. In this respect, the country has a performance focused on mutual partnership, focused on overcoming problems, differences and conflicts. From 2003 three ideas came to guide the Indian cooperation: review the dependency on external cooperation, expand cooperation to other developing countries and reexamine cooperation on credit lines (CHATUVERDI, 2014). Thus, the country decided to receive cooperation only from the United Kingdom, USA, Russia, Germany, Japan and the European Union, not renewing cooperation programmes with other providers. India also decided to pay debts it had with most countries (PRICE; HOUSE, 2004). From the beginning of this century its SSC was expanded and the granting of credit lines was one of the great pillars.
India understands the importance of SSC for the development and how actions are important to overcome the obstacles to development, since the own country received great cooperation flow for many years and still receives today, though on a smaller scale. As exposed in the Union Budget 2003-2004 of the country, India understands that “having fought against poverty as a country and a people, we know the pain this burden imposes”.

The case of Brazil: SSC as strategic or solidarity instrument?

Brazil gained international exposure from the years 1990’s, when broke with its policy of "autonomy through distance" and adopted the policy of "autonomy through participation", as suggests Gelson Fonseca (1998). The first strategy was used by the country during the period of Cold War and entailed in maintain a distance from the main discussions and negotiations at the time, avoiding to compromise its autonomy. The other strategy, “autonomy through participation”, is related to an active behavior in international relations, related to a desire of an active participation in the global decisions, in a context in which the alignment of Cold War was overcome (FRANCIS, 1998). The Brazilian foreign policy in this new scenario has been translated by a positive participation in the world, based on criteria of legitimacy. Thus, Brazil was engaged in UN peacekeeping operations, had intensified its dialogue with the developed countries (such as USA and EU), hosted Rio 92, adopted international mediator posture (as in the crisis between Peru and Ecuador), increased regional integration (via MERCOSUR), participated actively in the negotiations within the World Trade Organization (WTO) and applied for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council.

From Lula's Government (2003-2010), Brazil has adopted a more active foreign policy characterized by “autonomy through diversification” (CEPALUNI; VIGEVANI, 2007). This strategy is carried out through the promotion of South-South alliances and agreements with strategic partners in an attempt to reduce the asymmetry in the relationships with the most developed countries and expands Brazil’s power of negotiation (CEPALUNI; VIGEVANI, 2007). With this strategy, the country seeks visibility and recognition in international relations and seeks to become one of the leaders in this new scenario (characterized as multipolar, due to a decrease in the power of the USA and the emergence of powers such as
China, India and South Africa). One of the instruments used by Brazil to assist this strategy and raise prestige in international negotiations was the SSC, a Soft Power tool.

Brazil, as a developing country, initiated in the system of international cooperation in the condition of recipient country. Its insertion in international cooperation policy can be assigned to the years 1930, but gained wider exposure from the 1950’s, when it signed several international agreements, especially with the United States in the area of technology cooperation (GONÇALVES, 2011). Until today, the country receives international cooperation from developed countries, such as Germany, Spain, Japan and France, although the flow is in constant reduction (ABREU, 2013).

The trajectory of Brazil as a provider of cooperation refers to the 1970’s, when Brazilian Government realized that the country should have taken advantage of the experience and expertise acquired through technical cooperation to make it not only an instrument of foreign policy able to assist the socio-economic development of the country, but also a tool that would allow Brazil to assert itself on the international system and create conditions to open markets and promote national economic interests (CERVO, 1994). It was hoped also that the SSC, would deepen ties with other developing countries and facilitate the collective articulation of the Third World in international arena (VALLER FILHO, 2007). Similarity of economic, cultural and social conditions with the Latin American and African countries contributed to this belief.

It was also during this period that the theme of technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC) gained strength in the international system, involving several meetings between developing countries and absorbing space within the UN. In 1978, the Buenos Aires Plan of Action was drawn up in the United Nations Conference on TCDC. It instituted a new modality of cooperation, the TCDC, allowing developing countries to take advantage of its capabilities and overcome dependency relationships that exist in the traditional NSC through the SSC (CERVO, 1994).

From the years 1970, the cooperation provided by Brazil has expanded considerably, accompanied by changes in its institutional structure. In 1987, the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) was created within the framework of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) that until then shared the administration of cooperation with the Ministry of Planning. The creation of ABC meant an advance in Brazilian international cooperation policy, once the country had a single organ exclusively responsible for dealing with technical cooperation, in all its aspects.
Furthermore, for the first time it was created an organ to treat international cooperation that united technical functions and foreign policy (GONÇALVES, 2011).

During the 1990’s there was an expansion of Brazilian SSC initiatives. However, it was from this new century, during the Lula’s administration (2003-2010) that SSC received significant boost in foreign policy, made possible also by the increase in the budget of the ABC. From 2001 to 2010, the budget of ABC increased from 467 thousand reais in 2001 to 52.5 million reais in 2010 (ABC, 2010). Nevertheless, although the Agency's budget has expanded, still one of the greatest difficulties encountered by ABC to answer the demands of cooperation.

It is important to highlight that there is a difficulty in achieving a more precise diagnosis of Brazilian cooperation, since it lacks a consistent database of the projects and activities of development cooperation, including quantitative data. However, we can perceive an effort of ABC to change this situation. It created a computerized system for monitoring technical cooperation projects (still inadequate), carried out a first survey of Brazilian development cooperation, disseminating data and conceptualizing the modalities of cooperation provided by Brazil, and finally, created a Manual for the management of South-South technical cooperation (2013), showing guidelines to orient all stages of the projects. There is, in this sense, an effort to professionalize and institutionalize the SSC.

The Brazilian Government understands the development cooperation carried out by the country as the "totality of resources invested by the Brazilian Federal Government, totally thoroughly lost, in the Government of other countries, nationals of other countries in Brazilian territory, or in international organizations with the purpose of contributing to international development" (MRE, IPEA, 2010, p. 11). The areas encompassed in the country's development cooperation are humanitarian assistance, scholarships for foreigners, technical, scientific and technological cooperation, contributions to organizations and regional banks and peacekeeping operations.

To respond to the growing demand for Brazilian cooperation and to expand its offer of cooperation in several areas, the Brazilian Government mobilized various national institutions to provide the SSC. The MFA is the central actor in this process, responsible for devising the strategies of cooperation and direct the Brazilian actions in this field. In this respect, the institution operates through ABC, seeking to match the demand for cooperation from the exterior to the injunctions of national offer, checking to see if it is possible to mobilize cooperating institutions to perform the requested
actions. Between national organizations participating in the Brazilian cooperation there are various ministries and state-owned companies, such as Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Science and Technology and Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária (EMBRAPA). Also participating in the provision of SSC there are some private actors, such as Serviço Nacional de Aprendizagem Industrial (SENAI) and the NGO Alfabetização Solidária (AlfaSol).

Brazil provides SSC in several areas: agriculture, health, public safety, education, environment, public administration, social development, among others. The areas that mostly stands out are agriculture and health (IPEA, MRE, 2014).

As a Regional Power and aspiring to occupy a permanent seat in the UN Security Council, Brazil expanded the number of recipient countries of its SSC in recent years. The main recipients are the countries of Latin America and Caribbean (68.1%) and Africa (22.6%). Other regions also receive Brazilian SSC, such as Asia and the Middle East, but on a smaller scale (IPEA, MRE, 2014). Among the major recipients in Latin American are Haiti, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Cuba. With respect to the African continent, stand out the countries of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries (CPLP) – Cape Verde, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Sao Tome and Principe (IPEA, MRE, 2014).

Among the programs carried out with the countries there are vocational training centres, implemented in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Paraguay and soon in Haiti (ABREU, 2013). The centers are implemented in cooperation with SENAI and in addition to contributing to the development of the countries, assist Brazilian companies that are in these countries, creating workforce. In addition, these programs generate interest in national products and services.

There are also references the programs that develop human milk banks, such as those implemented in Cape Verde, Mozambique and Argentina. ABC carried out these projects in partnership with FIOCRUZ. In the health field, there is also the project undertaken in Mozambique for the construction and operation of a factory of medicines, which brought visibility for Brazil in the region.

Agriculture programs involve EMBRAPA and ABC and are internationally recognized. Among them, there are the Pro-Savannah performed in Mozambique (in conjunction with Japan) to develop agricultural productivity, the cotton cultivation program COTTON-4, involving Mali, Chad, Benin and Burkina Faso and the food security programme in Haiti (ABREU, 2013).
It is also important to note that Brazilian social programs, like Bolsa Familia, Fome Zero and Minha Casa, Minha Vida are the largest interest of African and Latin American countries. Currently, there is an initiative of cooperation between Brazil and Cape Verde to implement Minha Casa, Minha Vida in the country (IPEA, MRE, 2014).

Among other Brazilian modalities of cooperation, which does not appear in the definition of development cooperation defined above but has major impact, is the HIPC debt relief. In that respect, Brazil forgave the debt of Sao Tome and Principe, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Tanzania, Senegal, among other African countries. This type of action helps to build a closer relationship, strengthening the ties between the country and the African continent, with growing economies. According to the Government, these actions are important because they allow the improvement of negotiation of Brazilian companies in African countries and leverage trade relations.

Brazilian SSC is set by Brazilian Government as part of its solidarity diplomacy, concept coined during Lula’s administration. This practice "makes available to other developing countries the experiences and knowledge of specialized national institutions with the objective of collaborating in the promotion of economic and social progress of other people", as asserts Fernando Marroni de Abreu (2013, p. 6), CEO of ABC. Abreu also claims that the SSC is nonprofitable and devoid of economic and commercial objectives.

The idea that underlies Brazilian SSC is that the country does not depend on more large-scale cooperation and have benefited from actions received. Therefore, the country understands that should provide cooperation for other countries that face the same challenges of development. Brazilian SSC is based on non-conditionality (absence of connection between the SSC and commercial advantages) and in encouraging the internalization of knowledge by the recipient country (ABREU, 2013).

In official speeches, the Brazilian SSC is constantly presented as devoid of interest, commercial purposes and driven by principles of solidarity. However, although rhetorically the Government denies the existence of economic, commercial or related interests, it is important to note that there is concrete interests. Cooperation with South countries is related to the exercise of Soft Power, its quest to expand market access for services, products and national investment (especially in its neighborhood and in Africa) and to increase the visibility and prestige of the country on the international arena, which can extend the support to get a permanent seat on the UN
Security Council. The cooperation also allows Brazil to play its role as a Regional Power, keeping the region under its political influence. No wonder that Brazilian SSC focus is on Latin America and Caribbean.

It is important to note that the existence of political, financial and commercial interests do not mean anything bad for the Brazilian SSC. Actually it is part of the foreign policy strategy of most countries. This does not imply that Brazilian SSC projects are not based on the principles of co-responsibility and do not have the commitment to identify and develop projects together with partners, promoting structural and effective change. In fact, Brazilian SSC has great prestige among recipient countries and have positive results. In fact, the country receives many demands of developing countries. One of the biggest current problems is that Brazil does not have sufficient financial resources to answer the increasing demands.

The case of South Africa: partnership for development and interests

South Africa has the largest economy in the African continent. Since its democratization in 1994, the country has a more active role in the international system, seeking to contribute to a development agenda that is focused on international peace and security and promotion of economic and social development (LAU, 2013).

South Africa, under the management of Nelson Mandela, wanted to transform its image in international relations, trying to disassociate itself from the apartheid regime, which characterized the country for almost 50 years, impacting negatively on its international projection. In that period, the country suffered economic embargoes, sanctions and international pressure to start political change. Also, the international cooperation received in this period was forwarded to civil society, churches, student organizations and the private sector, reflecting the pressure for democratization of the country (BESHARATI, 2013).

With the democratization in 1994, South Africa wants to build an African identity. Then, South African foreign policy priorities were the development and integration of the continent and the promotion of peace and security in Africa (reflecting on the stability of the country). Other priorities were the strengthening of the SSC and the NSC and the country's participation in international institutions, allowing to advance their national interests. Thus, South Africa sought to play an important role as a Regional Power, working mainly on mediation and peacekeeping in Africa. Also worked actively in humanitarian aid and gave greater attention to multilateral framework,
claiming reforms in international governance structures, as in the case of the United Nations. The country also hosted major international events, obtaining greater international projection, as the World Conference against Racism (from the UN), meetings of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and events in the area of sport such as rugby, cricket and FIFA World Cup in 2010 (NQAKULA, 2013).

This new scenario, marked by the transformation of its foreign policy, was also accompanied by domestic changes, as advances in democratization and economic growth. Working toward to support its regional and international influence, South Africa has become an emerging donor. The country has been a recipient of international cooperation for many years, in the area of health, education and infrastructure. Even today the country receives assistance from more developed countries such as USA, Germany, France and United Kingdom. The cooperation received is technique and financial. The focus is still health and education (BESHARATI, 2013).

The inclusion of South Africa in SSC is not new, although currently it is more visible. The country not only invests in SSC for the development, but also participates in South-South coalitions. It participates in IBAS, along with India and Brazil, seeking greater coordination on development issues, is part of the BRICS (that in addition to the three countries, involves Russia and China) and is engaged in organizations from the South to promote the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It also participates in the G-20, World Economic Forum and is involved in the UN reform, claiming a permanent seat in this organization (LAU, 2013).

As a provider of development cooperation, the involvement of South Africa refers to the years of the apartheid regime, in the 1960’s. The Government used the SSC as a way to win political support and votes at the UN and as an instrument to fight communism in the region (BESHARATI, 2013). Moreover, it was an instrument to try to earn some respect in the international community, faced with an image so depreciated due to the political regime, as well as a way to facilitate trade relations (BRAUDE et al., 2008). The cooperation was focused on the continent, in countries like Zaire, Ivory Coast, Gabon. Also during this time, the Government provided assistance to the Bantustans (pseudo states with black-majority created by the apartheid regime and not recognised by the international community), in the areas of agriculture, mining, energy, transportation and infrastructure. The cooperation was offered through the Development Assistance Program, located in the structure of the Department
of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO), South African MFA (BESHARATI, 2013).

Seeking to repair the policy adopted earlier, which helped to destabilize the region, fomenting conflicts at the time of the Cold War, the government of Mandela tried to reevaluate South African cooperation. One of the actions immediately adopted was the forgiveness of debts of Swaziland, Mozambique and Namibia, neighbouring South Africa. Over the years 1990 and in this new century, the country's military apparatus was turned into an instrument for peacekeeping operations, as in Congo and in Liberia. Along with Nigeria and Egypt, the country became one of the main contributors of UN operations (BESHARATI, 2013). African cooperation policy has been redirected for a collective vision of the African continent and its development. In this opportunity, the country stopped to provide tied aid, which was common at the time of apartheid (BRAUDE et al., 2008).

To understand in more detail South African SSC policy, it is important to clarify what is inserted into its cooperation programmes. Its cooperation actions include conflict prevention and resolution, social and economic development, promotion of democracy and good governance, humanitarian aid and human resource development.

It is worth mentioning that as India and Brazil, there is a difficulty in estimating quantitatively the SSC provided by the country. Cooperation is decentralized and involves multiple programs, which makes it harder to monitor, coordinate and assess cooperation (BRAUDE et al., 2008). However, this is an aspect that has been worked by the South African Government, which has sought to structure and institutionalize its cooperation through the creation of a specific agency, the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA), that responds to DIRCO/MFA. This agency is responsible for taking care of all cooperation provided by the country, coordinating it and guiding it, according to the national and foreign policy objectives (DIRCO, 2013). As it can be observed, SADPA is the central actor in terms of South African cooperation. However, it is important to note that other departments are involved in the cooperation provided by the country, as the Education, Agriculture, Defense, Security, Energy, Trade and Industry Departments. There are also semi-public actors as the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) and Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), involved in the actions of cooperation (BRAUDE et al., 2008).
Regarding the programs of SSC, until 2000, the Development Assistance Program remained active, being replaced by the African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund (ARF) – that began operating in 2001. This Fund was created to broaden the cooperation between South Africa and developing countries – especially in Africa – through conflict prevention, socioeconomic development, integration, humanitarian aid, promotion of democracy and good governance (ARF STRATEGIC PLAN, 2014).

The ARF is within the structure of DIRCO and constitutes one of the main programmes of South Africa’s cooperation. Over the years, the actions carried out in the different sectors involved agricultural projects in Zimbabwe, projects in Mali and humanitarian aid in Somalia. It was also used to support peacekeeping processes in DRC (Congo) and Burundi, election observation in Zimbabwe and technical assistance to several African countries. The Fund was also used to relieve debts of some countries, such as Lesotho and Central African Republic (BESHARATI, 2013). However, while very important in the country cooperation framework, the ARF “constituted only 3-4% of South Africa’s overall development cooperation” (BESHARATI, 2013, p. 19).

The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) is another central programme for South African cooperation. This initiative aims to promote the continent’s development in all aspects, contributing to the continent’s renewal and empowerment. NEPAD seeks to support regional integration, develop agriculture, infrastructure and human resources of the continent. Cooperation through NEPAD is implemented by DIRCO and constitutes one of the main priorities of the Government with Africa (BRAUDE et al., 2008). South Africa is the main contributor of NEPAD.

Another program that has special place in South African cooperation policy is the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Its goals are to support the adoption of best practices that generate stability, economic growth and socioeconomic development (DIRCO, 2012). The country also contributes to the African Union and Southern African Development Community (SADC), being one of the main contributors of the budgets of these organizations – 15% and 20% respectively (LAU, 2013).

In terms of sectors of South African SSC, are highlighted the areas of peacekeeping, education, training and technical cooperation (BRAUDE et al., 2008).

As the main economy and power of the continent, South Africa focuses its cooperation in Africa, since the years of apartheid. Currently, the central concern of South Africa is to keep the African continent stable and safe, so it emphasizes cooperation to
countries in transition from conflict to peace, post-conflict reconstruction projects, peace, security and stability, promotion of good governance and humanitarian aid (LAU, 2013).

Braude, Thandrayan and Sidiropoulos (2008), highlight the cooperation provided to the countries who need support in the maintenance of peace (through the African Union and UN missions), as the case of DRC, Burundi, Sudan, Liberia and Ivory Coast. “This conflict related assistance is often followed by assistance from other South African government bodies. In effect, peacekeeping activity paves the way for more diverse forms of development assistance” (BRAUDE et al., 2008, p. 13). So, after peacekeeping processes many actions in other sectors are started, as in agriculture, education and training in public sectors.

It is clear that peacekeeping has great value for South Africa, not only for the stability in the continent, but also for other interests. An example is Congo, in which private sector companies had a great interest. South African companies have operated for some time in the country and with the peacekeeping process could retrieve its operations, especially in a country that has great energy potential (hydroelectric), and can supply the energy needs of the continent (BRAUDE et al., 2008).

South African cooperation is rather directed to SADC member countries, regional organization of which South Africa participates and is advancing regional integration. Despite the bulk of cooperation be addressed to African region, South African Government has also been directing cooperation for countries of Asia and the Caribbean, as Palestine and Cuba (LAU, 2013).

It is important to stress that South Africa is perceived as having a comparative advantage as a partner for development, concept that the country prefers to use (instead of donor or emerging donor). This is because the country has great knowledge of Africa and knows continent's problems and needs. However, not always the perception of other countries is like this. According to Besharati (2013), South Africa also needs to deal with negative perceptions, because it can be identified as an hegemon, a regional threat: “the apartheid legacy has left a certain degree of suspicion towards Pretoria. South Africa's regional dominance particularly concerns its immediate neighbours, which fear their fragile markets may be crusher by its powerful economy” (p. 23). Due to these perceptions, South Africa is usually quite diplomatic in their actions of cooperation.

Regarding the ideas that guide its SSC policy, the concept “Ubuntu” (humanity) stands out. This concept was reinforced in discussions of the African National Congress
(ANC) in 2007. Ubuntu assumes that the country has to divide what it has with other African Nations, moved by the spirit of solidarity and cooperation. This principle has guided South African foreign policy, including values and notions of collaboration and partnership among African countries. (BESHARATI, 2013).

The idea of “partnership for development” is also very present in South African cooperation policy. The term is used to oppose the idea of donor and overcome negative associations from the concept. Thus, points to a perception of not wanting to be seen as a country that replicates the traditional standards of NSC, replicating vertical patterns. For Braude, Thandrayan and Sidiropoulos (2008), the term is also used because the country is still a recipient of cooperation.

The emphasis on partnership for development is frequent in South African cooperation policy and the desire to overcome the problems plaguing the continent’s countries also appear frequently. As stated in the Report of DIRCO (2012, p. 35), South African Government recognizes the importance of using development cooperation to help overcome the challenges of poverty, underdevelopment and marginalization of Africa. “It is recognised that these challenges simultaneously reflect South Africa's own interests for security and development, and reflect its solidarity with the plight of people elsewhere” (DIRCO, 2012, p. 35).

However, it is not just altruism and solidarity that move South African cooperation. As South Africa has global aspirations regarding the construction of a new world order, it wants to advance its national interests at international level. Its SSC is also a tool of Soft Power, a way to build an international image respected and with greater prestige. Furthermore, its SSC avoids the negative impacts from the wars, disasters and political and economic instability that plague the continent, as immigrants and refugees flows, demanding jobs and public services. The Government realizes that an underdeveloped continent, expands insecurity, migration and crime. Thus, South Africa’s cooperation is linked to the African Agenda firstly (BESHARATI, 2013).

There is pragmatism in terms of economic interests. As says (2011) Sidiropoulos, the Zuma Administration indicated a foreign policy more aligned with business and economic objectives. The participation of the private sector is more evident in the visits of the President in the African countries, reflecting a more trade-oriented agenda. This is also a demand of the country's economic sectors, which wish that cooperation is linked to trade negotiations and is more oriented to the promotion of investment and South
African business abroad. However, despite seeking to advance their commercial interests on the continent, there are some difficulties.

For Besharati (2013), many of the resources invested in cooperation with African countries didn't bring results for South Africa, but for companies in other countries that also have relations with African countries, such as India, China and Brazil, which have benefited from the new markets. One example cited by the author is DRC, in which after peacekeeping actions and reconstruction of the country, South Africa failed to have concessions for exploitation of the mines. China, by contrast, will explore the mines in exchange for a package for investment in infrastructure that will be held by Chinese private companies. Thus, it becomes difficult for the country to compete with Chinese, Indian and Brazilian companies that offer advantages in infrastructure programs. What is missing is therefore developing a more articulated strategy involving existing commercial interests with SSC held practices. This point should be worked by SADPA operation, better control and formulation of South African cooperation.

**Conclusion: the South-South cooperation policies compared**

This section aims to briefly compare the SSC policies of India, Brazil and South Africa, pointing out common and distinct features in their behaviors of emerging donors.

As we have seen, the three countries have a common history with regard to the international development cooperation (IDC) since they entered in this system as recipients of cooperation. With the passage of time and political and economic maturity, India, Brazil and South Africa began to structure cooperation programmes to other developing countries seeking to build a new modality of cooperation that emerged in the 1970’s, the South-South Cooperation (SSC).

SSC was used by India and Brazil as a way of broadening relations with neighboring countries and other developing countries, sharing successful experiences, but also serving as a tool to expand political and economic relations. South Africa, under the apartheid regime, used SSC as an instrument to fight against Communism in neighbouring countries and win political support and votes at the UN, seeking to reverse the negative image that it had at that moment.

Although the provision of SSC is not a novelty in their foreign policies, it was highlighted only in the beginning of 21st century, period in which they began to appear as emerging donors (although they do not like the use of the term donor, due the assimilation of the term with the North-South Cooperation and its vertical pattern). In
this new century, Southern countries not only began to invest more on SSC for development, as well as in alliances within collective multilateral negotiations, such as in the UN and WTO. The goal is reforming multilateral institutions to reflect the interests of the developing world and the new architecture of global power. The three countries seek a permanent seat on the UN Security Council.

With regard to their policies of SSC for development, these countries prioritize neighborhood. India aims most of its cooperation to Afghanistan, Maldives, Bhutan, Nepal and Myanmar. Brazil prioritizes Latin American and Caribbean region. South Africa focuses in SADC member countries, covering neighbouring countries. This pattern in the behavior of these countries is related to their roles as regional powers. Main countries of their regions, India, Brazil and South Africa, invest in SSC as a tool of Soft Power and as a way of keeping their respective regions stable in political and economic terms. India and South Africa have an even greater concern with the stability of their regions, seeking to ensure the military security, as they are located in historically conflicting regions. Brazil does not has this concern, since it is part of a peaceful region, despite political instability. As regional powers, it is up to these countries ensure the well-being and stability of their regions, maintaining it away from the influence of other powers, as US and China.

Another geographical focus of the SSC of these countries is the African continent. India and Brazil aim to expand presence in Africa, looking for consumer markets, access to energy resources and political influence. However, while Brazil prioritizes relations with Portuguese-speaking African countries, India emphasizes cooperation with TEAM-9 countries (rich in energy resources) and NEPAD. South Africa focus in the countries of SADC and also prioritizes relations with countries that need assistance in peacekeeping (such as DRC, Liberia, Sudan).

With regard to domestic actors that participate in their SSC policies, the three countries have a central institution that coordinates SSC and which is structured within their ministries of Foreign Affairs. India created in 2012 the Development Partnership Administration (DPA), Brazil has the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) since 1987 and South Africa is structuring South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA). In this regard, Brazil is more mature, once it have organized its cooperation programmes within a specific organization since 1980’s, avoiding the dispersion of projects, such as occurred in India and in South Africa. Brazilian SSC is coordinated longer and it becomes easier to ensure consistency of projects with foreign
policy and to use efficiently the resources allocated in SSC. Faced with the expansion of India’s and South Africa’s cooperation, their Governments have realized the need to set up a specialized agency to better coordinate SSC initiatives and make better use of their resources. It is important to highlight that the developed countries which are major donors have renowned cooperation agencies, structured for quite some time and with well-defined strategies and budgets. In this sense, there is still a long way for developing countries.

A common point in the cooperation provided by Brazil, India and South Africa is the involvement of domestic institutions, such as ministries and other state organizations. A feature similar in their SSC is the difficulty in estimating the resources invested. Much of the bibliography on the subject claims to be complicated to obtain updated and reliable quantitative data. According to estimates of Zimmermann and Smith (2011), which integrate the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate, in 2009 Brazil spent US$ 362 million on development cooperation, South Africa spent US$ 108 million, and India (with the exception of credit lines), spent US$ 488 million. From 2009 to the present moment, these estimates have increased.

It is important to mention that there is some difficulty in comparing the SSC of these countries, because the definition of what encompasses their SSC is distinct. For example, Brazil does not consider financial cooperation as SSC for development, while India includes in its definition credit lines and grants. This points to a more strategic dimension of India SSC, which involves more clearly its commercial and economic interests.

SSC of India, Brazil and South Africa has good concept among developing countries, which are seeking it increasingly as a tool for social and economic development. SSC offered by these countries is considered horizontal. They do not impose ready-made solutions, seek to build joint solutions with recipient countries and respect their different realities. Furthermore, they do not try to interfere in domestic affairs of its partners by imposing specific conditions of governance to provide cooperation (as do the DAC countries).

In terms of thematic areas South Africa prioritizes peacekeeping programs and India infrastructure projects. Brazil has many projects in health, agriculture and education, although South Africa and India also offer a lot of cooperation in the educational field.
As mentioned in this article, the three countries have strategic interests in SSC. India, Brazil and South Africa realize it as an instrument to ensure stability in their regions and strengthen diplomatic and commercial relations with developing countries. As regards stability, are highlighted the cases of India and South Africa. India understands SSC as an instrument that can prevent the emergence or strengthening of separatist movements and terrorist activities in South Asia, ensuring the security of its own country. South Africa also seeks to assist countries in conflict in the transition to peace, emphasizing post-conflict stability and reconstruction projects as a way to ensure its region and its country in safety.

With respect to commercial interests are common the search for economic gains, the access to new markets and natural resources (oil and gas), the establishment of new trade agreements and the expansion of trade flows. In political terms, SSC is a tool that allows these countries to deepen their diplomatic ties and gain support, for example, in the UN reform to obtain a permanent seat. In addition, SSC is a way to gain prestige in international system and criticize the developed world and its traditional forms of cooperation via DAC/OECD, which imposes certain conditionalities to the recipient countries.

While Indian SSC transpires more clearly its strategic interests, as we see in the involvement of credit lines and subsidies on SSC and focus on infrastructure and investments in projects covering energy resources, Brazil and South Africa do not expose these interests so evident. Brazil emphasizes the idea of solidarity diplomacy and South Africa still needs to consolidate a more strategic vision for its SSC, representing more clearly the interests of its business sector. In this regard, Brazilian cooperation also need to mature.

Again it is relevant to point out that the existence of political, commercial and security interests do not imply that SSC does not result in benefits to recipient countries or to be oriented only to the achievement of donors interests. Many values and ideas guide the practice of SSC. As shown, these three countries aim realize a cooperation based on partnership and mutual desire to overcome common problems of developing countries, many of which are still faced by themselves. Because they have benefited and still benefit on a smaller scale of development cooperation, India, Brazil and South Africa recognize the importance of this instrument for the overcoming of poverty, underdevelopment and marginalization in the developing world. Thus, these countries seek to establish a partnership for development, focused on ideas more
egalitarian, on shared responsibilities, on the respect of the sovereignty and in overcoming the problems, differences and conflicts that beset the developing countries.

Finally, it is important to mention that this article presents in general terms the SSC policies of India, Brazil and South Africa and that there is a wide field for the research of the theme involving emerging countries. The study of cooperation of these countries allows us to investigate further this modality of cooperation and understand new patterns of behavior, interests, actors and ideas that are involved in international relations in this new century.
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