



PRIMO
Power and Region
in a Multipolar Order

WORKING PAPERS

Regional Powers and Democracy Promotion through Regional Organizations

A Comparison of Brazil and South Africa

Melina Breitegger

PRIMO Working Paper Number 10

PRIMO Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 10

Hamburg 2017

Internet: www.primo-itn.eu

E-Mail: primo@wiso.uni-hamburg.de



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 607133

Universität Hamburg
Institut für Politikwissenschaft
Allende-Platz 1
D - 20146 Hamburg

ISSN 2365-032X

Abstract

What role do the regional powers Brazil and South Africa play in democracy promotion in the regions of South America and Africa? While both South Africa and Brazil played an important role in building normative frameworks of regional institutions for democracy promotion, most notably within the African Union and the Union of South American Nations, their leadership within regional organizations to apply these frameworks is inconsistent. South Africa is trapped between regional and global expectations; Brazil's regional leadership lacks commitment. In the context of the loose regional integration settings in both institutions, the ambitious democratic frameworks remain ineffective when regional powers fail to unite the member states behind their implementation.

Keywords: regional powers, regional organizations, African Union, UNASUR, democracy promotion

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Regional Powers, Regional Organizations and Regional Leadership	4
3 South Africa: Regional Norms and Practices of Democracy Promotion	9
4 Brazil: Norms and Practices of Democracy Promotion in South America	12
5 Comparison and Conclusion	26

1 Introduction

Why should we look at democracy promotion by regional powers and why does it make sense to compare Brazil and South Africa? First of all, there is an apparent gap in the literature, which usually deals with democracy promotion by the United States or European states (Stuenkel 2013). This gap neglects the importance of regional actors who make regional affairs a priority of their foreign policy agenda and could play an important role in democracy promotion, especially in cases when the intervention of Western powers is not welcomed.

Second, Brazil and South Africa identify themselves as democratic multicultural nations and have even formed a grouping jointly with India –the IBSA trilateral forum– in order to highlight the shared democratic values which distinguish them from other emerging powers. Third, Brazil and South Africa have demonstrated similar approaches to regional leadership that are based on regional institution building, multilateral diplomacy and respect of non-intervention in domestic affairs. These regional norms and principles make it particularly interesting to investigate the involvement of both states in regional democracy promotion, which by nature constitute involvement in domestic affairs.

South Africa and Brazil are categorized as regional powers and emerging middle powers within the context of an increasingly multipolar world order, in which they wish to play a significant role (Flemes and Nolte 2010). Regional powers indicate a shift from a world order with a single hegemon, to a multipolar order, with power poles in different regions. While their status as regional powers and regional hegemons is acknowledged by “the West”, their leadership role in the region is contested by their neighbours (Alden & Soko 2005; Flemes & Castro 2016; Flemes & Habib 2009; Flemes & Wehner 2015; Malamud 2011).

Leadership in the region is a potential springboard for becoming a global power. However South Africa and Brazil need to be careful when voicing their leadership claims in the regional context if they do not wish to be seen as a bully (Stuenkel 2014), a dominant big

brother (Lalbahadur 2015) or an imperialist. In the case of democracy promotion, regional powers need to be careful not to be regarded as regional proxies of Western powers (Khadiagala & Nganje 2016, 1563). According to Burges (Burges 2009, 43), Brazil chose to mask its regional leadership agenda behind the rhetoric of consensus and inclusion, as a result of the fear that the perception of Brazil as an imperial power might trigger coalition building between Spanish speaking states.

In the South African case, fears of exclusion are linked to the history of the Apartheid. Shortly after the Apartheid, South Africa's foreign policy discourse was focused on issues of human rights and democracy. The aim was to reintegrate South Africa into the international community after more than 30 years of isolation (Grobbelaar 2014). However, when confronted with economic and trade issues, South Africa would follow a more pragmatic and interest based approach. As, Geldenhuys (2010, 155) argues, "South Africa's rulers thus decided that they would continue riding their moralistic high horses – preferably in the company of other norm advocates and under the banner of multilateral organizations – but dismount when entering commercial territory."

Given the environment of limited acceptance of leadership of regional powers within both regions, South America and Africa, regional organizations offer the opportunity to shape regional politics under the banner of cooperation. Regional organizations are an important aspect of regional politics, stressing the importance of regional cooperation and the ability of regions in the Global South to manage regional issues without using external intervention. Both South Africa and Brazil have been initiators and active members in regional organizations.

In this paper I will focus on two major regional organizations, the African Union (AU) and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), which cover the territory of the two regional powers' targeted region and have an established normative framework to promote democracy. By looking at the beginnings of the regional norm building on democracy

promotion in these institutions and recent examples of their implementation, the paper accounts for differences in Brazil's and South Africa's regional policy making, as well as the factor of changing regional and international circumstances.

The post- Cold War period saw the creation of a variety of regional institutions in the Global South. Especially in South America we can observe a number of (sometimes overlapping) integration schemes in the domains of trade, politics and welfare, driven by different ideologies (Riggirozzi 2012). In Africa, the most relevant organization, with almost complete continental membership (with the exception of Morocco) is the African Union. South Africa played a pivotal role in the creation of the AU, the follow-up institution of the Organization of African Unity. Brazil initiated the founding of several regional organizations (MERCOSUR, IIRSA) of which UNASUR – Union of South American Nations - is the most ambitious, because of its wide range of policy areas and almost complete South American membership. Both the AU and UNASUR have frameworks to promote democracy and constitutionality in the respective regions.

Regional institutions in the global South are a part of a wider strategy to solve regional problems within a regional context, and therefore keep involvement of other international hegemony at bay. The AU and UNASUR are both set out to help solving regional problems internally. The AU and its established security architecture is meant to deal with African issues in an African way. On paper, the AU is authorized to intervene in member states in case of grave violations such as genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes (as stated in article 7 of the 2002 Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union). UNASUR also has mechanisms to help countries deal with domestic issues, if they agree to accept UNASUR involvement. UNASUR has contributed to solving border disputes (e.g. between Colombia and Venezuela) and was involved in addressing the democratic turbulences experienced in Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador and Venezuela. While the security threats in South America and Africa might sometimes be different in nature (i.e. military coups have been a constant threat in Africa, while South

American democracies have been recently destabilized by impeachments), both regions can profit from regional organizations that support democratic practices in its member countries.

In comparing two regional powers and two regional organizations, this paper contributes to the emerging field of comparative regionalism (Borzel & Risse 2016; Söderbaum 2016) which studies regionalism and regionalization from a global perspective. Regional organizations are only one, more institutionalized, aspect of regional cooperation, which is an interesting field to explore. This encompasses the analysis of power, which is exercised in the formation and maintenance of these institutions; as well as the internal and external power politics of these institutions (Baldwin 2013, 290). The focus on regional organizations as a playing field for regional powers in this paper derives from the foreign policy strategy of the two powers in question.

2 Regional Powers, Regional Organizations and Regional Leadership

At the start of an analysis of regional powers, there is the question of what constitutes a region and what is the specific area of influence of a regional power? While a region is typically characterized by geographical proximity, its boundaries are the result of a social and political process, as is the development of a regional identity. Regional power is a self-ascribed status which needs to be accepted by peers in the defined region. In this context, regional power is understood as a social category even though it also requires a basis of material resources (Flemes and Nolte 2010).

This paper will draw on the definition of regional powers as “states in the global system that are part of a geographically delimited region of which they are ready to assume leadership” (Flemes and Habib 2009, 138). That means that regional powers have the capability for regional leadership and also a demonstrated interest in regional affairs. As Destradi (2010)

argues, regional powers can decide to use a range of different strategies to implement their regional policies. She differentiates between imperial strategies (hard power, based on military strength), hegemony (ranging from coercion to persuasion, with the end goal of realizing national interests) and leadership (leader or follower-initiated processes of pursuit of common goals). These strategies are to be seen on a continuum, and can be applied in different stages of interaction within the region.

Depending on the means by which a regional power exerts its interest in the region, it can be described as a detached regional power, a regional hegemon or a regional dominator (Prys 2010). While detached regional powers do not focus on the region, but rather on domestic and international politics and have a lack of identification within the region, regional hegemons and regional dominators are engaged within their region. Regional dominators use hard power (threat, military force) strategies to advance their interests. Regional hegemons in contrast use their soft power (Nye 1990) capabilities and work through regional cooperation projects.

Using the above classification for South Africa and Brazil, based on their foreign policy strategies and their interest in regional affairs, both countries fall into the category of regional hegemons.

Hegemony, a concept initially developed by Gramsci, has been used to describe forms of power projection that do not use direct (military) force or threat, but other means of coercion and co-option. According to Gramscian theory, the hegemon projects its ideas and world vision onto its followers, who (subconsciously) incorporate his/her ideology. Gramsci's theory as interpreted by Cox and Sinclair states that, hegemony can be seen as a structure of values and understandings of the international order of states and non-state actors, which is perceived as the natural order by most actors, but is based on the value system created by the dominant state (Cox and Sinclair 1996, 151).

While South Africa and Brazil are good examples of regional hegemon considering their engagement and interest in the region, they lack the followership that would be associated with an ideal type of a regional hegemon. South Africa's and Brazil's leadership in the regions of Africa and South America is contested. Which begs the question, are they leaders without followers (Malamud 2011)?

This seeming paradox of South Africa's and Brazil's status as regional hegemon with contested followership can be better understood by looking at their role within regional organizations. Institutionalized regional cooperation in an ideal platform for regional powers to project a hegemonic project and to lead the region through methods of cooperation and inclusion. Pedersen (2002) argues that regional integration is driven by declining or relatively weak regional powers. Through the creation of regional institutions the regional power agrees to share its powers with other states in the region and accepts to cover a large part of the costs associated with regional integration. This process can be costly for the hegemon in economic and political terms. Pedersen argues that regions which have one or two regional hegemon tend to form regional institutions, while regions in which a regional hegemon is lacking, usually have a relatively weak regional integration process (Pedersen 2002, 678). Pedersen termed the strategy of leadership through institution building "co-operative hegemony".

The academic discussion on the role of regional powers in regional institutions entails the question of whether regional organizations (and their bureaucratic apparatus) are independent agents themselves, or if they are merely a playground for regional powers and their neighbours to negotiate regional policy making.

Realism argues that international organizations are only as strong as its regional hegemon. States act through organizations to assert their interests. According to Mearsheimer (1994) institutions have very little influence over their member states' behaviour. Realist theory

would therefore assume that regional powers like Brazil and South Africa were the dominant drivers within regional organizations that are within their area of influence.

Contrary to the realist position, liberal institutionalism argues that international organizations as actors have agency (Keohane and Martin 1995). The secretariat and governing bodies of regional organizations would have a certain level of autonomy and the influence of regional powers on the policy making process of regional organizations would be balanced by the power of the bureaucrats of the institutions. Liberal institutionalists believe in the potential of multilateral organizations, like the United Nations, to foster cooperation between states. While states are seen as rational actors as in realist theory, liberal institutionalism claims that they do not operate in an international system of anarchy, but in the context of supranational governance, in which international organizations are (increasingly) relevant actors (Stein 2008).

However, as I would argue, the level of agency of regional organizations varies from institution to institution. As can be witnessed from the perspective of comparative regionalism, regional organizations have different levels of institutionalisation and range from multilateral to supra-national policy making structures. The AU as well as UNASUR do not have supranational decision making power, such as organizations as the European Union. Despite the fact that both organizations are to a certain extent modelled on the EU (with regards to their institutional structure), they have very limited financial resources, small staff and almost no to very limited supranational competencies in comparison. UNASUR can especially be characterized as a multilateral body where decisions are made based on the consensus of member states and where the secretariat has very limited powers. The AU apparatus is more institutionalized but its policies also depend heavily on member states' interests and the agency of the AU Commission and the Peace and Security Council are confined to specific areas of competence (and also depend on the national interests of member states occupying the leading positions within these organs).

Liberal and realist theory does not explain how institutional norms are developed. This is especially relevant for a discussion of democracy promotion by regional organization, which depends not only on the democratic norms of member states but also on the norms of regional policymaking. Constructivist theory brings up questions on the role of norms, ideas, identities in the constitution of national and international power politics (Adler 2013). States' ideas and interests are subject to change. Power politics are not a causal effect of anarchy. If states act in self-interest, this is due to a (constructivist) process not an inherent structure (Wendt 1992).

The constructivist theoretical framework is useful especially in the study of norms, as regional organizations' norms are the result of constructive practices by social actors (in this case by the representatives of the member states and the bureaucrats). The process of norm development of regional institutions happens within the context of international norm diffusion. Acharya has analysed the development of regional norms, looking at how international norms are interpreted and become localized in a given environment (Acharya 2004; Acharya 2011). He argues that international norms are not passively absorbed, but are modelled to be able to fit into the local context.

Hence, from that perspective, the normative frameworks on democracy promotion of UNASUR of the AU are not constructed in a vacuum, but are the result of norm building processes that incorporate international norms, which are already present and reworked in order to address the regional challenges. This process happens in a social environment where power politics come into play. The construction and the implementation of norms is therefore a political process (Risse and Sikkink 1999).

In the case of the UNASUR and the AU, institutionalized norms of democracy promotion coincide with norms of non-intervention, respect of national sovereignty and an emphasis on regional stability. How member states value and put emphasis on different norms, impacts how promotion of certain norms is exercised (Wendt 1992; Adler 2013). This is

where regional powers comes in. As Van der Vleuten and Hoffmann (2010) argue , regional organizations' actions depend on the cost of intervention of regional powers and the external pressure of third parties in the case of inaction. Regional organizations are made up of a variety of member states with different interest and different ideas for regional integration. While regional powers cannot impose their own interest on other member states, they are crucial in the process of creating consensus and assuming leadership roles that can streamline the different regional agendas into a more coherent regional response.

3 South Africa: Regional Norms and Practices of Democracy Promotion

The analysis of South Africa's regional foreign policy in this paper is confined to South Africa's post-Apartheid era, under the governments of the African National Congress (ANC), which is the dominant single party in South Africa's parliamentary democracy since 1994 (Moore 2011, 43–44). While the foreign policy under Nelson Mandela will be mentioned, the focus is on more recent foreign policy under Thabo Mbeki and Jacob Zuma which were/are the respective presidents of South Africa since the creation of the African Union.

The foreign policy agenda in South Africa is mainly steered through the ANC party's leadership. The South African foreign ministry (DIRCO) has little influence in setting the agenda of the ANC foreign policy. Decision making is highly centralized since the Mbeki government (Nel and Stephen 2010, 76). In the words of Marthoz: "South Africa's foreign policy is not DIRCO's preserve. In fact, many diplomats complain that the ministry is underfunded, understaffed and mostly forced into the secondary role of an implementing agency. The foreign policy decision-making process reflects the reality of a 'party state' in which the ANC plays a decisive role at the risk of blurring the lines between itself and state institutions." (Marthoz 2013)

The foreign policy discourse of the ANC has its main focus on Africa. The idea of a self-sufficient Africa, which takes care of its own destiny is reflected in the former South African President Mbeki's vision of an African Renaissance and the NEPAD development program for Africa, as well as South Africa's pivotal role in the creation of the African Union. The ANC's first pillar of its foreign policy is creating a better Africa in a better world (ANC 2015), arguing for the direct link between South Africa's prosperity and African prosperity (African National Congress, 2012).

While South Africa's foreign policy targets the whole of Africa and its policy imprint is visible in the African Union and its involvement in continental security affairs (Flemes 2009, 141), its direct economic influence is stronger in the region of Sub-Saharan Africa. South Africa's can claim regional leadership in the sub-regional organizations of the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

Hitherto, we can observe the hegemonic position of South Africa within its immediate region of Sub-Saharan Africa and a strong aspiration to being considered the leading African country in continental affairs. This position is contested by the other regional power, Nigeria, which holds the hegemonic position in West Africa. We can therefore observe at least two power poles in the African continent, with Nigeria and South Africa rivalling for leadership on the continent. Flemes (2009) argues that South Africa occupies the role of a constrained cooperative hegemon in Sub-Saharan Africa, referring to Pedersen's (2002) concept of cooperative hegemony. While South Africa is eager to engage in regional institution building and peacekeeping, the acceptance of its leadership is hampered by its Apartheid history, Flemes argues.

South Africa is traditionally involved in peace keeping on the continent. Through providing troops to the AU and UN peacekeeping missions, Pretoria can demonstrate its willingness and ability to play a leading role in regional peacekeeping and hence, a more legitimate claim to a permanent UN SC seat (Flemes 2009, 145). In this sense, regional leadership is used as

a springboard for global influence. However, differences in global and regional expectations and demands make foreign policy making tricky for South Africa. A prominent example was South Africa's quiet diplomacy in the Zimbabwe crisis. South Africa's use of soft power instead of hard power has been criticized by diplomats outside the continent, pointing out South Africa's reluctance to use force, even in the light of a humanitarian crisis (Sidiropoulos 2014, 199–200). However, as Schoeman and Alden (2003) argue, South African foreign policy options in the Zimbabwe crisis were limited, if it wanted to be seen as a truly "African" nation, which should not interfere or impose sanctions on a brother nation.

The norm of non-interference in domestic affairs has a long tradition in African regional affairs. Despite the existence of this norm, the African Union has adopted a framework for regional stability and democracy promotion, which is in contrast to that norm and allows for the intervention of the AU in domestic issues of member's states.

After the end of Apartheid, South Africa repositioned itself within the international community as a democratic country. The foreign policy with regards to democracy promotion was based on a value driven approach in the first years of Mandela's government. Nelson Mandela's foreign policy discourse was rooted in the promotion of democracy. He stated that the ANC's foreign policy would be grounded in the belief that "just and lasting solutions to the problems of humankind can only come through the promotion of democracy worldwide" (Mandela 1993, 87). Nelson Mandela's highly activist approach was softened by Thabo Mbeki, who took a more pragmatic and Africa centric approach, putting a greater emphasis on acting in accordance with other African countries. While Jacob Zuma did not break with the tradition of democratic discourse, South Africa's role as a regional democracy promoter became less prominent due to the problems that South Africa's democratic system faced within its own nation (Schönwälder 2014, 18).

Critics also point to the economic interests of the South African state in the region of Africa, which prevents it from taking a stronger pro-democratic stance. Some argue that South

Africa traded non-intervention and keeping quiet about human rights issues for the sake of gaining market access for its corporate companies in African countries. Khadiagala and Nganje (2015) argue that democracy promotion, although a prominent feature during Nelson Mandela's administration, came second to a politics of pragmatism during the administration of Mbeki and Zuma.

The same development, a shift from idealism to pragmatism (Khadiagala and Nganje 2015), can be followed in South Africa's role within the African Union. South Africa played a leading role in the creation of the AU (founded in 2002), the follow up institution of the Organization of African Unity, which was criticized for the lack of adherence to democratic and human rights values. The creation of the African Union was a chance for Thabo Mbeki to realize his vision of an African Renaissance. In the process, South African and Nigerian leaders reconciled their differences (Tieku 2004). With the teamwork of the two states men Mbeki and Obasanjo, and the combination of a value driven approach (Mbeki's African Renaissance) and Obasanjo's institutional approach, NEPAD was launched as the continent wide development program (Adebajo and Landsberg 2003, 178). While the Organization of African Unity had been named a club of dictators, the African Union was supposed to be the opposite. Within the NEPAD framework, African countries should monitor each other's performance and in that process advance good governance and democratic norms on the continent. The implementation of the peer review process proved to be difficult and was not accepted by many member states (Bischoff 2003). Some African states felt that the peer-review mechanism was only set out to please international donors and attract FDI, and therefore NEPAD was not considered a purely African project (Flemes 2009, 150).

The former South African President Mbeki heavily criticized the African Union on the occasion of the 10 year anniversary, calling it a dream deferred, and pointing to the problem of a lack of implementation of African Union policies at the domestic level (Mbeki 2012).

The problem of implementation seems to be one of the major drawbacks of African Union politics, which can be linked to a problem of different continental norms (Witt 2013) and therefore a problem of norm contestation. While South Africa has been leading in formulating policies and developing the institutional framework, it did not manage to rally sufficient support in order to have its policies practically implemented on the continent.

Despite the issues with implementation, the AU has been very active in developing democratic norms, e.g. through establishing a clause of non-acceptance of unconstitutional changes of government, and thereby addressing military coups as well as the issue of presidential third terms (i.e. an unwillingness of incumbents to step down after two terms in office). The adoption of the African Charter on Elections, Governance and Democracy (African Union 2007) and the Decision on the Prevention of Unconstitutional Changes of Government and Strengthening the Capacity of the AU to Manage such Situations (Assembly of the African Union 2010) demonstrates a norm change from non-interference in domestic affairs to a norm of non-indifference in the case of violation of democratic principles.

While the normative framework on unconstitutional changes on government marks a clear path for a strong norm of democracy promotion on the continent, implementation has proved to be difficult and inconsistent, as the cases of Egypt, Libya and the Ivory Coast show.

One of the test cases of norm implementation was the military coup in Egypt in 2011. The AU defended its norm when it suspended Egypt (one of its main member states in terms of annual budget contribution) after the military took over power following public protests against the government in 2011. The (South African) AU Commission Chairperson Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma said: "Nobody will sit behind the (Egyptian) flag – neither the previous government nor the present interim government – until there is an election" (Dersso, 2013).

The South African foreign ministry was in support of the AU sanctions and had been under attack from Egypt, which criticised that Pretoria had called the events in Egypt a coup (Patel, 2013). Egyptian delegates expressed the view that there was a conspiracy against Egypt within the African Union, led by South Africa, because it viewed Egypt as a rival (Jeenah 2015, 156). The harsh critique by Egypt, particularly of South Africa, while the AU had jointly suspended Egypt, points to the central role that was attributed to South Africa in the crisis and in the AU decision by the Egyptian government.

The official strong position against the interim government of Egypt by DIRCO however was challenged by South Africa's State Security Minister's visit to Egypt, in which a letter to President Zuma confirmed the support of the interim government's efforts for a democratic transition (Jeenah 2015, 157). In 2014 at the meeting of the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC), South Africa supported the decision to lift the suspension of Egypt, as General Al Sisi was elected president. According to the AU protocols Egypt should have remained suspended, because coup leaders or people involved in a coup shall not run for office. The readmission of Egypt was therefore a decision to choose pragmatism over principle (Dersso 2014).

The crisis in Libya was also a difficult case for South African foreign policy makers, as it was trapped between its role in two different institutions – the UN Security Council and the AU PSC. On the one hand South Africa was engaged in paving the way for a political solution in Libya through the African Union. South Africa was part of the ad-hoc High level Committee on Libya (jointly with Mauretania, Mali, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda), established by the AU PSC to facilitate a dialogue between the parties involved (Jeenah 2015, 149). At the same time, South Africa played an important role in allowing the NATO intervention in Libya and thereby diverting from the AU strategy of negotiations. South Africa, at the time a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, approved UNSC resolution 1973, which stated that civilians should be protected by all means necessary. However, South Africa complained at a later stage that the resolution was

implemented in a different way by NATO than was understood by South Africa (De Waal 2013). In this case member states within the AU were divided over how to react to the Libyan crisis. The South African position was criticized within the ANC (by the ANC young league) and by other African countries, such as Zimbabwe and Uganda (Jeenah 2015, 150), even though some African countries wanted to see Gaddafi removed and did not oppose the military intervention. The South African position in this scenario was inconsistent, trying to please the international and regional audience.

In the case of the post-election violence in the Ivory Coast (2010-2011), South African foreign policy strategy was again inconsistent. As in the case of Libya, South Africa voted for a UN resolution (Res 1975) that allowed for using “all means necessary” to protect civilians, hence supporting a military intervention. However, South Africa advocated for political rather than a military solution to the conflict, which was not in line with its voting behaviour in the UN. While the AU propagated a political solution, and South Africa also supported that position, both South Africa and Nigeria voted for the resolution which led to a UN intervention under French command. While the AU and the UN agreed on the election victory of Mr. Ouatarra, they did not agree on the means by which former president Ghabo should be urged to step down. As Spies and Abatan argue, the case of the AU position on the crisis in the Ivory Coast demonstrates the lack of willingness to implement the responsibility to protect in the case of violence against civilians (Abatan and Spies 2016).

South Africa’s engagement in conflict resolution was not approved by Nigeria, as Nigeria considered Cote d’Ivoire within its area of regional influence. As Zondi argues “[t]he intense conflict between South Africa and Nigeria, both non-permanent members of the Security Council at the time, reflected badly on both countries’ commitment to a strong African Agenda and posed serious challenges for South Africa’s Africa policy” (Zondi 2012, 27).

In the two cases, South Africa was trapped between global and regional expectations. Viera and Alden argue that the BRICS grouping is another example of regional powers acting on

the global stage seemingly on behalf of the region, which exacerbates tensions between the regional expectations and the international interests of South Africa (Vieira and Alden 2011, 524).

A more recent example of conflicting regional and international expectations was South Africa's inaction in the case of Omar Al Bashir, who attended the African Union summit in June 2015 in South Africa and was not arrested, as would have been South Africa's obligation as signatory of the International Criminal Court. The South African position in support of the AU, even in the light of violating its own laws, shows the "desire by South Africa to appease the Africa bloc even at a heavy price to its international standing in relation to international agreements" (Thipanyane 2011, 4).

While South Africa has played an important role in the establishment of the African Union and the norm building process of democratic governance in Africa, its role within defending the implementation of the AU normative framework, also against other international interventions, is incoherent. While the Zuma administration has continued the rhetoric on African solutions for African problems (and has taken a pro- African Union stand in the case of Omar Al Bashir), South Africa's voting patterns within the UNSC do not fall in line with its position within the African Union. Furthermore South Africa's role as a leader in African affairs is contested by other African nations, especially Nigeria. The responses to various crises in the region seem to be rather ad-hoc, than based on a well calculated strategy. By trying to please the audience in regional and international forums, South Africa ends up being criticized by the region and by the international community. As the image of Nelson Mandela fades, and corruption scandals are harming the image of the Zuma administration, the current South African government will have difficulty defending democratic norms on the continent legitimately.

4 Brazil: Norms and Practices of Democracy Promotion in South America

In the Brazilian case, two aspects have to be noted before analysing the foreign policy agenda. First, the central role of the Brazilian foreign ministry (Itamaraty) in the foreign policy making process. Second, the multi-party system that requires coalition building within the government.

Itamaraty has a reputation of being staffed with well-trained diplomats who have an important role in foreign policy making, a domain sometimes neglected by the political elites that are focused on domestic politics. However, Itamaraty is not an independent ministry, and we can see a trend towards presidential diplomacy since the Lula presidency (Cason and Power 2009).

The focus of this chapter is Brazil's regional foreign policy during the government of the Worker's Party (PT) under President Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff. While Brazil's focus on the region of South America can be traced back to the Cardoso administration, it manifested itself clearly with the election of Lula da Silva. The involvement of Brazil with the region can be witnessed as a process of gradual extension of the institutionalization of regional integration.

Brazil's foreign policy towards South America has implications for Brazil's global role. Regional trade and infrastructure initiatives like MERCOSUR and IIRSA in South America are a good example of how regional projects are benefitting Brazil's international power ambitions. By intensifying regional trade, Brazil reshaped the geography of regional economics and increased its bargaining power in the US led free trade negotiations of FTAA. Another example is the Brazilian involvement in the UN mission in Haiti. While Brazil had put little emphasis on peacekeeping, it wanted to demonstrate its capability to provide for security in the wider region of Latin America, and in doing so increase its legitimacy of occupying a permanent seat in a reformed UN Security Council (Burgess 2008, 79).

When we look at Latin America as a region, we can see Mexico as a rival for Brazil's regional power status. In contrast, in the region of South America, in terms of economic strength, population's size and land mass, Brazil is clearly the regional power in South America. Argentina, Venezuela (under Chavez), Colombia and Chile can be described as secondary powers.

Brazil's regional integration projects of Brazil have met resistance, mainly from secondary powers. One way of contesting Brazilian integration efforts is to create alternative integration projects or to form alliances with partners outside of the region. For example, during Lula's presidency, Hugo Chavez launched a competing regional project (the Bolivian Alternative for the Americas) that challenged the Brazilian vision of South American regional cooperation. In contrast to Brazil, Chavez's regional integration project was generously funded by the country's oil wealth. It offered an alternative for smaller countries like Ecuador and Bolivia. However, Chavez supported the concept of a distinct South American geopolitical and geo-economic space (Burgess 2008, 79) as opposed to a Latin American regional concept, which is in line with the Brazilian regional vision.

Colombia's strategy towards Brazil during president Uribe's presidency (2002- 2010) can be described as hard balancing, considering its military cooperation with the US to fight drug trafficking and guerrilla activities. Even though these activities were not directly geared towards balancing Brazil, they affected the Brazilian wish of keeping the US out of the region. The close ties with the US led to a relative isolation of Colombia in the region (Flemes and Wehner 2015). However, since the Santos presidency, Colombian relations to the region have changed, shifting the focus from the US to new regional partnerships, such as the Pacific Alliance – a regional trade block of Chile, Peru, Colombia and Mexico, which can be interpreted as institutional contestation of Colombia, opposing Brazilian integration projects (Flemes and Castro 2016).

Another example of institutional balancing is Chile's regional policy. Chile is part of several regional groupings, among them the Pacific Alliance as mentioned before. By fostering relationships with Mexico and also pursuing a friendlier foreign policy towards the US, Chile is soft-balancing Brazil's influence in South America (Saeber 2012). However, Chile is approaching Brazil and MERCOSUR for trade negotiations, therefore MERCOSUR and the Pacific Alliance do not necessarily have to be competing institutions.

Burges (2008) has described the Itamaraty's foreign policy approach after the Cold War as consensual hegemony, which is an idea driven leadership model that works with inclusion and co-optation, through the creation of common projects, disseminating ideas, fostering dialogue and creating consensus. Followership is not created through the use of force, but through the cost of non-followership. Compared to other forms of leadership it is a less costly approach that does not require the costly provision of public goods for followers.

Bluntly put, foreign policy under Cardoso was "leadership on the cheap" (Burges 2015, 194), an approach that was continued in the Lula and Dilma administration. It caused a call for more direct commitment of Brazil to provision of public goods and increased soft resistance of countries in the region, a situation which Burges identifies as a "quiet crisis of Brazilian leadership in South America." (Burges 2015, 195)

Gratius and Gomes Saraiva argue that South America as a geopolitical space with (limited) international influence has come into being due to the Brazilian initiative of creating UNASUR (Gratius and Gomes Saraiva 2013). Excluding Mexico, Brazil's only current (potential) rival in the region of Latin America, and Central America which has closer ties with the United States, leaves Brazil as the only hegemon within UNASUR. In contrast to other regional integration initiatives, UNASUR's agenda of political integration in South America can be seen as a result of emergency presidential summits dealing with crises in the region, which were related to issues of security and democracy rather than trade issues (Dabène 2016).

The emphasis on South America came to a halt since the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff and the taking of office of Michel Temer, who has shown a lack of interest in regional affairs and a focus economic relations with the US and Europe (Frazer and Piva 2016).

Given Brazil's history of military dictatorship and transition to democracy in 1985, democracy promotion is an integral part of the Brazilian foreign policy strategy. While the Cardoso administration focused on legal and constitutional issues of democratic governance through its membership in the Organization of American States it refused to interfere in cases of erosion of democratic practices. Since Lula, Brazilian democracy promotion was channeled through UNASUR where Brazil had more leverage (Schönwälder 2014, 15).

UNASUR is a Brazilian project with heavy Venezuelan influence during the process of its creation. Highlighting Venezuela's influence, and the support of Chavez by Bolivian president Evo Morales and the former President of Ecuador Raffael Correa, Briceno Ruiy and Hoffmann argue that UNASUR is not a Brazilian project but, one of "common interests and compromises among South American countries" (Briceño-Ruiz and Hoffmann 2015). Venezuela under Chavez and Brazil under Lula had different visions for UNASUR (Sanahuja 2012; Giacalone 2013). However Brazil managed to moderate Venezuelan initiatives (such as the establishment of a NATO like defence alliance) and Venezuela was not able to impose its vision to UNASUR without Brazilian support. As Gratius and Gomes Saraiva (2013) argue, UNASUR was Lula's and not Chavez child. Venezuelan ideology, situated at the far left spectrum, had to be acknowledged and balanced with divergent Colombian interests, especially in the domain of security affairs.

However, in the case of UNASUR, Colombia (after initial opposition) joined the South African Defence Council. Uniting Venezuela and Colombia under one defense institution under the umbrella of UNASUR was a challenging task, that was also time sensitive. Flandes, Nolte and Wehner (2011) argue that the creation of a South American defense institution was made possible through the efforts of leading countries, identified as Brazil, Venezuela, Argentina,

Chile and Colombia, who followed different national interests, but were united in the interest of stabilizing the region due to erupting crises (Bolivia 2008, Ecuador 2010, Colombian-Venezuelan border dispute 2010) and resulted in the mechanism of balancing the power of the OAS and the United States.

By developing a framework for democracy promotion, UNASUR is rivalling the OAS, which had traditionally played the role of the regional organization promoting democratic governance in the Americas (based on a model of representative democracy).

In the face of challenged or failed democratic governance in its member states, UNASUR has engaged in electoral monitoring, electoral assistance, and has developed normative frameworks for democratic governance. Highlighting the importance of democratic governance, a democratic clause was added to the Constitutive Treaty of UNASUR in 2010 (with entry into force in 2014) which specifies the measure to be taken in the case of a breach of democratic order, that range from expulsion of participation in the institution to the closing of borders (UNASUR 2014). The democratic protocol of UNASUR also applies in the case of a pure threat of breach of democratic practices or the violation of constitutional order as well as any situation that puts risk to the legitimate exercise of power and democratic values and principles. (UNASUR 2014)

The UNASUR democratic clause was adopted as a response to the political crisis in Bolivia (in 2008) and in Ecuador (in 2010, at a time when Ecuador was holding the pro-tempore Presidency of UNASUR) (Dabène 2016). Two years later, the democratic clause was activated in the case of Paraguay, when President Lugo was impeached by congress, without following a proper impeachment process. MERCOSUR and UNASUR both suspended Paraguay.

The wording in UNASUR's democratic clause is broad and allows for application in a wide range of scenarios, namely "any situation that jeopardizes the legitimate exercising of power and the application of the values and principles of democracy" (UNASUR 2014). Also the

sanctions that can be taken in the case of the given situation are wide-ranging. Dabène argues that this was made possible because of the political polarization of the continent. He states that the members of UNASUR share the same preoccupation with stability in the region. However, they do not necessarily agree on what can be qualified as a threat to the legitimate order (Dabène 2016). Also, the democratic clause does not specify what is to be considered a (threat of) breach of democracy, or what the qualities of a democracy are (Closa & Palestini Cespedes 2015). Given the history of military dictatorships in the region and the need to protect the young democracies, the democratic clause was mainly thought as an instrument to protect elected governments from destabilizing forces. The democratic clause was not intended to scrutinize elected governments that violate civil or political rights of their citizens (Closa & Palestini Cespedes 2015, 4).

Since its creation, UNASUR has become an agent for democracy promotion in Bolivia, Ecuador, Paraguay and Venezuela. The first case of UNASUR's involvement in democracy promotion was the constitutional crisis in Bolivia in 2008. UNASUR intervened, as did the OAS. Evo Morales' governing party preferred UNASUR's involvement while the opposition welcomed OAS involvement. The OAS model is based on the concept of a representative democracy but Morales vision was that of a more participatory democracy, which was supported by UNASUR and was the model that was taken into consideration, leaving the OAS model behind (Aruguay & Moreno, 2014). Lula da Silva played a vital role in the negotiation efforts of the ad hoc council in Santiago de Chile (Salaverry 2008). Malamud argues that at the time of the Bolivian crisis, UNASUR was more an organization for political coordination than for regional integration (Malamud 2008). Salaverry argues that the crisis in Bolivia was a test case for the institution which would help to assess whether UNASUR could be a substitute for the OAS in the region (Salaverry 2008). But moreover, it was a test case of Brazilian leadership versus US leadership in the region. As Espinosa argues that Brazil played a key role in solving the crisis in Bolivia, using UNASUR as a vehicle (Espinosa 2014, 45). Political stability in Bolivia was a key concern of Brasilia, not just because it shares 3,400

kilometers of border, but because more than half of Brazilian gas consumption depends on Bolivian imports.

Two years later in September 2010 Ecuador (where the UNASUR headquarters is based) experienced a coup attempt. Protesting police forces occupied parliament and a TV station, blocked access to the airport and held President Rafael Correa hostage. The police clashed with the army and loyal police forces, who freed President Rafael Correa eleven hours later. UNASUR issued a statement, condemning the events as an intended coup, expressing full support of Correa and pointing to potential sanctions if the constitutional order should be violated (El País 2010).

In 2012 Paraguay experienced a change of government, that some labelled a parliamentary coup. Congress voted to start an impeachment process against President Ferdinand Lugo over his handling of a peasant protest, in which eleven farmers and six police officers died (Telesur 2015). The impeachment was deemed unconstitutional since President Lugo was only left with 24 hours to prepare his defense. In this case, both MERCOSUR and UNASUR took action and suspended Paraguay from the organizations. However, some argue that the constitution of Paraguay does not provide details on how an impeachment process has to be carried out, and hence the impeachment was in line with the constitution of Paraguay. The suspension of Paraguay from MERCOSUR also allowed for the inclusion of Venezuela in the trading block, which had before been blocked by Paraguay, leading to the conclusion that the suspension of Paraguay was also motivated by economic interests of member states.

While UNASUR's swift response to the crises in Ecuador and Paraguay has led researchers to highlight that UNASUR "stood out as an effective player in international conflict resolution and mediation" (Kersfield 2013, 193).

While Argentina, Ecuador and Venezuela took the position that the impeachment was in fact a coup d'état, the United States did not interpret the events as a coup, and therefore

recognized the new government (Lindsay 2013). Brazil criticized the quick impeachment of Lugo, Dilma assumed a rather discrete position (compared to Chavez and Kirchner for example) and did not speak of a coup (Souto 2012, 14). Despite the careful rhetoric of Brazil in order not to risk any bilateral tensions, Brazil's action through UNASUR was straight forward, which allowed UNASUR to respond in a quick and efficient manner.

In 2013 Venezuela, a significant member of UNASUR (in terms of financial contributions and political influence in the region) slid into a democratic crisis that is still ongoing. The crisis involved mass protests against the government paired with undemocratic practices by the government and military intervention in politics. As Corrales points out, Venezuela under Chavez increased its authoritarian tendencies and further decreased its democratic practices under Maduro's government and turned into an autocratic regime (Corrales 2016).

In the Venezuelan case, UNASUR decided not to suspend the country from the organization. The OAS did not put sanctions on Venezuela because of internal disagreements, despite the efforts of the Secretary General of OAS to do so. MERCOSUR did not take much action, until September 2016 when it refused to hand over the pro-tempore presidency to Venezuela and set a deadline of December 1st 2016 for member states to comply with MERCOSUR's standards (putting increased pressure on the Venezuelan government) (Stuenkel 2016) and finally suspended Venezuela from MERCOSUR in December 2016.

Prior to the negotiation efforts of UNASUR, it engaged in an electoral mission in Venezuela. While the government asked for UNASUR's involvement, the opposition advocated for the involvement of other players, such as the Vatican, the OAS, and the EU (Closa & Palestini Cespedes 2015, 8) as it feared that UNASUR was biased.

Merke argues that the change in some of the South American nations from left wing to right wing governments makes it more difficult for UNASUR to mediate in the Venezuelan crisis,

because “policymakers in Buenos Aires and Brasília see the UNASUR secretary general, former Colombian president Ernesto Samper, as too pro-Maduro”(Merke et al. 2016).

Giving the example of UNASUR’s involvement in the Venezuelan crisis (2013 onwards), Stuenkel points to the role Brazil plays within the Union: “UNASUR’s attempt to mediate in the Venezuelan conflict is a multilateral undertaking, and an interesting experiment to see in how far the continent is capable of solving its own problems. Yet given that the United States is largely staying out of the discussion, Brazil is by far the most important actor in South America that, in theory, would be best placed to assume leadership. If things go wrong in Venezuela, it is Brazil, not UNASUR, that will – rightly so – be blamed for failing to defend democracy and stability in the region.” (Stuenkel 2014)

However, as UNASUR’s involvement in the crisis continued, Brazil did not assume an official leadership position in the mediation efforts between the Maduro government and the opposition in Venezuela. The Brazilian delegate dropped out of the electoral monitoring mission, and the talks between government and opposition were led by Leonel Fernandez (former president of the Dominican Republic) and Martín Torrijos (former president of Panama) and at a later stage also included the Vatican. Michel Temer’s government put more pressure against Venezuela in MERCOSUR and with the support of Argentina and Paraguay (where the socialist governments have also been replaced by conservative parties) suspended Venezuela from the organization.

Schoenwaelder argues that Brazil’s regional and global role depend on the success of its own democratic model, on which it can base its soft power (Schönwälder 2014, 17). With corruption charges against the entire political elite and the impeachment of Brazilian president Dilma Rousseff the Brazilian system is unstable (Taub 2016) and has to some extent lost its status as a regional role model. Especially left wing governments in the region have condemned the impeachment of Dilma as a coup. The current mistrust of some South

American governments could also hamper Brazil's leadership role within UNASUR, the regional organization of which it was the main initiator.

5 Comparison and Conclusion

Brazil and South Africa have demonstrated a clear interest in institution building in their respective regions and an active involvement in democracy promotion. Both states are careful to openly express regional leadership ambitions, and they operate through regional organizations in the case of democracy promotion. Strengthening regional organizations has helped Brazil to keep other actors, such as the United States, out of the region. In the case of Africa, where democratic crises often have a military component, we can still observe a strong presence of international organizations and Western powers. While the AU and South Africa have taken an active stance against unconstitutional changes of governments, the region is not managing its crises independently of external actors.

Brazil and South Africa face the challenge of regional contestation of their leadership. In South America, the great number of regional organizations allows for forum shopping. Governments and oppositions in South American countries favor involvement of different institutions, as they perceive some regional organizations as biased due to the ideological orientation of the member states. While UNASUR operated more efficiently when most member states were run by left wing governments, the current ideological diversity in the region makes decision making very difficult. While Brazil was very engaged in UNASUR during the Lula presidency, its involvement and use of the regional mechanism has faded during the Dilma administration and is currently on hold since the Temer administration.

In the case of Africa and the African Union, we have two regional hegemons, South Africa and Nigeria. South Africa and Nigeria are sometimes rivaling for leadership within the African

Union. But the main obstacle to South African leadership is the inconsistency of its foreign policy and its dilemma of conflicting demands from international and regional organizations.

While South Africa's regional policy (especially with regards to defending human rights) has been criticized internationally (due to inaction in the case of Zimbabwe, Omar Al Bashir's attendance of the AU summit, non-cooperation with the ICC) and regionally (due to support interference by international forces in the crises of Libya and Cote D'Ivoire), Brazil's regional policy has been less controversial (with the exception of a call for a more strict stance against human rights violations in Venezuela).

Regional dynamics play a major role in the capability of regional powers to promote certain regional policies. Both South Africa and Brazil played an important role in the creation of the normative frameworks of democracy promotion. They did not create those norms on their own, but were supported or cooperated with other leading states in the region. With bilateral relations between South Africa and Nigeria or Brazil and Venezuela deteriorating, it becomes harder for regional powers to advocate for certain norms and create a regional consensus.

Instability and domestic democratic flaws are both challenging the status of Brazilian and South African democracies. Corruption, one-party rule (in South Africa) and impeachment (in Brazil) demonstrated the instability of the systems and make it more difficult (or less legitimate) for both countries to criticize poor democratic governance in other states.

An important factor, domestic as well as regional, are vested interests. While South Africa and Brazil both have an interest in regional stability and in providing regional solutions for regional problems without international intervention, the level of engagement in different crisis is affected by economic and political interests, depending on the cost of intervention or non-intervention. In the case of Bolivia, the cost of intervention was low for Brazil and the resolution of the conflict crucial to secure Brazilian gas imports. The Venezuelan crisis is more complex and would need more resources, at a point in time when Brazil is more

focused on its own domestic issues. Despite the dire humanitarian situation and refugee flows into Brazil, the Venezuelan crisis has not been perceived as an immediate threat to Brazil or regional stability. Similarly South Africa failed to criticize authoritarian tendencies in other African countries, most prominently in Zimbabwe, in order to keep good economic relationships with its neighbors. Even in cases when South Africa openly criticized another African nation (as in the example of Egypt), it did not do so coherently, and therefore leaving room to alternative interpretations of its official position.

The role of regional norm entrepreneur and norm shaper in the domain of democracy promotion within UNASUR and the AU can be witnessed in the early years of the South African democracy and during Lula's Brazil. The willingness to engage in democracy promotion in the region through particular regional organizations is dependent on various domestic, regional and international factors. A strategy of consensual hegemony was especially fruitful during times of relative regional consensus due to major regional powers working together, as was the case of improved bilateral relationships with Nigeria during Mandela's South Africa, and the ideological affinity of left-wing governments in South America during Lula's Brazil (also known as "pink tide" (Chodor 2015)) with good bilateral relations between Brazil and Venezuela.

Despite the challenges, Brazil and South Africa have demonstrated the capability to contribute to democracy promotion in the regions of South America and Africa. Their engagement in future democratic crises will depend on the willingness of the governments of both states to take leadership roles and pay the costs for strong regional organizations.

Bibliography

Abatan, E., & Spies, Y. (2016) 'African Solutions to African Problems? The AU, R2P and Côte d'Ivoire', *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 23:1, 21-38.

Acharya, A. (2004) 'How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism', *International Organization*, 58:02, 239-275.

Acharya, A. (2011) 'Norm Subsidiarity and Regional Orders: Sovereignty, Regionalism, and Rule-Making in the Third World', *International Studies Quarterly*, 55:1, 95-123.

Adebajo, A., & Landsberg, C. (2003) 'South Africa and Nigeria as Regional Hegemons' in *From Cape to Congo: Southern Africa's Evolving Security Challenges* (pp. 171-203). London: Lynne Rienner Publishing.

Adler, E. (2013) 'Constructivism in International Relations: Sources, Contributions, and Debates' in W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, & B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (Second Edition, pp. 112-144). London: Sage Publications.

African National Congress (2012, March) *International Relations ANC Policy Discussion Document*. Retrieved from <http://www.anc.org.za/docs/discus/2012/internationalb.pdf>

African Union (2007) *African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance*. Retrieved from <http://www.au.int/en/treaties/african-charter-democracy-elections-and-governance>

African Union (2014, August) *Agenda 2063. The Africa We Want*, second edition, popular version. Retrieved from http://agenda2063.au.int/en/sites/default/files/agenda2063_popular_version_05092014_EN.pdf

Alden, C., & Soko, M. (2005) 'South Africa's Economic Relations with Africa: Hegemony and its Discontents', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 43:03, 367-392.

ANC (2015) *African National Congress NGC 2015 Discussion Documents* (Umrabulo) Retrieved from http://www.anc.org.za/docs/umrabulo/2015/ngc_disc_docsy.pdf

Aruguay, A. A., & Moreno, G. X. B. (2014) *Competing Regionalism? The Role of the OAS and UNASUR in Bolivia's Constitution-Drafting Process* (Strömsborg: International Institute for Democratic and Electoral Assistance).

Assembly of the African Union (2010) Decision on the Prevention of Unconstitutional Changes of Government and Strengthening the Capacity of the African Union to Manage Such Situations, Assembly/AU/Dec.269(XIV) Rev.1 §.

Baldwin, D. A. (2013) 'Power and International Relations' in W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, & B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (pp. 273-297) (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Ltd).

Bischoff, P.-H. (2003) 'External and Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy Ambiguity: South African Foreign Policy and the Projection of Pluralist Middle Power', *Politikon*, 30:1, 183-201.

Borzel, P. of P. S. and C. in E. I. T. A., & Risse, T. (2016) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Briceño-Ruiz, J., & Hoffmann, A. R. (2015) 'Post-Hegemonic Regionalism, UNASUR, and the Reconfiguration of Regional Cooperation in South America', *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies / Revue Canadienne Des Études Latino-Américaines et Caraïbes*, 40:1, 48-62.

Burges, S. W. (2008) 'Consensual Hegemony: Theorizing Brazilian Foreign Policy after the Cold War', *International Relations*, 22:1, 65-84.

Burges, S. W. (2009) *Brazilian Foreign Policy after the Cold War* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida).

Burges, S. W. (2015) 'Revisiting Consensual Hegemony: Brazilian Regional Leadership in Question', *International Politics*, 52:2, 193-207.

Chodor, T. (2015) *Neoliberal Hegemony and the Pink Tide in Latin America. Beaking Up With TINA?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Closa, C., & Palestini Cespedes, S. (2015) 'Between Democratic Protection and Self-Defense : the Case of Unasur and Venezuela', Working Paper 93, *EUI RSCAS*. Retrieved from http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/38064/RSCAS_2015_93.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

Corrales, J. (2016) 'Autocratic Legalism in Venezuela' in L. Diamond, M. Plattner & C. Walter (Eds.) *Authoritarianism Goes Global: The Challenge to Democracy* (pp. 78–95) (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Cox, R. W., & Sinclair, T. J. (1996) *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Dabène, O. (2016) 'Crisis-induced Agenda Setting in the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR)' in S. Saurugger & F. Terpan (Eds.), *Crisis and Institutional Change in Regional Integration* (pp. 117-135) (London: Routledge).

De Waal, A. (2013) 'African Roles in the Libyan Conflict of 2011', *International Affairs*, 89:2, 365-379.

Dersso, S. (2013, August 9) 'The African Union versus Egypt', *Aljazeera.Com*. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/08/201388125435183276.html>

Dersso, S. (2014, June 6) 'The AU on Egypt: between a rock and a hard place?', *ISS Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.issafrika.org/iss-today/the-au-on-egypt-between-a-rock-and-a-hard-place>

Destradi, S. (2010) 'Regional Powers and their Strategies: Empire, Hegemony, and Leadership', *Review of International Studies*, 36:04, 903-930.

El País (2010, October 1) 'Correa retoma el control en Ecuador y promete una depuración en la policía'. Retrieved September 20, 2016, from http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2010/09/30/actualidad/1285797605_850215.html

Flemes, D. (2009) 'Regional Power South Africa: Co-operative Hegemony Constrained by Historical Legacy', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 27:2, 135-157.

Flemes, D., & Castro, R. (2016) 'Institutional Contestation: Colombia in the Pacific Alliance', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 35:1, 78-92.

Flemes, D., & Habib, A. (2009) 'Introduction: Regional Powers in Contest and Engagement: Making Sense of International Relations in a Globalised World', *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 16:2, 137-142.

Flemes, D., & Nolte, D. (2010) 'Introduction' in D. Nolte & D. Flemes (Eds.) *Regional Leadership in the Global System - Ideas, Interests and Strategies of Regional Powers* (pp. 1-14) (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing)

Flemes, D., Nolte, D., & Wehner, L. (2011) 'Una comunidad de seguridad regional en formación: la unasur y su Consejo de Defensa / A regional security community in the making: UNASUR and its South American Defence Council', *Estudios Internacionales*, 44:170, 105-127.

Flemes, D., & Wehner, L. (2015) 'Drivers of Strategic Contestation: The Case of South America', *International Politics*, 52:2, 163-177.

Frazer, R., & Piva, A. (2016, July 20) 'The Temer Administration and the Threat to the Southern Regional Integration Process'. Retrieved February 3, 2017, from <http://www.coha.org/the-temer-administration-and-the-threat-to-the-southern-regional-integration-process/>

Geldenhuys, D. (2010) 'South Africa: The Idea-driven Foreign Policy of a Regional Power. In D. Flemes (Ed.), *Regional Leadership in the Global System Ideas, Interests and Strategies of Regional Powers* (pp. 151-168). Ashgate.

Giacalone, R. (2013) 'Venezuela en Unasur: integración regional y discurso político', *Desafíos*, 25:1, 131-166.

Gratius, S., & Gomes Saraiva, M. (2013) 'Continental Regionalism: Brazil's Prominent Role in the Americas', Working Paper 374, CESP. Retrieved from http://aei.pitt.edu/40231/1/WD_No_374_Brazil%27s_Continental_Regionalism.pdf

Grobbelaar, N. (2014) *Rising Powers in International Development: the State of Debate in South Africa*, IDS Evidence Report No. 91 (Brighton: Institute of Development Studies). Retrieved from <http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/123456789/4305/ER91%20Rising%20Powers%20in%20International%20Development%20The%20State%20of%20the%20Debate%20in%20South%20Africa.pdf?sequence=1>

Jeenah, N. (2015) 'Engaging with a Region in Turmoil: South Africa and the Middle East and North Africa Region', in L. Masters, S. Zondi, & J.-A. van Wyk (Eds.), *South African Foreign Policy Review: Volume 2* (pp. 143-168) (Africa Institute of South Africa).

Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (1995) 'The Promise of Institutional Theory', *International Security*, 20:1, 39-51.

Kersfield, D. (2013) 'El papel de la unasur ante los conflictos internacionales: dos estudios de caso', *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 58:218, 193-208.

Khadiagala, G. M., & Nganje, F. (2016) 'The Evolution of South Africa's Democracy Promotion in Africa: From Idealism to Pragmatism', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 29:4, 1561-1581.

Lalbahadur, A. (2015) *SAIIA - South Africa's Foreign Policy: Tempering Dominance Through Integration*, Occasional Paper 213, SAIIA (South African Institute of International Affairs). Retrieved from <http://www.saiia.org.za/occasional-papers/south-africas-foreign-policy-tempering-dominance-through-integration>

Landsberg, C. (2012) 'The African Union and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD): Restoring a Relationship challenged?', *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 12:2, 49.

Malamud, A. (2011) 'A Leader Without Followers? The Growing Divergence Between the Regional and Global Performance of Brazilian Foreign Policy', *Latin American Politics and Society*, 53:3, 1-24.

Mandela, N. (1993) 'South Africa's Future Foreign Policy' *Foreign Affairs*, 72:5, 86-97.

Mbeki, T. (2012) 'The African Union at Ten Years Old: a Dream Deferred!' Retrieved from http://reference.sabinet.co.za/sa_epublication_article/afriins_v42_n3_a2

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1994) 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security*, 19:3, 5-49.

Merke, F., Feldmann, A. E., & Della Costa Stuenkel, O. (2016, June 29) 'Venezuela on the Edge: Can the Region Help?' Retrieved July 4, 2016, from <http://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/29/venezuela-on-edge-can-region-help-pub-63947>

Nye, J. S., Jr. (1990) 'Soft Power', *Foreign Policy*, 80, 153-171.

Patel, K. (2013, August 21) 'Blow by Written Blow: South Africa and Egypt Cross Swords', *The Daily Maverick*. Retrieved from <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2013-08-21-blow-by-written-blow-south-africa-and-egypt-cross-swords/#.WJSOvTi-d48>

Pedersen, T. (2002) 'Cooperative Hegemony: Power, Ideas and Institutions in Regional Integration', *Review of International Studies*, 28:4, 677-696.

Prys, M. (2010) 'Hegemony, Domination, Detachment: Differences in Regional Powerhood', *International Studies Review*, 12:4, 479-504.

Riggirozzi, P. (2012) 'Region, Regionness and Regionalism in Latin America: Towards a New Synthesis', *New Political Economy*, 17:4, 421-443.

Risse, T., & Sikkink, K. (1999) 'The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction' in *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change* (pp. 1–10). Cambridge University Press.

Saeber, P. (2012, May 16) 'Brazil And Mexico: Latin America In-Between – Analysis'. Retrieved March 8, 2016, from <http://www.eurasiareview.com/16052012-brazil-and-mexico-latin-america-in-between-analysis/>

Sanahuja, J. A. (2012) 'Post-liberal Regionalism in South America: The case of UNASUR'. Retrieved from <http://cadmus.eui.eu//handle/1814/20394>

Schoeman, M., & Alden, C. (2003) 'The Hegemon That Wasn't: South Africa's Foreign Policy towards Zimbabwe', *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, 25:1, 1.

Schönwälder, G. (2014) *Promoting Democracy. What Role for the Democratic Emerging Powers?*, Discussion Paper (Bonn: Deutsches Institut fuer Entwicklungspolitik). Retrieved from https://www.die-gdi.de/uploads/media/DP_2.2014.pdf

Sidiropoulos, E. (2014) 'South Africa's Emerging Soft Power', *Current History*, 113:763, 197-202.

Söderbaum, F. (2016) 'Old, New, And Comparative Regionalism. The History and Scholarly Development of the Field' in T. A. Boerzel & T. Risse (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Stein, A. A. (2008) 'Neoliberal Institutionalism' in C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on International Relations* (pp. 201–221) (New York: Oxford University Press).

Stuenkel, O. (2013) 'Rising Powers and the Future of Democracy Promotion: the Case of Brazil and India', *Third World Quarterly*, 34:2, 339-355.

Stuenkel, O. (2014) 'Can UNASUR help Brazil stabilize Venezuela?' Retrieved from <http://www.postwesternworld.com/2014/03/31/brazil-stabilize-venezuela/>

Stuenkel, O. (2016, September 17) 'Brazil and Argentina should lead regional effort to address humanitarian crisis in Venezuela'. Retrieved September 18, 2016, from <http://www.postwesternworld.com/2016/09/17/regional-humanitarian-venezuela/>

Taub, A. (2016, August 31). All Impeachments Are Political. But Was Brazil's Something More Sinister? *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/americas/brazil-impeachment-coup.html>

Telesur (2015, June 22) 'Paraguay Yearns for Justice Three Years on from Coup'. Retrieved September 18, 2016, from <http://www.telesurtv.net/english/analysis/Paraguay-Yearns-for-Justice-Three-Years-on-from-Coup--20150622-0023.html>

Thipanyane, T. (2011) *South Africa's Foreign Policy under the Zuma Government. A Human Rights-Based Policy or a Pragmatic Approach Based on Political and Economic Considerations?* Policy Brief 64 (Africa Institute of South Africa).

Tieku, T. K. (2004) 'Explaining the Clash and Accommodation of Interests of Major Actors in the Creation of the African Union', *African Affairs*, 103:411, 249-267.

UNASUR (2014) 'Protocolo Adicional al Tratado Constitutivo de UNASUR sobre Compromiso con la Democracia'. Retrieved from <http://www.unasursg.org/images/descargas/DOCUMENTOS%20CONSTITUTIVOS%20DE%20UNASUR/Protocolo-Adicional-al-Tratado-Constitutivo-de-UNASUR-sobre-Compromiso-con-la-Democracia-opt.pdf>

Van Der Vleuten, A., & Hoffmann, A. R. (2010) 'Explaining the Enforcement of Democracy by Regional Organizations: Comparing EU, Mercosur and SADC', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48:3, 737-758.

Vieira, M. A., & Alden, C. (2011) 'India, Brazil, and South Africa (IBSA): South-South Cooperation and the Paradox of Regional Leadership', *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 17:4, 507-528.

Wendt, A. (1992) 'Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization*, 46:2, 391_425.

Witt, A. (2013) 'The African Union and Contested Political Order(s)' in U. Engel & Gomes Porto Joao (Eds.), *Africa's New Peace and Security Architecture: Continental Embeddedness, Transnational Linkages, Strategic Relevance* (pp. 11–30) (Farnham: Ashgate).

Zondi, S. (2012) *South Africa in Southern Africa: A Perspective*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Retrieved from library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/mosambik/09403-no-8.pdf