



Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional

ISSN: 0034-7329

rbpi@ibri-rbpi.org.br

Instituto Brasileiro de Relações Internacionais
Brasil

Duarte Villa, Rafael Antonio; Viana, Manuela Trindade
Security issues during Lula's administration: from the reactive to the assertive approach
Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional, vol. 53, diciembre, 2010, pp. 91-114
Instituto Brasileiro de Relações Internacionais
Brasília, Brasil

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=35817453006>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal
Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

Artigo

Security issues during Lula's administration: from the reactive to the assertive approach

*Questões de segurança no governo Lula:
da perspectiva reativa para a afirmativa*

RAFAEL ANTONIO DUARTE VILLA*
MANUELA TRINDADE VIANA**

Rev. Bras. Polít. Int. 53 (special edition): 91-114 [2010]

Introduction

An analysis of continuities and changes in Brazilian foreign policy during Lula's administration is only possible through careful observation of the two mandates under his power. This assertion stems from the fact that there was, during these eight years, a gradual process of structuring and consolidating the country's foreign policy. In this sense, Lula's foreign policy during 2006-2010 can only be read together with the structural modifications promoted during his first tenure¹. This is valid for all the issues in the foreign policy agenda, but especially important for security.

The gradual process mentioned above allowed a new and remarkable feature on Brazil's foreign policy: the movement from a reactive to a more assertive approach towards security issues. Indeed, in Lula's first mandate there was an emphasis on reacting to proposals related to terrorism presented by United States and also those discussed in the Organization of American States (OAS); in the second one, it is possible to identify a considerably active role as regards security issues, such as the deploy of Brazilian troops to join the stabilization mission in Haiti, the negotiations with Colombia's Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC) for hostage liberation, the mediation on the controversy on nuclear energy involving Iran, among others. It can be argued that, until Lula's first administration, Brazil didn't have a security policy at the regional level. Due to this "vacuum" left by

* Professor of the Department of Political Science and of the Institute for International Relations of the University of São Paulo – USP, Brazil (rafaelvi@usp.br).

** Master's Degree by the Department of Political Science of the University of São Paulo – USP, Brazil, and Researcher in the Center for International Relations at the same university.

1 This article passes briefly through the main points of inflection between Fernando Henrique Cardoso's and Lula's administration. For a more complete analysis regarding this matter, see: Villa; Viana (2008).

Brazil, the initiative towards security issues in South America has been traditionally taken by the United States.

Furthermore, Lula's second mandate reveals a "worldlization" of the foreign policy agenda on security – in contrast with the regionalization that has characterized Brazil's foreign policy in this area. Of course, the country's involvement in debates, for instance, on Middle East security issues has always existed. Nevertheless, the proactive aspect in Brazil's foreign policy constitutes the main feature that distinguishes Lula's second mandate from the past administrations.

Having these ideas as its fundamental base, this paper is structured in four sections. First, it deeply analyzes what we consider to be Brazil's "reactive approach" towards security issues during Lula's first mandate (2002-2006). The second and third sections focus on the two main elements in relation to which a more assertive approach can be identified: the expansion of the foreign policy agenda in terms of security towards global issues; and the innovative features through which Brazil's security policy towards South America was exercised during Lula's second mandate. The last section of this paper analyses the impacts of the elements mentioned above over Brazil's relations with the United States.

The reactive period

Lula's first mandate conserves, in general terms, the major characteristics that have prevailed since Itamar Franco's administration (1992-1993)² (Villa; Viana, 2008) a period known as "autonomy through integration". This doctrine was essentially different from the one called "autonomy through distance", attributed to Brazilian foreign policy from Ernesto Geisel's (1974-1979) to José Sarney's government (1985-1988).

"Autonomy through distance" presented as its main pillars: i) the diversification of diplomatic and trade relations; ii) the stabilization of Brazil's identity as a developing and Third World country, as well as the country's intensive participation in international regimes related to these categories³; iii) the condemnation of international asymmetries in international trade, finance and nuclear regimes; and iv) the claim for dialogue among nations in the North-South axis instead of the East-West axis⁴.

After Itamar Franco, foreign policy is used in a more systematic way in order to achieve development, an effort made through a model that combined autonomy of action before the international scenario with active participation

2 This position is not consensual: some analysts identify structural differences in Lula's foreign policy, in comparison to the past governments. See, for example, Guilhon Alburquerque (2007) e Weintraub (2007).

3 For instance, Non-Aligned Movement and G-77 (which congregates developing countries).

4 For more information about "autonomy through distance" doctrine features, see: Sennes, 2003; Vizontini, 2003.

in international fora and diversification of external relations. This new doctrine was guided by an attempt to build an identity focused on Brazil's continental proportions, which stressed regional integration as a new form of international insertion. Furthermore, "autonomy through participation" aimed at articulating the aspiration of being a global trader in the medium term with that of being a political global player in the long term.

These goals were followed mainly by three means. First, the Third World activism that characterized previous governments was gradually substituted by a more positive approach towards international regimes, which meant an active participation in multilateral organizations such as World Trade Organization (WTO), United Nations Security Council and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Nevertheless, in all of these fora, Brazil's participation included an active critique about the asymmetries perpetrated by these regimes⁵.

Secondly, Brazil built a more constructive agenda with United States, maintaining at the same time Brazilian foreign policy's autonomy. This position can be illustrated by trade liberalization, privatizations of several governmental companies and the signature of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) – denounced as unfair by Brazilian diplomacy since the 1960's.

Finally, in South America, Brazil gave priority to Mercosur as a special locus for reaffirming its regional leadership (Campos, 2000; Vigevani *et al.*, 2004). This stage was privileged in Brazil's strategy not only in regard to trade and political integration: for security matters, this is also valid.

The security agenda during Lula's first mandate gave continuity to the same guidelines performed by Brazilian foreign policy; specifically in terms of security issues, there were no wide ruptures, comparably to the previous administrations, towards some concerns arising within the continent.

The security reactive agenda was outlined around three points: i) the position on the new architecture for security in the Americas; ii) the attempt to stabilize conflicts in some of the neighboring countries, especially Venezuela; iii) the denial to engage the war on terror approach in South American territory, stressing the need not to securitize regional problems that in fact had its roots derived from the social inequalities, poverty or domestic violence.

The debate about a new security architecture of the inter-American system stemmed from the need to adjust hemispheric institutional design in order to combat threats which have a non-estate nature⁶. As for this point, Brazil reacted positively to new conceptual bases to think hemispheric security: the country

5 In WTO, for instance, Brazil articulated a coalition with developing countries, with the objective to enjoy a better position in the negotiations. In the UN Security Council, Brazil's participation presented an emphasis on the need for redistributing seats among the Organization members so that it could include developing and least developed countries in its decision making process. Finally, a more intense participation in the IMF was seen as a good strategy to achieve better terms to the negotiation of the country's debt.

6 These issues were analyzed in Villa, 1999.

accepted the concept of multidimensional security⁷ – as institutionalized by the OAS in 2003 – as well as the new role for regional armed forces. However, Brazil opposed the proposal presented by the US delegation, according to which Armed Forces and national police forces cooperated in the fight against drugs, terrorism and even migration.

As regards South America, Brazil's reaction aimed at avoiding that internal crisis escalating towards political instability in the regional sphere. Defined by Itamaraty's discourse as "non-intervention without indifference" (Amorim, 2004) the role played by Brazil can be understood through concepts that entail democracy, political stability, regional security and economic integration, searching, at the same time, for a political initiative facing the United States.

Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador – countries that went through political instability in 2003, 2004 and 2005, respectively – were objects of Lula's administration special attention. Brazilian diplomacy led the creation of the *Friends of Venezuela Group*, an initiative considered to be the first moment of audacity in Brazil's foreign policy (Carvalho, 2003). Gathering the OAS, Chile, United States, Mexico, Portugal and Spain, the *Friends of Venezuela Group* facilitated the negotiation between diverging actors in May 2003 – more than a year after the coup attempt against Hugo Chávez, in April 2002, which triggered the political crisis in Venezuela. As for the Bolivian crisis, in October 2003, Lula's Special Adviser on Foreign Policy, Marco Aurélio Garcia, played an important role in the negotiations that led to a political solution that resulted in the renouncement of the President Sanchez de Lozada. As regards the 2005 institutional crisis in Ecuador, Brazil's participation was determinant in the negotiation of a diplomatic agreement that established the exile, in the Brazilian Embassy, of President Lucio Gutiérrez, who was then transferred to Brasília by Brazilian Air Force airplanes.

In respect to the adoption of the war on terror approach in South America, Brazil neither recognized the presence of terrorist groups in the region, nor accepted the denomination of some guerrillas as terrorist groups – despite US and Colombia's pressures in this direction⁸. However, the denial to accept these approaches was

7 The Declaration on Security in the Americas resulting from the Special Conference on Security (OEA/Ser.K/XXXVIII.CES/DEC.1/03 rev. 1), held in Mexico City in October 2003, recognizes that "states of the Hemisphere face both traditional threats to security and new threats, concerns, and other challenges that, in view of their complex characteristics, have meant that security is multidimensional in nature" (preamble). More specifically, "new threats, concerns, and other challenges are cross-cutting problems that require multifaceted responses by different national organizations and in some cases partnerships between governments, the private sector, and civil society all acting appropriately in accordance with democratic norms and principles, and constitutional provisions of each state. Many of the new threats, concerns, and other challenges to hemispheric security are transnational in nature and may require appropriate hemispheric cooperation" (4.k). Available at: <<http://www.oas.org/en/sms/docs/DECLARATION%20SECURITY%20AMERICAS%20REV%201%20-%2028%20OCT%202003%20CE00339.pdf>>. Access: 7 Aug. 2010.

8 It is worth mentioning that Barack Obama's new national security strategy, launched on May 2010, abandoned the global war on terror doctrine. Despite defining Al-Qaeda as the main threat to United States security, the "Obama doctrine" defines American partnerships beyond United States traditional allies and includes countries such as China and India.

not followed by an alternative proposition, leading to a vacuum of initiative in the region, which was historically filled by the United States – especially in the Andean countries.

The “worldlization” of Brazilian foreign policy

By the end of Lula's first mandate, it was possible to notice that the complete rupture expected when he was elected did not happen. Instead, the president conducted foreign policy according to the same pillars that characterized the “autonomy through participation”. During Lula's second mandate, the initial efforts to differentiate Brazil's foreign policy resulted in the expansion of some differences, beyond the institutional and multilateral spheres. In this period, Brazil's security foreign policy presented a more active approach while Lula's administration took advantage of the initiatives both in global and regional multilateralism. Particularly, this approach was evident through Brazil's claim of a UN Security Council permanent membership; in the proposal to create an autonomous regional defense council at Unasur; and in the technological modernization of Brazilian military forces. All of these actions were underlined by the search for political objectives under a regional label.

Although the claim for a permanent seat in the UN Security Council does not constitute a new goal – it has been in Brazil's foreign policy agenda since Itamar Franco's government (1992-1993) –, Lula's second mandate approach to this matter presents discontinuities in comparison to past administrations regarding the intensity and methods applied to accomplish this goal.

Since 1992, Brazilian diplomats have emphasized the importance of implementing a reform in United Nations structure so that the organization can reflect the changes observed in power distribution in the international scenario. Assuming the existence of a different international order, Brazilian government has since then put the incorporation of new actors as an indispensable measure to maintain the efficiency and reliability of the United Nations. Put differently, this doctrine associated Brazil's aspiration with the process of democratization of international relations, suggesting that the incorporation of Brazil as the developing world representative in the permanent group of countries in the Security Council would contribute to minimize the legitimacy deficit in this international organization (Silva, 2004).

Despite essentially presenting elements of continuity in comparison to the doctrine established by previous governments, Lula's foreign policy approach presented important discontinuities. Firstly, the reference on the democratization of international relations is as strong an idea as a political interest. Quoting Lula: “It is not enough to watch world events distantly and subordinately: we want our voice to be heard and respected. We are taking big steps on this direction”. (Silva, 2004) In this sense, the president and the diplomats explicitly communicate the

means applied in order to pursue what this administration considers the country's political interests to be. A similar conduct was taken towards the announcements of Brazil's regional and global preferences.

Secondly, there is very strong belief that Brazil's respectability throughout the world undergoes participation in the UN Security Council and that developing countries' leaders are favorable to the Brazilian claim. This self-perception is reinforced by the presidential figure: "Our partners recognize that Brazil assumed its weight and importance in the community of nations", affirms Lula (Silva, 2004).

It is possible that Brazil's relative power in the international arena is misrepresented according to developing countries perceptions. However, there is no doubt that these actions aiming at adequate means and ends have led to some novel aspects of Brazil's foreign policy. First, the action through coalitions was one of the main methods applied by diplomats during Lula's administration, a trend in which the claim for a seat in the Security Council also fits: Brazil led the articulation of G-4 (constituted by Brazil, Germany, Japan and India), whose members consider themselves potential occupants of a permanent seat in the Council. Even in the case of a negative result – after United States and China blocked the possibility of reform in the Council –, Brazil was supported by a considerable number of South American countries and some important medium powers, such as France, Russia, Spain and China. As the Chinese vice-minister recognized, "Brazil is the greatest developing country in the Western Hemisphere and we attribute a great importance to its role in regional and international issues (...) China is disposed to intensify its collaborations with the Brazilian part as regards the reform on the Security Council" (Trevisan, 2004, A10)

Brazil's efforts to participate on UN peace operations – notably in Haiti – can also be understood as a strategy circumscribed in the country's aspiration of participating in the Council as a permanent member. It is relevant to underline that Brazil joined UN peace missions in East Timor and Angola during Cardoso's governments. Nevertheless, the activism in the Haitian case reveals a more explicit way to aspire for a seat in that body⁹.

The consequences of this more active involvement towards regional security issues can be seen as a paradox. On one side, there is the Brazilian perspective of a multipolar world with strengthened regional powers. Brazil's aspiration of affirming its autonomy and neutralizing United States military goals in the regional sphere can also be understood in this involvement, especially after Plan Colombia, considered by Brazilian government to be the main responsible for the militarization observed in the Andean and Amazon regions. On the other side, sending troops to Haiti can be understood as a message to the United States that

⁹ As put in an article published in *The Economist*, "Brazil has long been a gentle and introverted giant, content to be a bystander on the world stage. Now that is changing". Available at: <www.economist.com>. Access: 30 Oct 2009.

Brazil is able to share political and economic costs related to peace missions. This message is positive to the United States, since they are looking for partners with whom to share the costs of regional security.

Anyway, Brazilian action is innovative – it can't be forgotten that it refused to send troops to Haiti in the beginning of the 90s, when this country was facing a crisis. However, this action lacks some necessary legitimacy degree (Soares de Lima, 2006), having all the decision processes been concentrated on the Executive, especially on the Presidency and the Defense Ministry.

Therefore, Lula's multilateral action moves in the normative sphere through the re-affirmation of a discourse that can be summed up as follows: "be attentive to the need of those who are more vulnerable, defending a free, fair and egalitarian international trade, and democratization of deliberative instances. Our compromise with democracy and with popular participation is reflected in the purpose of working together to strengthen multilateralism, stimulating more transparent and legitimate forums, which are representative of international cooperation" (Amorim, 2004b). As regards these principles, it seems to exist no innovation, since diplomacy continues to have its traditional doctrinaire motivations: the pacifist discourse backed by negotiation and international intermediation as a way of resolving conflicts; and the re-affirmation of a juridicism that dates back to the 20th century. By adding to these two characteristics the democratization of the international system, in which prevails the existence of politically autonomous units, not subordinated to any superior, it is possible to understand why Lafer (2001) considers Brazil's foreign policy to be "Grotian".

To sum up, if the plea for a permanent seat in the Security Council was already present in Cardoso's administration (Amorim, 1994; Guimarães, 1999), it was manifested with greater intensity during Lula's government. Moreover, the deployment of Brazilian troops and command forces in Haiti reveals the rising of a new actor in Brazil's foreign policy on security: the Ministry of Defense. All of the activities in Haiti – from training and sending troops to the coordination of Brazilian military and civil personnel – are in charge of the Ministry of Defense. Recently, a cooperation agreement signed by United States' Department of Defense and Brazil's Ministry of Defense also reveals a greater participation of this latter Ministry in foreign policy on security¹⁰. This could mean that the conduction of Brazil's foreign policy agenda on security is not anymore monopolized by Itamaraty.

However, the most important income that derived from the emerging role of the Ministry of Defense was that global goals were associated to the goal of strengthening the national defense agencies, especially the Armed Forces and the construction of a collective and regional body on security. This idea can be

10 The content of the agreement is available at: <https://www.defesa.gov.br/mostra_materia.php?ID_MATERIA=34008>. Access: 15 Aug. 2010.

accentuated if we singularize two measures taken by Lula's administration which connected directly defense and security policies: the gradual modernization of national armed forces; and the proposal of creating a South American Defense Council. In September 2007, President Lula announced the creation of a working group which, under the direction of the Ministry of Defense and coordination of Mangabeira Unger, then Secretary of Strategic Affairs, would formulate guidelines for a modernization plan directed to the Armed Forces. The Strategic Plan of National Defense – or Plan to Accelerate Growth (PAC, in Portuguese) in Defense, as it became known in the media – takes into account three broad goals: i) to review defense strategies; ii) to reactivate the domestic arms industry; iii) to assure the autonomy of defense policy. Directly linked to these goals, the PAC in Defense aims at addressing the following concrete concerns: i) what are the best strategies for peacetimes and war; ii) how to organize the Armed Forces, operationally equipped with cutting-edge technologically; iii) how to reactivate the national industry of armaments accordingly to the autonomy in defense; iv) how to identify the Armed Forces with the nation, especially on the defense of borders in the Amazon as a priority, compulsory military service and social tasks; and v) how to establish lines for the Armed Forces in situations of maintenance of order and the rule of law.

Additionally, it doesn't seem plausible that the modernization project of Brazilian armed forces is derived from an analogous modernization ongoing in any neighboring country. Instead, Brazil's main motivation seems to reside in the projection of its hemispheric and global role, that is, in the search for adequacy with the country's status of emerging global and multidimensional actor – which include not only economic but also political and security aspects. "Brazil is well-positioned to initiate a sustained arms buildup increasingly supported by its own domestic industries (...) The choice of the three finalist aircrafts – significantly, two are from NATO member states and one is from a state that might as well be – suggests something of essential importance about the way Brazil views its future. Despite shifting geopolitical realities around the world and its own rise to regional prominence over the next decade, Brazil does not appear to foresee a major conflict or even an adversarial relationship with the West" (Stratfor, 2008)¹¹.

The proposal presented by Brazilian Unasur delegation to create a regional body of defense can also be interpreted as a measure aligned with the country's political goal towards the region. In this sense, the process of "South Americanization" could be understood as "an important leverage" to build up Brazil's national development project (Monteiro, 2001, p. 2) in which "collective security complements national security," (Idem, p. 4). As Medeiros points out, "The emerging question is: to what extent is regional integration as proposed by

¹¹ This note refers to an international bidding process referring the purchase of military aircrafts by the Brazilian Air Force

Brazil an end in itself (i.e., an aim to promote the interests of the whole region) – or is it a means to achieve the objectives of Brazilian foreign policy? (Medeiros, 2010, p. 175)

This reflection becomes more striking when one observes that, especially in Lula's second mandate, the country adopts a foreign security policy with a more incisive character. Two events can be cited in this direction. Firstly, the South American Defense Council could be seen as an instrument of collective defense. The idea is considered to be strategic for Brazil's future in the region, according to the Presidency's Center for Strategic Affairs (Núcleo de Assuntos Estratégicos da Presidência da República – NAE, in Portuguese). Secondly, the Defense Minister, Nelson Jobim's, campaign throughout South America, at the end of 2007, to promote the establishment of a regional collective defense body (Medeiros, *ibid.*, p. 176).

More recently, one of the steps forward taken by Brazilian diplomacy on security issues was the recent mediation played by Brazil and Turkey on an agreement with Iran. On May 2010, the three countries signed a document – known as the Tehran Declaration – through which the Iranian government committed itself to send 1,2 ton of Uranium to Turkey, where the material would be enriched and sent back to Tehran in order to be applied to medical research.

The agreement represented an effort of Brazilian diplomacy to avoid the renewal of sanctions towards that Persian country in the UN Security Council. However, the initiative can also be interpreted as an attempt to leap further towards international recognition of Brazil's capability to build dialogues on hard topics on the world security agenda and, in this sense, to advance on its quest for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Despite the UN Security Council's refusal to accept the agreement as a confidence building move, it is worth saying that it was the first time that a developing country assumed a proactive position in core negotiations on world security and stability.

South America: still on the top, but with a different emphasis

South America has always been on the top of Brazil's foreign policy agenda (Almeida, 2008; Bandeira, 2006; Onuki, 2006). Indeed, the country has always seen the region as an area of its natural influence, given its proportions on territory, population and economy (Bandeira, 2006). Nevertheless, Brazilian government's main efforts were more often directed to intraregional trade relations.

As for the political dialogues, these rarely evoked the multilateral coordination between South American countries in security matters. Moreover, the predominant approach towards security issues was characterized by bilateral geometries and by a reactive position.

It can also be argued that United States influence in some of South American countries – notably Colombia and Peru – favored a more militarized treatment

towards some of the problems faced by these countries. The most evident example can be found in anti-drug policies led by the United States in Andean countries. Indeed, Plan Colombia – considered to be the highlight of American foreign policy to fight drug production – has presented an unequivocal solution to the problem: the military one. The securitization of the drug problem was gradually deepened and culminated with the creation of battalions specialized on assuring the success of fumigation operations in Colombia. Even US involvement with the Colombian armed conflict was read through the narcotized and securitized lenses that characterized American foreign policy towards the region¹².

In this context, Lula's administration represents a watershed regarding the promotion of an approach based on pillars different from the bilateral-reactive-militarized tripod prevailing in the previous period. An emblematic initiative in this sense is the creation of Union of South American Nations (Unasur, in Spanish), in 2008.

Stemmed from a Brazilian proposal, the Unasur project resulted from numerous summits¹³ involving South American chiefs of State and government representatives. The initiative was formalized in the Cuzco Declaration (December 8th, 2004), a document in which the participants affirmed their determination to gradually build a South American identity and citizenship as well as to develop a regional *locus* of integration in political, economical, social, cultural and environmental issues, besides its emphasis on infrastructure as a channel to reduce asymmetries among the countries of the region. The project was then temporarily called as South American Community of States (CASA, in Spanish), until the Isla Margarita Summit (Venezuela), in 2007, when it was renamed Unasur.

Despite the modifications on the initial draft, its main innovative traits remained intact: i) rupture with the bilateralism that has prevailed up to that moment in South American countries intra-regional relations; and ii) rupture with the priority given to trade in previous integration processes developed within the region. These two characteristics are directly related to the approach given to security issues by Lula's administration, especially after his second mandate (2006-2010).

Firstly, Unasur is essentially a multilateral project, an aspect which is reinforced in its constitutive treaty: "[Unasur is seen as a] decisive step towards the strengthening of multilateralism and the force of law in international relations, in order to achieve a multipolar, balanced and fair world" (Tratado Constitutivo da Unasul, Preâmbulo).

¹² For more information, see: Viana, 2009.

¹³ The first dialogue that promoted a closer cooperation between South American countries happened in 2000, at the first Summit of South American Presidents, in Brasília (Brazil). It is worth mentioning that this attempt to approximate South American leaders happened in a context of regional apprehension because of controversies surrounding Plan Colombia. On the third summit, the participants of Cuzco Summit (Ecuador, 2004) decided to create the South American Community of States (CASA). From 2000 to 2008 there were seven summits of South American presidents.

It was the first time that an institutional and multilateral initiative was launched in South America. Thus, with its 12 State members¹⁴, Unasur represents a rupture with the bilateralism or unilateralism that has since then characterized the relations between the governments of the region.

Furthermore, the emerging South American bloc constituted a multilateral project which, for the first time, did not privilege the trade agenda among its members. Among the multiple goals upon which Unasur is structured¹⁵, three of them open room for debates related to security issues: i) to strengthen the political dialogue between State members, aiming to assure a coordination space in order to reinforce South American integration and Unasur's participation in the international scenario; ii) to stimulate the coordination between South American States' specialized agencies, respecting international norms, with the objective of strengthening the fight against terrorism, corruption, "the world problem of drugs", human trafficking, weapons traffic, transnational organized crime and other threats, as well as to address disarmament, non-proliferation of nuclear and massive destruction weapons and mines removal; and iii) to exchange information and experience in defense matters.

Some elements are noteworthy on this excerpt. First of all, it seems plausible to argue that the choice for the terms "the world problem of drugs" reveals a South American historical claim to a broader understanding of the fight against drugs. Indeed, many governments in the region – especially those whose international image has been affected by this problematic – have protested against the supply-side-approach¹⁶ underlying developed United States policies to combat the problem of drugs, that is, the idea that the most efficient way to fight it is to eradicate the problem on the source axis, not on the demand one. South American presidents have insisted that the responsibility on the existence of narcotraffic lies also on those countries whose citizens largely consume drugs. Thus, the emphasis on the drug problem as a "world problem" must be read in this context.

Another interesting aspect related to the goals highlighted above is the formalization of the cooperation in defense matters between South American States. This is an ongoing practice in some countries of the region, notably Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador and Venezuela, initiatives which were also intensified during Lula's mandate. Brazil's Federal Police has promoted joint operations with neighboring countries' police forces to fight organized crime, often relying on the United States support as regards logistics, personnel and finance. In early

14 UNASUR members are: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Uruguay and Venezuela.

15 Unasur's Constitutive Treaty presents 21 goals for the integration project, which include economical, political, social and cultural spheres. These are specified in the second and third articles of the above mentioned treaty, available at: <www.integracionsur.com/sudamerica/TratadoUnasurBrasil08.pdf>. Access: August 9th, 2010.

16 To see how this approach was used by United States in its anti-drug policy, visit the Office of National Drug Control Policy website, at: <<http://www.ondcp.gov/policy/ndcs.html>>. Access: 14 Aug. 2010.

2006, there were nine operations¹⁷ along the boundaries with other countries nearby the Amazon forest. Additionally, through the establishment of the Amazon Surveillance System (SIVAM) in 2001, which includes surveillance and alarm units, the Brazilian government shared data collected by the system¹⁸ with Colombia, so that this country could expand its military, police and environmental control over the Amazon region (Urighen, 2005, p. 182; Guzzi, op. cit). Similar measures were also taken towards Peru and Ecuador with whom Brazil signed military cooperation agreements, which a schedule of annual meetings between the Parties.

As regards security, there is another interesting aspect in the process of consolidating Unasur. A careful analysis of the documents on the initial period of South American integration reveals that there was an attempt to associate the emphasis on poverty and social inequality eradication with the de-securitization of some problems faced by the countries in the region. More specifically, the documents often invoked the terms “citizen security” to refer to the need for States to deliver better life conditions and economic development to their citizens. This development is here broadly understood, involving income fair and balanced distribution, access to education, promotion to social inclusion and cohesion, as well as the environmental protection¹⁹. After an inter-ministerial meeting in 2005, involving Ministries of Justice, Defense and others in charge of issues related to this concept of security, South American leaders recognized that “social inequality is one of the causes of violence and insecurity in South America, at the same time that the latter hampers better levels of social equality” (Declaration on Citizen Security in South America, 2005, preamble). Regardless of the attempt to formalize regional cooperation on a new approach towards security, the term “citizen security” was gradually removed from the official documents, which may

17 These are COBRA and CRAF operations, on the border with Colombia; PEBRE (Peru); and VEBRA (Venezuela). Besides these, in the regions defined as a second priority, the operations performed were: GUISTU (Guyana and Suriname); BRABO (Bolivia); “Ribeirinho”, along all Amazon border; Alliance (Paraguay); and the Southern Cone (Argentina and Uruguay).

18 Seeking to respond to a challenge identified by surveillance systems data – according to which most of the drug entering Brazil was carried by small planes –, the government approved, through the Decree N. 5.144/2004, the Destruction Shot Law (*Lei do Tiro de Destruição*, in Portuguese, which regulates a 1988 law on aircrafts intercepting in Brazilian aerial space, in case these are suspected to be carrying illegal drugs into the country. The previous law – Law N. 9.614/1998 – determined that “Once legally specified means of coercion are exhausted, the aircraft will be classified as hostile, thus subjected to destruction”. The Decree approved in 2004 specifies concepts such as “means of coercion”, hostile aircraft” and “destruction”. The full content of the Decree N. 5.144 is available at: <https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2004-2006/2004/Decreto/D5144.htm>. Access: 07 Aug. 2010.

19 See: Declaração de Ayacucho (available at: <<http://casa.mre.gov.br/documentos/reuniao-presidencial-de-cusco/declaracao-de-ayacucho/>>; access: 14 Aug. 2010); Declaração Presidencial e Agenda Prioritária (available at: <<http://casa.mre.gov.br/documentos/i-reuniao-de-chefes-de-estado/declaracao-presidencial-e-agenda-prioritaria>>; access: 14 Aug. 2010) and Declaração sobre Segurança Cidadã na América do Sul (available at: <<http://casa.mre.gov.br/documentos/i-reuniao-de-chefes-de-estado/declaracao-sobre-seguranca-cidada-na-america-do-sul>>; access: 14 Aug. 2010).

illustrate the difficulty to find a common ground on de-securitization matters between South American countries, as well as the lack of priority of this approach in some of the foreign policy agendas.

Despite the broad range of themes on Unasur's scope, it can be argued that the South American integration project dedicated a privileged space for defense and security issues. More specifically, beside the four-body institutional structure²⁰ approved in the final version of the bloc's constitutive treaty, State members accepted, in 2008, Brazil's proposal to create the South American Defense Council (CDS, in Spanish). The objective of the new institution is to promote the cooperation between Unasur members in security issues, the coordination on joint defense policies, the exchange of armed forces personnel, the joint participation on United Nations peace operations, among others.

Therefore, the CDS does not assume a conventional military alliance between South American countries such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). With the objective of clarifying the traits that differentiate CDS from past international initiatives on security, Brazil's Minister of Defense, Nelson Jobim, visited South American countries before the Brasilia Summit (May 2008). According to the Brazilian government, a forum specifically dedicated to defense and security matters in the region could avoid crises such as the one that involved Colombia and Ecuador in 2008. Moreover, CDS's institutional deepening could contribute to defend the region from potential external interventions. Nevertheless, South American leaderships did not reach a consensus on that occasion: the Brazilian proposition was only immediately accepted by Argentina, Bolivia, Venezuela and – with some reservations – by Uruguay. Beside the disagreement between Andean countries on the decision-making procedures to be incorporated to the Council, Colombia also insisted that OAS constituted the appropriate forum to discuss issues related to regional security.

Despite the approval of the CDS by Unasur's members on December 2008, the possibility that the proposal is interpreted by South American countries as an instrument for Brazil's projection may become an obstacle for consolidating the CDS. This defense body could certainly improve Brazilian military capability. However, being a mechanism of defense cooperation, it doesn't seem plausible to hold that the CDS could induce regional suspicion as regards Brazil's motivations, or that it could trigger an arms race in South America (Amaral, 2004, p. 32).

Anyhow, Unasur's CDS fills a vacuum related to autonomous initiatives towards South America security issues, in which United States usually takes the lead (Hirst, 2003; Villa, 2007). Its most distinguishing trait is the quest for multilateral solutions to conflicts in the region, which downplays unilateral measures as well as the role of OAS in South American security issues, considered

20 The South American bloc is composed by the Chiefs of State and Government Council (UNASUR's main decision body); the Ministers of Foreign Affairs Council; the Delegates Council; and the General Secretariat.

to “not sufficient for the current challenges and threats presented in the continent” (Cepik, 2009, p. 230).

The mediation played at the end of 2008 by Unasur on the Bolivian crisis involved Evo Morales’ administration and indigenous groups on one side, and governors of Eastern provinces on the other. The conflict threatened to trigger a conflict escalation and, then, the destabilization of Bolivia’s political scenario. As put by Emilio Mendez do Valle (2008), Unasur’s mediation meant, firstly, that South American countries could formulate solutions through their own means, that is, without United States mediation; secondly, the strong support to Morales and to the democracy on the country represented a joint South American initiative towards Andean countries. To Brazil, this meant an assertive reaction to the critique that its security policy – as well as the radius of this one – is limited to Mercosur (Pagliari, 2009).

Despite the optimism surrounding Unasur, the region still faces the persistence of bilateral problems between some of its members – for instance, those involving Colombia and Ecuador, or Venezuela and Colombia.

One of the first challenges faced by the South American bloc consists of the close relations between Colombia and the United States. The history and nature of these relations conflict directly with one of the main motivations underlying the CDS: the autonomous conduction of South American security agenda. The dynamics of the presidential meeting in Bariloche (Argentina), on August 2009, was affected by the announcement made by Colombian government of a cooperation agreement with the United States through which Bogotá authorized American troop presence in seven military bases in the Andean country. The initiative was justified as a continuity of the bilateral efforts to fight narcotrafficking and terrorism in the Andean region, as well as a necessary measure face the removal of American troops from Manta military base (Ecuador). Brazil²¹ and Venezuela critiques considered the measure a threat to regional stability, once it could result in the permanent presence of US troops in the region. Moreover, Brazil accused the agreement of being incompatible with the Colombian government’s declarations that the guerrillas were significantly weakened during Uribe’s administration. During the discussions, South American Presidents pressured Colombia to reveal the content of the agreement – which had not been signed at the time – as well as to accept a proposal related to transparency on cooperation in military matters. However, divergences observed in the Bariloche presidential summit were not reflected in the declaration finally approved by all Unasur members.

This was not the first occasion in which Colombia was considerably isolated in multilateral talks with its South American neighbors. Indeed, the military aspect of United States presence in Colombia constitutes a constant topic of concern

21 One of these military bases is about 50km distant from the boundaries with the region known as “Cabeça de Cachorro”, on Amazon Northwest.

towards the armed conflict faced by the Andean country. Traditionally, Brazil sustains that political or violent conflict in South America countries should be interpreted as a social-rooted problem. As a conflict stemmed from development gaps and social and political inequality, Brazil holds that its resolution can't be found in the military sphere²².

If the two declarations of the CDS²³ suggest some advances on the intra-regional cooperation in defense matters – such as data disclosure and transparency on the conduction of military exercises –, the South American Council was put to the test on matters of its members' relations with extra-regional countries, as it was the case of the agreement signed by the United States and Colombia. Indeed, Unasur's constitutive treaty and CSN's statute reveal a gap in respect to how the previous sub-regional integration projects – namely, Community of Andean Nations (CAN, in Spanish) and Mercosur – and the repertoire of bilateral cooperation agreements with non-South American countries will be articulated inside Unasur's structure. These are challenges with which the South American bloc still has to handle, given the divergences in security agenda among some of its members.

For Brazil Unasur is also a bridge for the cooperation with neighboring countries, especially the Bolivian case. Vaz (2002) defends that the current peculiarity of the security relations among South American countries is given by “the fact that potentials threats don't emanate from state policies”. But if any moment there was possibility what Brazilian interest in matters of security would be threatened by other South American state, that happened in the episode that embraces the (re) nationalization of gas and petroleum by the Evo Morales government on May 1st 2006. That was the most polemic and defensive moment within South America exactly because it involved a problem of energetic security. Brazil is the first client of the Bolivian gas (having imported more than 30 million cubic feet from Bolivia in 2006). On the other side, the Brazilian company, Petrobras– Brazil's Petroleum – was the main investor in these Bolivian gas and oil sectors and all of the refineries were operated by Petrobras. But the principal impact derived from that fact is that part of the Brazilian industry had changed its technological matrix in order to adequate this to the consumption of natural

22 Regardless of the consideration that the Colombian crisis is a matter of domestic nature, the large boundary that Brazil shares with Colombia has stimulated some concerns about the resulting scenario of offensive military operations led by Uribe's administration in the Colombian Amazon forest. Particularly, Brazil fears that guerrillas can use the Brazilian territory as a base for operations or temporal refuge to escape from Colombian army's offensive. Brazil is also concerned with the possibility that drug traffic groups use Brazilian territory in order to expand coca-leaf crops or to install cocaine processing labs. In this regard, the Federal Police of Brazil decided to promote joint operations with neighbor countries' police forces to fight organized crime.

23 See Santiago Declaration (available at: <<http://www.cdsunasur.org/es/consejo-de-defensa-suramericano/documentos-oficiales/57-espanol/161-declaracion-de-santiago-de-chile-2009>>; access: 15 Aug. 2010) and Quito Declaration (available at: <<http://www.cdsunasur.org/es/consejo-de-defensa-suramericano/documentos-oficiales/57-espanol/150-reunion-extraordinaria-de-ministros-de-relaciones-exteriores-y-de-defensa-de-la-unasur>>; access: 15 Aug. 2010).

gas. The episode involving the Bolivian government also arose more problems by the Brazilian government because it meant the participation of other regional actors with political projects that, at first sight, seemed to be competing with Brazil. Especially the Brazilian sectors, inside and out of the government, saw in the episodes that followed the Bolivian nationalization a strong influence of the Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez, as well as the Venezuelan oil company PDVSA – Venezuela’s Petroleum. Despite the exaggeration in the affirmation of Chávez’s regional leadership potential, it is true that his administration took the regional leading role from Brazil, contributing to an uncomfortable diplomatic atmosphere between both countries²⁴. However, this crisis involving Bolivia has also revealed that old negative images, as that of Brazilian sub-imperialism, are still strong in the imagery of nationalist sectors in South American countries. However, the Brazilian nationalistic wave erected by the Bolivian nationalization accused Lula’s administration of not being firm in defense of the national interest and Petrobras’ interests in Bolivia; Lula’s government maintained one moderated position and continued to manage the situation inside the boundaries of the diplomatic treatment. The main example of that moderate position was the delay of some military maneuvers that the Brazilian army had scheduled exactly for the weeks when the nationalization happened. The rationale of the Brazilian government seems to have been action in a pragmatic way, so that the process of integration would be preserved and, in the medium range, could have accommodated Brazil’s, the Petrobras’s and the Bolivian government’s interests. That in fact happened when the Petrobras signed an agreement of compensation by the investments that Brazilian companies, all in the infra-structure sector, like refineries, made in Bolivia since 1996. At the same time, negotiations on new Brazilian investments were retaken²⁵.

Bolivia, on the other hand, also brought to Unasur’s multilateralism its first diplomatic victory when, in the end of 2008, the new institution avoided escalation and greater instability of Morales’s government. Reinforcing democracy, Unasur avoided a new delay in the process of regional integration²⁶. “As a lesson

24 This major initiative drives of the Venezuelan government was manifested under, at least, two aspects: the purchase of public securities of Argentina’s and Ecuador’s external debts; and the polemical proposal of building a South American pipeline whose extension would be from the South of Venezuela until Patagonia (Argentina). On the other side, addressing the Brazilian Congress, Chancellor Celso Amorim expressed his displeasure with Venezuela’s behavior during the nationalization of the Bolivian gas.

25 On this matter, check: “Brasil deverá anunciar a retomada de investimentos na Bolívia, available at: <http://tv2.rtp.pt/noticias/?article=90184&visual=3&layout=10>. Access on 08/15/2010.

26 In Morales’s government the conflict had its starting point in the claim of the Bolivian Eastern provinces of managing of autonomous way the resources that derived the exploration and commerce of the gas and petroleum. As it is well known in the Eastern provinces of Santa Cruz, Beni, Pando, Sucre and Tarija concentrate greater dynamism of the Bolivian economy because these provinces are the producers of gas and petroleum. Thus it is very common amid local elites according to claim to their provinces a huge part of Bolivian welfare and, therefore, the Bolivian East would have more rights from the profits that are derived from the exploration of gas and oil. This idea is rejected both by Morales administration and by poorest

from experience, the agility of the South America reaction signaled to others countries that South America would not accept any separatism, as well as any external intervention in the continent" (Cepik, 2009, p. 238). In others words, Unasur gave an autonomous answer within South America's security complex, addressing a problem whose dynamics is internal to that complex. For countries like Brazil and Argentina the solution through Unasur was an excellent result in political terms and in security terms. In the case, mainly for Brazil, the success of Unasur's mediation passed the first test, and confirmed its conviction according to which the process of regional integration needs multilateral mechanism to be speedily accessed in particular moments of crisis which threaten the process of integration. In the second case, because Brazil (and Argentina too) depends so much on the supply of the Bolivian gas, national interest was delivered from a collective initiative. It is necessary to remember that the rebel groups in the Bolivian Eastern provinces in a given moment began to attack the gas infra-structure, which affected production and supply.

Partnership and dispute involving the United States: impacts of an assertive approach

Studies on American security policy towards Latin America agree that this region does not figure as a strategic priority to United States interests (see Vilas, 2005; Bonilla, 2004; Messari, 2004). In general, this assertion is correct but it is important to mention that it neglects one important point: although, since the Cold War, South America is not as relevant in strategic terms as other regions – such as the Middle East, Western Europe and Asia –, the United States has kept a coherent security policy for the region²⁷. This is possible due to a solid consensus among Democrats and Republicans that guarantees the continuity of goals

At the same time, differently from the past, now the United States has to deal with threats of a distinct nature in the region: communist states, parties or movements are not anymore perceived as actual threats, but actors and processes such as drug traffickers, migration, political instability, weapons traffic, money laundry, terrorism – all of them of non-estate nature.

social groups (and their organizations), which claim that the resources must be managed and distributed broadly in the Bolivian state, beside the State would have the control over supplies. The top point of this polarization came in September 2008, when the governors of these provinces, all opposition, stimulated local groups to violent actions against indigenous groups and gas infra-structure that resulted in more of two dozen of deaths, mainly between indigenous and peasant groups. By fearing the escalation of the conflict, Unasur called for an emergency meeting, held in Santiago de Chile, on September 15th. The strong support and pressures from Unasur to the Morales government and the internal democratic process were decisive to stabilize and to pace, at least temporarily, the Bolivian political conflict.

27 Plan Colombia, the allocation of military bases, anti-drug policies and anti-terrorist initiatives are some of the measures that validate this assumption.

In this sense, September eleven has presented impacts over the security policy towards South America. Indeed, one important change was the emergence of conceptual and political changes in the way American decision-makers perceived the relation between threat and terrorism. Particularly, the United States global strategy after September eleven propelled a conceptual and material overlap between the war against narcotraffic and the war against terrorism – which was strongly supported by Álvaro Uribe's administration. Therefore, from the conceptual and practical perspective, the Colombian guerrilla, as well as the paramilitaries, became synonymous of terrorism (Villa, 2007).

Brazilian government and its diplomacy diverged from the Colombian and American approach towards guerrilla groups and decided not to consider these armed groups as terrorists, fearing this association could block any possibility of demobilization negotiations. Instead, Brazil offered to participate as a mediator of peace talks, if invited by the government of Colombia. However, this call was never made, so Brazil had no active participation in negotiation processes (Hoffmeister 2003).

Another aspect that was subjected to disagreement between Brazil and United States particularly regards the “new architecture of inter-American system” in order to combat threats which have a non-estate nature. One of the first steps towards this new system was the institutionalization of the Conference of Ministers of Defense, in 1995. On the first meeting, the US delegation presented as one of its objectives the wish that South American countries' Armed Forces cooperated with their national police forces to combat coca crops and other perceptions of non-territorial threats, terrorism and even migration.

The decision to associate Armed Forces and Police in the fight against drug traffic has not been consensual among most of South American countries. Brazil, for example, accepts the concept of multidimensional security²⁸ – as institutionalized by the OAS in 2003 – as well as the new role for regional armed forces, but it disagrees with the United States on the idea that those should be used primarily to combat threats as drug traffic and terrorism.

The Sixth Conference of Ministers of Defense (2004), held in Quito (Ecuador), exposed the tensions between these two perspectives. Especially due to Brazilian pressure, the meeting, which aimed at formulating a type of security

²⁸ The Declaration on Security in the Americas resulting from the Special Conference on Security (OEA/ Ser.K/XXXVIII.CES/DEC.1/03 rev. 1), held in Mexico City in October 2003, recognizes that “states of the Hemisphere face both traditional threats to security and new threats, concerns, and other challenges that, in view of their complex characteristics, have meant that security is multidimensional in nature” (preamble). More specifically, “new threats, concerns, and other challenges are cross-cutting problems that require multifaceted responses by different national organizations and in some cases partnerships between governments, the private sector, and civil society all acting appropriately in accordance with democratic norms and principles, and constitutional provisions of each state. Many of the new threats, concerns, and other challenges to hemispheric security are transnational in nature and may require appropriate hemispheric cooperation” (4.k). Available at: <<http://www.oas.org/en/sms/docs/DECLARATION%20SECURITY%20AMERICAS%20REV%201%20-%2028%20OCT%202003%20CE00339.pdf>>. Access: 7 Aug. 2010.

architecture for the continent, culminated with the rejection, by most of the participant countries, of the proposition that the Armed Forces were turned into a security agency, with police functions (Guzzi, op., cit, 2007, p. 43)

It is noteworthy that the United States proposal may have been motivated not only by changes in perception of threats since the end of the Cold War, but also by the anti drug policies implemented in Bolivia and Peru during the 1990s and in Colombia since 1980s (Thoumi, 2003). In these countries, the illegal production of drugs has been fought both by security agencies (police) and defense agencies (mainly the army). Since late 1990s, however, the case of Colombia experienced a more dramatic change in this direction, especially as regards the involvement of military personnel with security issues (Thoumi, 2002; Viana, 2009).

This approach was gradually materialized through United States narcotized foreign policy towards Colombia (Crandall, 2002) and culminated with the approval of Plan Colombia, a package of US\$ 1,2 billion implemented in 1999. Initially thought by President Pastrana as a Colombian Marshall Plan, the version and budget finally approved by American Congress directed 80% of the resources – until now, approximately US\$ 3,8 billions – to intelligence, training, personnel, arms and equipments dedicated to combat drug traffic in Colombia (Isacson, 2006).

Brazil's reservations towards Plan Colombia are related to the emphasis on military strategy to solve the drug problem and the protracted conflict in the Andean country. Expressed since Fernando Henrique Cardoso's administration, these objections to Plan Colombia sustained the thesis that the United States policy may have spill over effects on other South American countries, that is, the execution of Plan Colombia could result not only in the displacement of drug crops, but also of the refining activities (Hofmeister, 2003, p. 51). Moreover, "the strength of the positions of the United States implies obstacles to the project of South American integration promoted by Brazil" (Castro, 2003, pp. 69-70).

The idea that the strengthening of American presence in Colombia could represent a precedent for United States military engagement in South America was stressed with the installation of seven United States military bases in Colombia, announced in 2009. The cooperation agreement signed between these two countries was seen as an alternative to the withdrawal of bases from Panama (Howard air force base) in 1999, from Puerto Rico (Vieques naval base) in 2003 and from Ecuador (Manta air force base) in 2009. United States removal from these countries demanded that its Department of Defense sought, through the Southern Command, alternatives for American military presence in the region not only to monitor the Caribbean drug transit zone and the production area (Bolivia, Colombia and Peru), but also to support United States war on terror.

Moreover, it can be argued that the United States took advantage of the absence, of regional security initiatives from the main states in the region. The Paraguayan Congress approval to the temporary allocation of United States troops can also be interpreted as a result of the security and defense vacuum,

considering Mercosur main members' omission in relation to the perception of threats in the region known as Triple Border – a reference to the geographical limits between Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay (Flores, 2005/2006, p. 37). In this regard, the negotiations aiming at the allocation of troops in Paraguay and Peru were responded by Brazil and Argentina through an outline of some military measures by the end of 2006.

However, it is important to mention that there were some security issues towards which Brazilian and American governments agreed. Interestingly, former president Cardoso (1994-2002) shared with the United States the perception that drug trafficking and weapon smuggling “posed a threat to national sovereignty”. This announcement, made in 1996, as aligned with the bilateral Agreement to Combat Drug Trafficking, signed in April 1995, which launched a financial and technical cooperation between United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Brazil's Federal Police (Martins Filho, 1999).

During this period – which we consider to be the “reactive” phase of Brazilian foreign policy of Lula's administration –, there were other moments of cooperation between the two countries, especially involving the Triple Border. Once identifying threats related to money laundry in this region, the United States – with Argentinean support – has suggested that Brazil established a regime to regulate financial and bank operations in the Triple Border.

After 9/11, the suspects towards the possibility of terrorist groups' activities in the region – added to the perception that they were not being carefully guarded by the police and intelligence agencies of the countries comprehended in the Triple Border – were accentuated. Thus, the United States State Department announced, in March 2006, that the Agency of Immigration and Customs Inspection would join the Argentinean, Brazilian and Paraguayan governments in order to combat the money laundry and other financial crimes in the Triple Border Area. Moreover, the State Department associated this region to radical Muslim groups funding, such as Hezbollah and Hamas, link assumed to date back to July 1994, when there was a terrorist attack against the Mutual Israeli Argentina Association (AMIA, in Spanish).

In this context, Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay signed an Antiterrorist Agreement to patrol their common boundaries. Additionally, Brazil created, in November 2005, the Regional Intelligence Center in Foz de Iguaçu, which was thought as a national agency that would gradually evolve towards a pivotal unity for cooperation with its neighbors Argentina and Paraguay.

Final Remarks

The analysis of Brazil's foreign policy security agenda during Lula's administration leads to the observation of a heterogeneous approach through the

President's two mandates. While the first tenure (2002-2006) revealed a more reactive approach towards security issues, the second one (2006-2010) presented an assertive position.

Brazil's security agenda during Lula's second mandate was significantly changed in terms of its geographical scope and instruments through which it was exercised. Indeed, this article sustained that the foreign policy on this sphere incorporated more systematically global issues, such as the Iran nuclear weapons negotiations and UN peace missions as a channel to accelerate the country's quest for a permanent seat in the Security Council of this Organization.

South America – which has constantly been an object of Brazil's foreign policy attention – was also approached differently by Lula's administration. Despite being a geographical space historically privileged in Brazil foreign relations, South America was often regarded as a *locus* for economic exchange. Thus, the emphasis on security underlying the regional integration project – through Unasur's CDS – can be read as a thematic fundamental difference in comparison with past administrations. Moreover, the multilateral answer to security problems faced by South American countries also represents a shift in relation to the bilateral approach that has characterized dialogues on security in this region. It also implies that inter-American institutions, like the OAS and its concept of “new architecture of security”, do not offer answers that take into account a regional, more autonomous perspective. The OAS “(...) is not sufficient for the current challenges and threats that are present in the continent. In this sense Unasur draws a different approach from that which has been asserted from the OAS (...)” (Cepik, 2009, p. 230)

It is, thus, interesting to stress how the promotion of a security agenda can be read through the lines of the development of integration projects in the South American experience. In other words, threat perception was not perceived through security lenses only: it was interpreted as a challenge to the integration efforts in the region.

Once the CDS was structured on the idea that the region should develop a more autonomous agenda on security, United States' presence in some of South American countries is interpreted by Brazil as a threat to the integration efforts in the region. At the same time, the creation of the South American Council aims at fulfilling a vacuum left by Brazil's lack of initiative towards South American security topics – a space that has been historically taken by the United States. Thus, it seems plausible to suggest that the consolidation of South American integration project will conflict with the external relations that some of the countries in the region – namely Colombia and Peru – present with the United States. This scenario will certainly lead to further challenges in the quest for Unasur to perform a more preeminent role in international scenario.

References

- ALBURQUERQUE, João Augusto Guilhon (2007). Brazilian foreign policy under Lula: colliding agendas. ALBURQUERQUE, João Augusto Guilhon. *Política Externa do Governo Lula: 2003-2005*. São Paulo: São Marcos, pp. 17-35.
- AMORIM, Celso Luiz Nunes (2004a). Lecture at the Universidade Federal do Ri de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 12 Mar. 2004a. Available at: <<http://www.mre.gov.br/index.htm>>. Access: 20 Jun. 2010.
- AMORIM, Celso Luiz Nunes (2004b). Palestra proferida pelo Ministro Celso Amorim na London School of Economics The Foreign Policy of the Lula Government. Available at: <<http://www.mre.gov.br/index.htm>>. Access: 20 Jun. 2010.
- AMORIM, Celso Luiz Nunes (1994). Uma Diplomacia Voltada para o Desenvolvimento e a Democracia. In: FONSECA JUNIOR, Gelson *et al.* (eds.) *Temas de Política Externa Brasileira II*. São Paulo: IPRI; Paz e Terra.
- BONILLA, Adrián (2004). Percepciones de la amenaza de seguridad nacional de los países andinos: regionalización del conflicto colombiano y narcotráfico. GÓMEZ, José Maria (org.). *América Latina y el (des)orden global neoliberal*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- CAMPOS DE MELLO, Flávia (2000). *Regionalismo e Inserção Internacional: Continuidade e Transformação da Política exterior Brasileira dos Anos 90*. Mimeo. Teses de Doutorado. São Paulo: USP.
- CARVALHO, Leonardo Arginiro de (2003). Limites à política externa brasileira: perspectivas para o governo Lula. CARVALHO, Leonardo Arginiro de. Curitiba: Juruá.
- CASTRO, André D. M. S. de (2003). *A crise na Colômbia: impactos e implicações para o Brasil*. Dissertação de Mestrado. Brasília: Instituto Rio Branco.
- CEPIK, Marcos (2009). Regional security and integration in South America: what UNASUR could learn from the OSCE and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. KANET, Roger (ed.). *The United States and Europe in a changing world*. Republic of the Letters. The Neetherlands/ St. Louis.
- CRANDALL, Russell (2002). *Driven by drugs: US policy toward Colombia*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- FLORES, Mario Cesar (2005/2006). Presença norte-americana no Paraguai. *Política Externa*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (dez-fev), p. 33-40.
- GUIMARÃES, Samuel Pinheiros (1999). *Quinhentos Anos de Periferia*. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal de Porto Alegre.
- GUZZI, André Cavaller (2007). *A Relação EUA-América Latina: medidas e consequências da política externa norte-americana para combater o tráfico ilícito de drogas*. In press.
- HIRST, Monica (2003). Seguridad regional en las Américas. GRABENDORFF, Wolf (ed.) *La seguridad regional en las Américas*. Bogotá: Fescol-Cerec, p. 25-80.
- HOFMEISTER, W. (2003). “Colômbia e seus vizinhos: os tentáculos da instabilidade”. *ICG Relatório sobre a América Latina*, Bogotá/Bruxelas, 2003. Available at: <<http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=7&fileid=4A80D7F1-159D-5B98-92C8-E02A58584819&lng=pt>>. Access: 4 July 2010.

ISACSON, Adam. (2006) Plan Colombia – six years later: report of a CIP staff visit to Putumayo and Medellín, Colombia. *International Policy Report*. Center for International Policy, nov. Disponível em: <<http://www.ciponline.org/colombia/0611ipr.pdf>>.

LAFER, Celso (2001). *A identidade internacional do Brasil e a política externa brasileira*. Passado, presente e futuro. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

MARTINS FILHO, J. R. (1999). *O Governo Fernando Henrique e as Forças Armadas: um passo à frente, dois passos atrás*. Available at: <<http://crab.rutgers.edu/~goertzel/martins.html>>. Access: 4 May. 2010.

MEDEIROS, Oscar Filho (2010). *Entre a cooperação e a dissuasão: políticas de defesa e percepções militares na América do Sul*. Tese de mestrado. Universidade de São Paulo.

MESSARI, Nizar (2004). Existe um novo cenário de segurança?. GOMEZ, Jose María (comp.). *América Latina y el (des) orden global neoliberal*. Rio de Janeiro: CLACSO.

MONTEIRO, Raymundo Guarino (2001). *Uma percepção sobre a segurança hemisférica, a defesa do espaço regional e tropas de paz*. Palestra proferida no IV Encuentro Nacional de Estudios Estratégicos, Buenos Aires, 17-19 Sept. 2001.

PAGLIARI, Graciela de Conti (2009). *O Brasil e a segurança a América do Sul*. Curitiba: Juruá.

PROCÓPIO FILHO, A.; VAZ, A. C. (1997). O Brasil no contexto do narcotráfico internacional. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, Vol. 40, No. 1.

SENNES, Ricardo (2003). *A mudança da política brasileira nos anos 80: uma potência média recém industrializada*. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal de Rio Grande do Sul.

SILVA, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. (2004). “Pronunciamento do presidente Lula em cadeia nacional 20/05/2004 Página Internacional. Boletim Eletrônico de da Secretaria de Relações Internacionais do Partido dos Trabalhadores, V., <http://www.pt.org.br/site/secretarias_def/secretarias_int_box.asp?cod=739&cod_sis=9&cat=901>

SOARES de LIMA. (2006). Decisões e indecisões. Um balanço da política externa no primeiro governo do presidente Lula. *Carta Capital*, ano XIII, no. 425, p. 56-58.

STRATFOR (2008). *Brazil: Momentum builds for Defense Reform*, 2 Oct. 2008, Available at: <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis>. Access: 15 May 2010.

THOUMI, Francisco E. (2003). *Illegal drugs, economy and society in the Andes*. Washington: Woodrow Wilson.

THOUMI, Francisco E. Illegal Drugs in Colombia: From Illegal Economic Boom to Social Crisis. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, No. 582, 2002. Filadélfia, pp. 102-116.

TREVISÁN, Cláudia (2004). China não deve ser temida, diz vice-ministro. *Folha de São Paulo*, 23/05/04.

URIGÜEN, H. M. (2005). *Colômbia y sus vecinos frente al conflicto armado*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

VALLE, Emilio Menendez de. Bolívia: el ejemplo positivo del UNASUR. Available at <http://www.comunidadeandina.org/prensa/articulos/elpais15-10-08.htm> Last access: 30/07/2010.

VAZ, Alcides Costa. “Desafios e Questões de Segurança nas relações do Brasil com os Países Andinos”. Center for Hemispheric Defense and Security Studies. REDES 2002. Research

and Education in Defense and Security Studies, August 7-10, 2002, Brasília, Brazil. Panel on “Las eguridades Emergentes de la Comunidad Andina y MERCOSUR”. Available at: <http://www.unb.br/irel/ibsa/documentos.htm>. Last access: 14/08/2010.

VIGEVANI, Tullo *et. al.* (2003). “A Política exterior Brasileira no Período Cardoso: a Busca de Autonomia pela Integração”, Revista *Tempo Social*, (15) 31-61.

VILLAS, Carlos C. , (2005). “Is there any room for Latin América in US foreign policy”. In: *Journal of Developing Societes*, 21 (3-4).

VILLA, Rafael .Duarte. (2007). Quatro teses sobre a política de segurança dos Estados Unidos par a América do Sul. Tese de livre docência apresentada á Universidade de São Paulo para obter o grau de livre docente. São Paulo.

VILLA, Rafael Duarte; VIANA, Manuela Trindade. (2008) b Política Externa Brasileña: nuevos y viejos caminos en los aspectos institucionales, en la práctica del multilateralismo y en la política para el Sur. *Revista de Ciencias Políticas*, Vol. 28, No. 2. Santiago, pp. 77-106.

VIZENTINI, Paulo. (2003). Relações Internacionais do Brasil: de Vargas a Lula. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo.

WEINTRAUB, S. (2007) Impact on the United States of Brazil’s foreign policy under president Lula. Política Externa do Governo Lula: 2003-2005. São Paulo, p. 59-71.

Received August 16, 2010

Accepted November 11, 2010

Abstract

Brazil’s security agenda during Lula’s administration was not homogeneous through the two mandates: the first tenure (2002-2006) revealed a reactive approach towards security topics, while the second one (2006-2010) was more assertive. More specifically, the shift occurred in terms of both its geographical scope – once it incorporated global issues in a more systematic way –, and instruments through which the security agenda was exercised, given the multilateral initiative of Unasur’s CDS.

Resumo

A agenda de segurança do governo Lula não foi homogênea durante os dois mandatos: o primeiro período (2002 – 2006) revelou uma postura reativa quanto às questões de segurança, enquanto o Segundo mandato (2006 – 2010) foi postura mais assertiva. Mais especificamente, a mudança ocorreu em termos de escopo geográfico – uma vez incorporadas as questões globais de maneira mais sistemática – e em termos de instrumentos por meio dos quais a agenda de segurança foi exercida – dada a criação do Conselho de Defesa Sul-Americano.

Key-words: Lula’s security agenda; assertive approach; South American Defense Council (CDS).

Palavras-chave: agenda de segurança de Lula; política externa afirmativa; Conselho de Defesa Sul-americano.