

International Political Economy Series

South–South Cooperation Beyond the Myths

Rising Donors, New Aid Practices?

Edited by Isaline Bergamaschi,
Phoebe Moore and Arlene B. Tickner



International Political Economy Series

Series Editor

Timothy M. Shaw
Visiting Professor at the University
of Massachusetts Boston, USA
Emeritus Professor at the University
of London UK

Aim of the Series

The global political economy is in flux as a series of cumulative crises impacts its organization and governance. The IPE series has tracked its development in both analysis and structure over the last three decades. It has always had a concentration on the global South. Now the South increasingly challenges the North as the centre of development, also reflected in a growing number of submissions and publications on indebted Eurozone economies in Southern Europe. An indispensable resource for scholars and researchers, the series examines a variety of capitalisms and connections by focusing on emerging economies, companies and sectors, debates and policies. It informs diverse policy communities as the established trans-Atlantic North declines and ‘the rest’, especially the BRICS, rise.

More information about this series at
<http://www.springer.com/series/13996>

Isaline Bergamaschi • Phoebe Moore • Arlene B. Tickner
Editors

South-South Cooperation Beyond the Myths

Rising Donors, New Aid Practices?

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Isaline Bergamaschi
Department of Political Science
Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Phoebe Moore
Department of Law
Middlesex University
London, United Kingdom

Arlene B. Tickner
School of Political Science
Government and International
Relations
Universidad del Rosario, Colombia

International Political Economy Series

ISBN 978-1-137-53968-7 ISBN 978-1-137-53969-4 (eBook)

DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-53969-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016958217

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017

The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © Rob Friedman/iStockphoto.com

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

The registered company address is: The Campus, 4 Crinan Street, London,
N1 9XW, United Kingdom

CONTENTS

1	Introduction: South–South Cooperation Beyond the Myths—A Critical Analysis	1
	<i>Isaline Bergamaschi and Arlene B. Tickner</i>	
Part I	Imagining and Shaping SSC: Ideas, Identities and Actors	29
2	Malleable Identities and Blurring Frontiers of Cooperation: Reflections from India’s “Distinct” Engagement with Senegal and Mozambique	31
	<i>Pooja Jain and Danilo Marcondes</i>	
3	The Turkish Way of Doing Development Aid?: An Analysis from the Somali Laboratory	59
	<i>Mehmet Ozkan</i>	
4	Good-Bye <i>Che</i>?: Scope, Identity, and Change in Cuba’s South–South Cooperation	79
	<i>Daniele Benzi and Ximena Zapata</i>	
5	The South–South Partnership Puzzle: The Brazilian Health Expert Community in Mozambique	107
	<i>Paulo Esteves and Manaira Assunção</i>	

6	South Africa's Development Diplomacy and South-South Cooperation: Issues of Institutionalization and Formalization?	137
	<i>Sanusha Naidu</i>	
Part II	Is Another Cooperation Possible? Cultivating Difference, Building Bridges	171
7	Venezuela and South-South Cooperation: Solidarity or <i>Realpolitik</i>?	173
	<i>José Briceño-Ruiz</i>	
8	Emerging Donors on the Field: A Study Case of China and South Korea in Lao PDR	197
	<i>Camille Laporte</i>	
9	From Identities to Politics: UAE Foreign Aid	225
	<i>Khalid Al-Mezaini</i>	
10	Going South to Reach the North?: The Case of Colombia	245
	<i>Isaline Bergamaschi, Arlene B. Tickner, and Jimena Durán</i>	
11	Resisting South-South Cooperation? Mozambican Civil Society and Brazilian Agricultural Technical Cooperation	271
	<i>Jimena Durán and Sérgio Chichava</i>	
12	Conclusion: South-South Cooperation Experiences Compared and the Way Forward	301
	<i>Isaline Bergamaschi and Jimena Durán</i>	
	Index	325

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Mehmet Ozkan worked as Professor of International Relations at the Turkish National Police Academy before becoming Director of the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA) in Colombia and South America. He has studied in South Africa, Sweden, and Spain; and held positions in India, Egypt, and Bosnia–Herzegovina. Dr. Ozkan also worked at the SETA Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research; and was Director of The International Centre for Terrorism and Transnational Crime (UTSAM), both in Ankara, Turkey.

Manaíra Anaité Charlotte Assunção is a graduate student at the Institute of International Relations of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro. Since 2011, she has worked at the BRICS Policy Centre developing research in International Development. In 2014, she coauthored an article published by *Third Word Quarterly* with a historical sociological approach to North–South and South–South cooperation. Her research interests are development cooperation governance, South–South and tri-lateral cooperation, BRICS's and Brazil's cooperation practices, with an emphasis on health development and policy mobilities/translations.

Daniele Benzi is a Professor in the Department of Global and Social Studies at the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Ecuador. He was formerly an associate professor of Sociology and International Relations at ICSyH-BUAP (México), FLACSO-Ecuador, and Universidad Central del Ecuador. His research areas focus on global political economy, regionalism and South–South cooperation, Latin American Critical Thought, and politics.

Isaline Bergamaschi is a Lecturer in Political Science at the Université Libre de Bruxelles/REPI. Her interest is on studying globalization and international relations through the global South and her research focuses on the sociology of international development and aid. She has worked on the politics of aid, the post-Washington Consensus, and the transformations of international intervention after the 2012 crisis in Mali. Her current projects also deal with development policies and assistance in Colombia. She has published articles in the *Revue Tiers Monde*, the *Journal of Modern African Studies*, and *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, as well as chapters in edited volumes at Oxford University Press, Routledge, Brill, and Amsterdam University Press.

José Briceño-Ruiz is a professor-researcher in the School of Economic and Social Sciences at the Universidad de los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela. His research interests include regionalism, integration and development in Latin America. He is the coeditor of *The Resilience of Regionalism in Latin America and the Caribbean* (Palgrave, 2013), and *Integración latinoamericana y caribeña* (Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2012).

Sergio Chichiva is a senior researcher at the Institute of Social and Economic Studies (IESE) in Mozambique. His research focusses on the role of China and Brazil in Mozambique's agricultural sector. His most recent publications include *China and Mozambique: From Comrades to Capitalists* (Jacana Media, coedited with Chris Alden, 2014).

Jimena Durán is an independent consultant on international development cooperation, internationalization and policy analysis. She has conducted research with IESE and CIRAD about the new development actors in Mozambique, especially China and Brazil. She has worked as a Lecturer on Development Cooperation at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana and in the *Agencia Presidencial de Cooperación de Colombia* (APC-Colombia) in the Directorate of Demand of International Cooperation.

Paulo Esteves holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Rio de Janeiro University's Research Institute (IUPERJ). He is the Director of the Institute of International Relations of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro and the General Supervisor of the BRICS Policy Centre. He was a post-doctoral fellow at Copenhagen University in 2008. Recent publications include articles and books on development cooperation, the nexus between international security and development, and emerging powers. Professor Esteves was the President of the Brazilian International Relations Association (ABRI) from 2012–2015.

Pooja Jain is a Visiting Fellow at EHESS in Paris. She is working on a three-year research project on the new actors, dynamics, and territorialities of development. She got her Ph.D. from Sciences Po Paris where she studied Partnerships for Development through a case study on India and Senegal. Her research interests include development practice and policy, public–private partnerships in development, international relations, and South–South cooperation. She has written and published articles for the French Agency of Development, *Afrique Contemporaine*, and *Le Soleil*, a Senegalese daily.

Camille Laporte defended her Ph.D. in international relations at Sciences po Paris in March 2015. Her thesis is entitled “The Politics of Evaluation: The Case Study of Overseas Development Aid.” Now, she is Head of Project in public policy evaluation at the French Prime Minister’s office and teaches “evaluation of development aid projects” at Université Paris Sud. Her research interests deal with emerging donors, aid effectiveness, transfer studies, and sociology of international relations.

Ximena Zapata Mafla is a Ph.D. candidate at the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA) and the University of Hamburg. She has a Master’s in International Relations from the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO-Ecuador). Her research interests include emerging powers in Latin America, South–South cooperation, and regionalism in Latin America.

Danilo Marcondes is a Ph.D. candidate at the Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge and the holder of a CAPES–Cambridge Trust Scholarship. Prior to that, he was a lecturer at the Institute of International Relations at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Janeiro, Brazil (IRI/PUC-Rio) in 2010–2012. His research interests include South–South cooperation, Brazilian foreign policy, and BRICS involvement in Africa. Danilo has published in *Africa Review*, *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region*, and *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*.

Arlene B. Tickner is a professor of International Relations in the School of Political Science, Government and International Relations at the Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia. Her main research interests include Latin American security, Colombian foreign policy, and the sociology of international relations knowledge in the non-core. She is the coeditor of the Routledge book series, *Worlding beyond the West*.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAAJC	Association for the Support and Legal Aid for Communities
ABC	Brazilian Agency of Cooperation
ABRASCO	Brazilian Association of Graduate Studies in Collective Health
ACCI	Colombia Agency for International Cooperation
ACIRC	African Capacity for Immediate Response to Crises
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific Group States
ADECRU	Academic Action for the Development of Rural Communities
ADFD	Abu Dhabi Fund for Development
AEC	Association of Caribbean States
AECID	Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development
AID	Association of International Physicians
AFD	French Development Agency
AFKAD	Africa Brotherhood and Solidarity Association
ALADI	Latin American Integration Association
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
ALBA-TCP	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America, Commerce Treaty of the Peoples
AMEXID	Mexican Agency of International Development Cooperation

ANC	African National Congress
APC-Colombia	Presidential Agency of International Cooperation of Colombia
APRM	African Peer Review Mechanism
ARF	African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund
ARV	Antiretroviral
ASA	Africa-South America Summits
ASBRAER	Brazilian Association of Technical Assistances and Rural Extension
ASDB	Asian Development Bank
AU	African Union
ESAFED	Aegean Health Association Federation
BADEA	Arab Fund for Economic Development in Africa
BAPA	Buenos Aires Plan of Action
BHEC	Brazilian Health Expert Community
BNDES	Brazil National Bank for Economic and Social Development
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa
CAF	Development Bank of Latin America
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CELAC	Community of Latin American and Caribbean States
CII	Confederation of Indian Industries
CIVETs	Colombia, Indonesia, Vietnam, Egypt, and Turkey
COMECON	Council for Mutual Economic Assistance
CPLP	Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DBSA	Development Bank of South Africa
DECTI	Special Division of Technical International Cooperation
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
DIRCO	Department of the International Relations and Cooperation
Diyanet	Directorate for Religious Affairs
DNP	National Planning Department
DPA	Development Partnership Administration
DSI	State Hydraulic Works

EDF	Electricity of France
ELAM	Latin American Medical School
Embrapa	Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation
ECOWAS	Economic Community of Western African States
ELN	National Liberation Army
EU	European Union
EXIM	Export-Import Bank of India
FARC	Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FGV Projetos	Fundação Getúlio Vargas
FICCI	Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry
Fiocruz	Oswaldo Cruz Foundation
FM	Woman Forum
FOCAI	Cooperation and International Assistance Fund
FONAGNI	Forum of Niasa's NGOs
FONGZA	Forum of Zambezia's NGOs
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GNI	Gross National Income
GODE	Gulf Organization for the Development of Egypt
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Country Initiative
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
HLF	OECD's High-Level Forum
HLSSD	High Level Strategic Security Dialogue
IADC	Inter-American Democratic Charter
IBSA	India, Brazil, South Africa Dialogue Forum
ICCR	Indian Council for Cultural Relations
IDB	Islamic Development Bank
IDC	International Development Cooperation
IFIs	International Financial Institutions
IHH	Humanitarian Relief Foundation
IMF	International Monetary Fund

IR	International Relations
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
ITEC	Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation Programme
IT	Information Technology
JA	Environmental Justice
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JIRCAS	Japan International Research Centre on Agriculture
Kizilay	Turkish Red Crescent
KOICA	Korean International Cooperation Agency
KSA	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Lao PDR	Lao Popular Democratic Republic
LDC	Least Developed Countries
LDH	Mozambican League of Human Rights
MB	Muslim Brotherhood
MDR	Ministry of Rural Development of Brazil
MEA	Ministry of External Affairs of India
MERCOSUR- MERCOSUL	Common Market of the South
MIC	Middle Income Country
MICAD	Ministry of Development and International Cooperation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MINAG	Mozambican Ministry of Agriculture
MISAU	Mozambique's Ministry of Health
MRE	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MSF	Doctors Without Borders
MUSD	Million US Dollars
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NAFTA	North America Free Trade Agreement
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NAMA	Non-Agricultural Market Access
NAS	Narcotics Affairs Section
NDB	New Development Bank
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NHS	Mozambique's Primary Health Care System
NIEO	New International Economic Order

NITC	New Information and Communication Technologies
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NSC	North-South Cooperation
OAS	Organization of American States
ODA	Overseas Development Aid
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIC	Organisation of Islamic Cooperation
ONUMOZ	United Nations Operation in Mozambique
OPEC	Organisation of Exporting Petroleum Countries
PAHO	Pan-American Health Organization
PALOP	Portuguese Speaking African Countries
PAP	Pan African Parliament
PCRM	Regional Cooperation Programme for Mesoamerica
PDVSA	Petroleos de Venezuela Sociedad Anonima
PECS	Strategic Public Health Cooperation Plan for 2009-2012
PEDSA	Strategic Development Plan of the Agrarian Sector of Mozambique
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PIS	Comprehensive Medical Program
PPOSC-N	Provincial Platform of Nampula's Civil Society
PPPs	Private Public Partnerships
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategic Papers
RADEZA	Organizations Network for Environment and Sustainable Community Development
SA	South Africa
SACU	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADPA	South African Development Partnership Agency
SAPs	Structural Adjustment Programmes
SCCG	Security Cooperation Coordinating Group
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEGIB	Ibero-American Secretariat General
SELA	Latin American and Caribbean Economic System

SRRP	Syria Regional Response Plan
TA	Technical Assistance
TCIL	Telecommunications Consultants India Limited
TDC	Triangular Development Cooperation
TEAM 9	Techno-Economic Approach for Africa–India Movement
TICAD	Tokyo International Conference on African Development
TIKA	Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency
TSK	Turkish Armed Forces
UK	United Kingdom
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UN	United Nations
UNAC	National Union of Peasants
UNASUR–UNASUL	Union of South American Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
USA	United States
US\$	United States Dollar
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization
WP-EFF	Working Party on Aid Effectiveness
YTB	Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 6.1	IBSA Overview of Spending and Projects	150
Figure 8.1	ODA from emerging donors (1997–2013) (MUSD)	200
Figure 8.2	ODA by traditional donors (1997–2012) (MUSD)	201
Figure 8.3	Sectorial distribution – traditional donors (2012–2013)	210
Figure 8.4	Sectorial distribution – South Korea	210
Figure 8.5	Sectorial Distribution China	211
Figure 8.6	Chronology of dam funding (1970–2018)	216
Figure 8.7	Repartition of dam funding per donor (1970–2013)	217
Figure 9.1	Foreign Aid Objectives	236
Figure 12.1	Role of the President vs. Professionalisation	310
Figure 12.2	Role of the private sector and civil society	313
Figure 12.3	Compliance and Collaboration with Traditional Aid	319
Figure 12.4	Claiming difference	320

LIST OF TABLES

Table 6.1	Overview of ARF Funding	146
Table 6.2	Key Performance Indicators, Planned Targets and Actual Achievements	162
Table 9.1	UAE's Foreign Assistance 2011–2013	239
Table 9.2	UAE's Aid to Africa 2009–2013	240
Table 9.3	UAE's Aid Distribution from 2009–2013	241
Table 11.1	List of CSOs actions against ProSavana	288
Table 12.1	Membership in the OECD	318

Introduction: South–South Cooperation Beyond the Myths—A Critical Analysis

Isaline Bergamaschi and Arlene B. Tickner

THE RISE AND FALL OF SSC

The concept of South–South cooperation (hereafter SSC) covers many layers of economic initiatives and political realities. In common parlance, it can include political, military, economic, or cultural relationships; humanitarian assistance and technical cooperation between developing countries; the allocation of financial resources for development projects and regional integration as well as the constitution of blocks—a common position and agenda in multilateral negotiations.¹ Historically, however, the concept finds its roots in the struggle for independence of Asian and African countries during the 1940s and in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) a few years later. The ideas of a common identity, equality, and

The authors thank Danilo Marcondes, Mehmet Ozkan, Daniele Benzi, and Camille Laporte for their comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

I. Bergamaschi (✉)

Department of Political Science, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

e-mail: isaline.bergamaschi@ulb.ac.be

A.B. Tickner

School of Political Science, Government and International Relations, Universidad del Rosario, Colombia

e-mail: arleneb.tickner@urosario.edu.co

solidarity between less-developed countries; the defence of the sovereignty of newly independent states; and opposition to the “North” are thus core elements of SSC. From an economic perspective, development planning, state intervention in the economy, and import substitution through the consolidation of local production influenced the strategies of developing countries to varying degrees during the 1950s and 1960s.

The spirit of SSC materialized in the creation of coalitions among developing countries—the Group of 77 or G77 within the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and, as of 1995, the World Trade Organization (WTO)—and led to some concrete achievements. The United Nations Conference for Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was calling for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) and products from developing countries were granted privileged access to Northern markets (e.g. the Lomé agreement between the European Community and the Africa–Pacific–Caribbean countries) as well as exceptions to the free-trade regime. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) united countries around a common agenda and successfully managed to put pressure on Western economies by increasing international oil prices during the 1970s. As recalled by Sachin Chaturvedi (2012, 18), the South Conference (now South Centre) was created in 1987 and identified the following major areas of SSC: finance, trade, industry and business, services, transport, information and communications, and people-to-people contact. SSC also covered Cuban or Chinese military support to governments or armed movements on the African continent.

As of the 1980s, SSC as a political project progressively lost momentum as a result of a number of factors. The spread of Cold War politics led governments in developing countries to progressively seek out international patronage and align with one of the two superpowers. The debt crisis during the 1980s forced Southern governments to accept the loans, advice, and conditions attached to assistance from International Financial Institutions (IFIs)—that is, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The ideological shift in developed countries (with Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom) created a context less favourable to the negotiation of a New International Economic Order wooed by developing countries’ governments. The fragmentation of the global South, with the “take-off” of East Asian countries and economic development in Latin America, also challenged the identity of a united “Third World” and impeded the establishment of a common agenda around shared economic and diplomatic interests in instances such as the United Nations (UN) or the WTO.²

Only during the 2000s did South–South links revive and gain strength because of economic growth and the consolidation of regional integration in some parts of the world, the election and ambitions of “revolutionary” or left-wing leaders in Latin America, the growing frustrations regarding North–South relations, the unpopularity of the reforms, and the austerity imposed by the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). Such developments have triggered high expectations and a couple of myths.

SSC RISES AGAIN? POTENTIAL, EXPECTATIONS, AND MYTHS DURING THE 2000s

One, if not the most important, feature of contemporary international relations and political economy is the (re-)emergence of the “global South” in world politics. During the 2000s, developing and emerging countries had begun to form coalitions in multilateral organizations and establish ad hoc forums, such as the BRICS or the CIVETs,³ to promote their interests, agendas, and visions for global governance and international development.⁴

Accordingly, a marked rebirth of SSC has taken place. While Chinese cooperation and investments in Africa have multiplied in the past decades and surpassed those of many of the so-called traditional powers,⁵ Brazil (with the ABC, since 1987), the Republic of Korea (KOICA in 1991), and more recently Mexico (AMEXID in 2011), India (the Development Partnership Administration in 2012), and South Africa (the Development Partnership Agency or SADPA in 2013), now have cooperation agencies of their own and are sometimes adapting their laws to scale up—that is, projecting new development practices in their respective regions and beyond. Through South–South diversification, emerging and middle-income countries (MIC) have seen their roles as regional leaders catapult them into positions as potential global leaders.

According to information gathered by Chaturvedi et al. (2012, 255), the volume of SCCs doubled in one decade and reached US\$20 billion in 2010, accounting for 9.5% of the total amount of foreign aid in 2008. Although this is a very modest share of the total aid that flows worldwide, the qualitative, symbolic, and political impact of SSC has been considerable. Indeed, the categories of “North” and “South,” “donors” and “recipients,” and “developed” and “developing” countries are being blurred and challenged. At times the terms “North–South partnerships” or “multilateral arrangements” are renegotiated as traditional powers and international organizations feel the necessity to catch-up with ongoing shifts.⁶

The momentum gained by SSC, particularly in the 2000s, has had important implications for the restructuring of development agendas and aid practices, both globally and in developing countries. Venezuela under President Hugo Chávez (1999–2013) encouraged and financed policy change for neighbouring like-minded countries led by leftist leaders (e.g. Bolivia, Ecuador, Cuba) in order to promote “socialist” development projects while allowing these countries to bypass IFI loans rife with conditionalities. Meanwhile, African governments have been welcoming financial support from donors, such as China, that typically do not impose conditions regarding governance and macro-economic choices. In Sub-Saharan Africa and Central America, competition between new and traditional donors in the “aid cartel” (Easterly 2003) has given aid-dependent governments strategic advantages and manoeuvring room to negotiate aid on better terms and to select their international partners.⁷

This book explores the aid policies implemented by donors of the global South in other developing countries. In doing so, it adopts a restricted definition of SSC, which as seen earlier, has represented broader realities historically. As a result, issues related to the impact of emerging donors on, and insertion (or lack of) into the global governance of aid, are only considered as secondary matters; and Southern diplomacies in distinct multilateral arenas (within the UN system or at the WTO level) and “clubs” (e.g. the BRICS, the G20, etc.)—that have already received wide coverage in the media and academic literature—are also not taken into account.

Expectations resulting from the revival of SSC are high, multifaceted, and have nurtured some myths about its potential benefits and dangers. Some nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and alter-globalist activists see it as an opportunity to pursue the interests of developing countries and to advance progressive policies that counteract the neoliberal order espoused by Western governments and the IFIs.⁸ They also see potential for the revival of the assertive nonaligned and Third Worldism movements of the recent past, which were more effective at taking into account the interests, agendas, and aspirations of governments and populations in the global South.

Following George W. Bush’s decision to invade Iraq in 2003 as part of the broader “war on terror,” the limitations of US leadership in the world became clearer, highlighting the importance of alternative cooperation strategies. The instabilities and inequalities triggered by contemporary globalization were violently underscored by the 2008 financial and economic crisis, and the global justice movement has burgeoned and

multiplied pledges for a change in the world economic and political order. Seeing Southern experts and civil servants engaging in capacity-building, experience and knowledge-sharing for development has been appealing to many—especially since Western economies have lost their legitimacy to “teach” the South economic lessons after the onset of the 2008 crisis—because it has borne the promise of a transfer of successful models to the poorest countries.

High expectations regarding SSC also come from recipient governments. South–South cooperation is a source of inspiration for replicating successful development models and serves as a wellspring of resources that traditional donors do not provide. This has been the case for loans provided by China for infrastructure projects in Africa. Traditional donors are concerned about creating “white elephants” and thus rarely finance such endeavours, which are used to build everything from airports to roads, to government buildings, to stadiums. Rwanda and Ethiopia explicitly claim to replicate the Chinese development “model” and Ecuador’s President Rafael Correa receives advice from Ha-Joon Chang, a UK-based heterodox economist whose academic work is mostly inspired by the experiences of late industrialization in East Asia.⁹

From an academic point of view, general interest in Southern diplomacies has evolved in tandem with that of private actors (i.e. banks and investors) in emerging economies and the diplomatic ambitions of the BRICS and MICs to increase their global influence. The topic has brought not only some fresh air into the international aid field as a set of practices but also as an object of study, including because it has led to an increase in the number of publications by scholars from the global South. The SSC concept has been seen as having the potential to introduce some diversity into development models and to contribute to a shift in the balance of power in decision making within an increasingly multipolar world.¹⁰

In the global North, it has led to concern and curiosity about changes in the international system, the role of new development cooperation actors, and the involvement of the global South and emerging powers. Interest in South–South relations indeed spans the globe—so much so that special summer courses, graduate programmes, and think tanks are being created to study Southern diplomacy and SSC in both developed and emerging countries specifically.¹¹

This book seeks to respond to the growing call within both academe and practitioner circles for more systematic analyses of current trends in international development cooperation. The following discussion of

the literature on SSC attempts to show that existing works have yet to explore its specificities and implications fully. The authors then present the innovative analytical framework used by the various contributors to this book.

CONTEMPORARY SSC: THE EXISTING LITERATURE AND ITS LIMITATIONS

Together with the diplomacies of Southern countries,¹² contemporary SSC has been the subject of renewed academic interest and enthusiasm, especially during the 2000s. The specialized literature on SSC highlights a number of characteristics and weaknesses exhibited by this kind of cooperation, which the following subsections discuss.

Focus on the BRICS

The SSC literature is dominated by the BRICS.¹³ In the development of specific case studies, China's foreign policy in Africa has undeniably drawn the most attention,¹⁴ due both to the volume of its aid and growing interest in this powerful global political and economic actor. This has sometimes obscured the activities and paradigms deployed by China in other regions, or by other Southern donor countries. Topping the list of the most attractive topics for scholars, China has been followed by Brazil; this is especially so since former President Lula's SSC policy was characterized by an Africa focus and the country generated high expectations regarding its domestic development records and its regional leadership before the economic slowdown and social protests became clear during the FIFA World Cup competition in 2014. India also has produced considerable interest, while South Africa's diplomacy has been studied not mainly through its aid policy—because it has not flourished in a way as linear and spectacular as other emerging countries (see this book's Chap. 6)—but through its diplomatic contribution to alternative multilateral debates and fora, such as IBSA (a diplomatic club gathering India, Brazil, and South Africa since 2003), or the creation of the New Development Bank (NDB), which is a bank created in 2015 by the BRICS as an alternative to the IFIs. The focus on the BRICS is problematic to the extent that they are not always representative of all Southern diplomacies and policies,¹⁵ and it leaves aside other donors.

*Seeing SSC Through the Eyes of Donors: Emerging Countries
and the International System*

When authors apply the tools of International Relations (IR) to the study of SSC, they usually refer to realist theory's core notion of "national interest," understood as the geostrategic or economic motivations driving SSC. Several works have questioned the nature of the SSC concept as a public policy, and its links with foreign policy considerations, highlighting the gap between claims and "real" interests to engage more actively in other developing countries.¹⁶

With emphasis placed largely on Southern donors, SSC often is portrayed as a symptom and a sign of the "emergence" of middle or great powers (i.e. China, India, and Brazil in particular) at the expense of more detailed accounts of the potential effects of SSC in recipient countries informed by in-depth field research.¹⁷ The attention thus is placed on the role of emerging donors on the international scene and the "geopolitics" of SSC.¹⁸ By doing so, existing works reproduce a bias found in most classical works within the field of IR—that is, the focus on donor motives (cynical or altruistic depending on the school of thought) to send human, technical, and financial support to developing countries¹⁹ at the expense of its meaning for, uses by, and insertion into recipient societies. Nowadays, many studies still envisage the aid policies of emerging powers from the perspective of their potential impact on the global aid architecture and landscape, and thus insist on its macro-effects on world politics (i.e. the challenges to the Western promotion of "liberal democracy" all over the globe) or on the international system itself—that is, the rise of multipolarity in world politics at the expense of US dominance.²⁰

Generalizations Versus Diversity

It cannot be denied that Southern donors share a number of common characteristics, some of which distinguish them from traditional ones. Financial support is not necessarily the biggest share of their aid—technical assistance usually plays a key role—and is delivered mostly through bilateral, rather than multilateral, channels. Aid projects, instead of aid programmes or budget support, are the dominant aid modality in SSC. In addition, its providers claim that SSC is different from the North–South by nature, as it complies with the principle of horizontality, solidarity and reciprocity and mutual benefit. Moreover, while in the past decades the conditionalities attached to traditional aid have proliferated and expanded

to cover not only every aspect of policy (e.g. economic reforms, good governance, institutional and social development) but also its process of elaboration and implementation (e.g. civil society participation, transparency, introduction of results-based management techniques), SSC claims to respect sovereignty, to adhere strictly to the principle of “non-interference” in domestic affairs, and to be devoid of conditionalities (Gould 2005). China, however, asks recipient governments to recognize the doctrine of “One China” against Taiwan’s diplomatic efforts for international recognition.

It would be erroneous to consider Southern donors as a homogenous category.²¹ Although they all claim to act out of horizontality and mutual benefit, these principles in reality have a variety of meanings and practical implications in each SSC scenario. The notion of “China’s exceptionalism” in Africa, a prominent feature in Beijing’s current engagement on the continent, seeks to structure relations such that they remain asymmetrical in economic content but are nonetheless characterized as equal in terms of recognition of economic gains and political standing (i.e. mutual respect and political equality).²² Southern donors are not equally “new” in their engagement with other parts of the global South. Even though China has a long tradition of cooperation with African countries, Turkey is fairly new to the game. China mostly is interested in extracting the natural resources present on the continent so as to feed its own industries at home; whereas this is not an objective for the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Cuba, or the Republic of Korea. Brazil and Cuba are not similarly “powerful” or, on the contrary, horizontal in their relationships with poverty-stricken, aid-dependent countries. Despite a common rhetoric, each Southern donor uses specific resources and references to justify its actions, and does not equally claim to be different from its Northern counterparts.

Normativity and the Economic Focus

The topic of contemporary SSC has often been addressed by aid and development institutions and policy actors themselves,²³ along with scholars located within the fields of IR and development studies and frequently enmeshed in policymaking circles.²⁴ This has had the positive effect of providing dense descriptions of official initiatives and ongoing policies;²⁵ however, it has at times also held the risk of a lack of critical distance vis-à-vis the claims of Southern donors themselves and of the perpetration of some myths associated with SSC.

An additional difficulty (i.e. the lack of public data on SSC) has stalled the production of both detailed and critical analyses. To date, many analysts have relied extensively on official discourses and policy documents produced by Southern governments as well as scarce quantitative data, as nontraditional donors are not committed to the norm of transparency instilled by the OECD–DAC,²⁶ often lack the institutional capacity to collect and systematise data, and are reluctant to publish information about their aid policies for fear of raising social contestations in their own societies. Because emerging economies are very unequal (i.e. between rural and urban areas, coastal and hinterland regions, educated-formal and illiterate-informal workers), the number of poor in these countries also tends to be high—arguably, most of the world’s poor live in emerging and underdeveloped countries. This is in contrast to some developed countries where there is a political base and social constituencies that favour sending aid abroad. The lack of quantitative data available sometimes has not been compensated for by use of consistent qualitative empirical fieldwork in the form of ethnographic and onsite observations by scholars.

A fair number of academic pieces adopt a normative or prescriptive posture, assuming the desirability of SSC a priori. Many are oriented towards an evaluation that emphasizes the benefits of SSC as well as the “limits” and “challenges” it faces²⁷ or the persistent “gap” between rhetoric and reality. They are interested in learning “lessons” from traditional aid or in offering policy recommendations for improving the implementation, coordination, transparency, or accountability of SSC.

The literature also suffers from an economic bias. When the effects of SSC are under scrutiny, it is mostly as a threat or opportunity in reference to *economic* development, and sometimes the discussion is being held in the absence of a multifaceted debate about its definition and the diverse ways of achieving it. This is a topic of immense controversy not only in the specialized literature but also in the policymaking world; historically, it has led to development strategies ranging from socialist, to protectionist projects inspired by dependency theory, to import-substitution strategies, to neoliberal structural adjustment during the 1990s or micro-finance.²⁸ Such normative concerns and ambitions are absent from this book because its contributors do not work on the basis of a specific, preconceived definition of development; and the individuals do not feel the urge to improve the practice or effects of SSC but rather to unpack and interpret them.

Overall, there is a vacuum of critical knowledge informed by fieldwork regarding SSC. As highlighted by Chaturvedi et al. (2012, 6), “SSC is not exposed to global scrutiny in the same way as are development aid flows from the OECD-DAC.” Benzi and Lo Brutto add that there is a lack of dialogue between works looking at North–South cooperation and SSC, and that the latter is often “excessively idealized.”²⁹

STRUCTURE AND RATIONALE: A CRITICAL SSC RESEARCH AGENDA

Given that most existing works on SSC are descriptive (not analytical) in nature and often are incomplete, this book builds on and complements them through a critical approach. The word “critical” is used here for three main reasons. First, it refers to the book’s objective to provide an independent and informed analysis through a non-economic lens. As such, SSC is not considered here as desirable *or* dangerous, but as one among many subjects of international study that must be approached and explained with existing theoretical and methodological tools. Therefore, the various chapters in the book look at the *politics* of SCC—that is, its political foundations, assumptions, and articulations with domestic politics in provider countries—and assess its sociopolitical effects in recipient countries through a dense, context-specific, and interactional account of its inner workings. The chapters also pay special attention to the ideas and ideologies, norms and institutions, bureaucratic categories and practices, professional representations, cultural bonds, and popular imaginaries that underlie and sustain SSC practices.

Second, “critical” is used in reference to those vital trends within IR that fuel our analytical framework, including critical (as opposed to conventional) constructivist thinking, inspired in particular by development anthropology and international political sociology. In line with some classical contributions in the field of development studies,³⁰ SCC is treated throughout the book as the outcome of a *social construct*—shaped by the dialectical relationship between knowledge and power—and as a project aimed at *governing* poverty, the global South, and/or international politics. In doing so, the authors build on existing sociological and anthropological works that address traditional foreign aid and that have explored knowledge and beliefs, evidence, representations and interactions, daily

practices and habits, and institutional and bureaucratic routines that drive long-established development policies and aid programmes.³¹ In the same vein as for traditional donors, SSC providers are “part of a political process in which the issues of development and politics are closely interwoven”;³² thus, there is an interest in the strategies that the providers deploy in order to gain and sustain legitimacy.³³ Surprisingly enough, similar socioanthropological analyses of SSC are few and far between (Brotherton 2008),³⁴ especially if one compares it with other topics.³⁵

Finally, the book heeds international political sociology’s invitation to look at the characteristics of professionals, the distribution of resources, and the power dynamics within political fields. Thus, an attempt is made to incorporate such approaches—elaborated mostly in reference to law or security in European and North American contexts³⁶—into the study of contemporary SSC policies. It is important to note that despite their diverse disciplinary origins, the scholarly works mentioned previously are not contradictory but rather complementary. The main reason for this is that they share a Foucauldian (and sometimes Bourdieusian) approach to power, and they pay great attention to the articulation between knowledge (including the form adopted by expertise) and practice and to the competition for resources and legitimacy as driving forces within the field of international aid. Constructivism also provides tools for unveiling the (self-)perceptions and (mutual) representations at play, as well as the roles and division of labour organizing the relationships between actors in the field of SSC.

In brief, this book sets forth a critical research agenda that aims to do the following:

- Produce innovative insights on SSC practices, norms, and professionals beyond an assessment of the donors’ motivations and of the policies’ impact on “development.”
- Shed light on SSC’s site-specific and localized meanings and outcomes in recipient contexts (instead of SSC’s articulation with, and impact on, aid’s global architecture).
- Take the diversity of SSC experiences seriously, including professionalization and politicization, legitimation and implementation, and to offer hypotheses and plausible explanations to account for the differences observed.
- Highlight the political—not mainly economic—underpinnings and effects of SSC in both donor and recipient countries.

- Include understudied SSC providers, such as Colombia, Turkey, the Republic of Korea, or the UAE, in order to turn attention away from just the BRICS. However, when the BRICS are studied, they are approached in a way that is uncommon in the literature. Chinese aid is examined through its actions in Laos (see Chap. 8) instead of Africa, on which numerous studies already exist. Brazil is explored in two distinct chapters, but through varied and original lenses: the role of civil society organizations in protests against its agricultural cooperation in Mozambique (see Chap. 11), and a sociological analysis of its *cooperantes* in the health sector (see Chap. 5).
- Incorporate aspects and actors of SSC, such as civil society movements (e.g. the case of Mozambique) and the private sector, that are rarely taken into account—because of an almost exclusive focus on diplomatic developments—but that play an essential role in SSC of at least India, Brazil, China and, to a lesser extent, Turkey.

In pursuing these objectives, the editors were fortunate enough to draw on a diverse array of analytical assets. The book brings together contributors based at institutions and/or coming from countries in the North (i.e. Université Libre de Bruxelles, SciencesPo in Paris, Middlesex University, University of Cambridge, the German Institute of Global and Area Studies – GIGA) and the South (i.e. Universidad del Rosario in Colombia, Universidad de los Andes in Venezuela, Qatar University, the Instituto de Estudos Sociais de Moçambique – IESE, the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar in Ecuador, the Institute for Global Dialogue (South Africa)).

In addition, contributors include junior scholars, returning from the field with fresh information and ideas, and established scholars with more experience and knowledge about development, the International Political Economy (IPE), and South–South issues. A number of the authors are experts on the societies they describe (i.e. both donor and recipient countries). Although all of the chapters draw on original materials and empirical evidence that is not available in existing works, several contributors have been directly involved as civil servants in SSC agencies in the policymaking processes that they describe (e.g. Mehmet Ozkan at TIKA and Jimena Durán at the Colombian *Agencia Presidencial de Cooperación*), and they adopt a reflective posture towards the categories and assumptions that dominate their professional milieu. Finally, the language skills of the book’s editors and authors allowed them to tap into the diverse array of literature produced on SSC in