Contexto Internacional
vol. 44(1) Jan/Apr 2022
http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-8529.20224401e20200091

Foreign Policy and Policy Diffusion in Lula da Silva's Brazil (2003-2010)

Carlos Aurélio Pimenta de Faria*

Abstract: The article argues that international policy diffusion should also be understood as one of the many foreign policy instruments, and that it is a rather versatile one, as it can be coupled to most or perhaps all traditional foreign policy instruments: political, economic, cultural, and military. It also proposes that the exportation of Brazilian policy innovations may be regarded as the backbone of Lula da Silva's foreign policy (2003-2010), as it was central to: (a) the manufacturing of a renewed international identity for the country; (b) the promotion of post-liberal regionalism in Latin America; (c) the defence of new or expanded roles for international organizations, which was a central priority for Brazilian foreign policy in that period; (d) the revitalisation of the South-South coalition; (e) the presidential diplomacy; and (f) the promotion of systematic bilateral cooperation with Latin American and African countries.

Keywords: international policy diffusion; Brazilian foreign policy; Lula da Silva's administration

Introduction

International policy diffusion (PD) has become a widespread phenomenon, one that encompasses all kinds of countries and policies and that, more recently, has been widely investigated (Graham, Shipan & Volden 2013; Oliveira & Pal 2018; Oliveira et al. 2020). Nevertheless, its role as a foreign policy (FP) instrument or, more broadly, in the national strategies of international insertion, has been greatly neglected (Faria 2012). Studies on international development cooperation, South-South cooperation and soft power are partial exceptions, as it is usual that the sharing, exportation or importation of policy experiences are emphasised, even if not always in dialogue with the policy diffusion literature (Chatin 2016; Lima 2015; Milani & Duarte 2015; Milani & Lopes 2014; Milhorance 2013, 2019; Osorio Gonnet et al. 2020; Pomeroy et al. 2019; Santarelli & Pomeroy 2017; Silva 2017). Be that as it may, those studies usually fail to grasp the full meaning of policy diffusion as a foreign policy tool and to stress the role played by foreign policy as a driver for policy diffusion.

* Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUC-MG), Minas Gerais, Brazil; carlosf@pucminas.br. ORCID iD 0000-0003-1776-6064

Although governments frequently seek external legitimation for their domestic policy options or inspiration and examples to tackle their indigenous problems, the potential connection between policy 'exportation' and foreign policy objectives are seldom understood. How and why does foreign policy promote, directly and indirectly, both policy exportation and importation? Moreover, how can policy diffusion influence foreign policy decisions and alternatives? In other words, why is it important to study the several possible interactions between foreign policy and policy diffusion? This article will provide some preliminary answers to these questions, even if this is not its main objective.

It is my contention in this article that the exportation of Brazilian policy innovations may be regarded as the backbone of Lula da Silva`s foreign policy (2003-2010). As we will try to demonstrate, their international diffusion in that period played crucial and complementary roles, as they were central to at least six of the most important objectives and/or strategies of a foreign policy self-proclaimed as "active" and "proud" ("*ativa e altiva*"), namely: (a) the manufacturing of a renewed international identity for the country; (b) The promotion of post-liberal regionalism in Latin America; (c) the defence of new or expanded roles for international organizations (IOs), which was a central priority of Brazilian foreign policy during those years; (d) the revitalisation of the South-South coalition; (e) the presidential diplomacy; and (f) the promotion of systematic bilateral cooperation with Latin American and African countries.

Apart from this brief introduction and the conclusions, the paper is divided into two sections. We start the first one by recalling the methodological nationalism that still plagues Public Policy Studies and the way both the field of Foreign Policy Analysis and the multidisciplinary research devoted to the study of international policy diffusion have all been mostly blind to the relevance and pervasiveness of the phenomena that interest us in this article. The following section discusses how and why foreign policy frequently performs as a driver for international policy diffusion. Our aim in this first section is to portray policy diffusion as yet another foreign policy instrument, one that is as usual and relevant as it is neglected by the three academic areas just mentioned. The second section is entitled 'The exportation of policy innovations as the backbone of Lula da Silva's foreign policy.' It presents our main argument, providing examples that are expected to demonstrate our thesis. The Conclusions synthesise the argument and the main findings and present some important additional questions to be analysed in future investigations.

International policy diffusion as a foreign policy instrument

Before we start demonstrating the central relevance and indeed the strategic character of the exportation of Brazilian policy innovations for the country's foreign policy during Lula da Silva's two terms in office (2003-2010), it is important to stress the fact that traditional Public Policy Analysis has been very slow to recognise the importance of extra-national inputs to policymaking processes, which have become increasingly internationalized (Faria 2018a). Policymaking is a process that has been almost always studied as if it was a strictly domestic business (one should notice, however, that this is usually not the case in

times of severe international or systemic crisis). That is why the field has been criticised for its 'methodological nationalism.' As it was acutely stated by Diane Stone (2008: 19, 20):

> Public policy has been a prisoner of the word 'state'. (…) Trapped by methodological nationalism and an intellectual agoraphobia of globalization, public policy scholars have yet to examine fully global policy processes and new managerial modes of transnational public administration.
>
> [N]ational public institutions no longer serve as the sole organizing center for policy. Instead, it is necessary to 'look at the restructuring of the playing field itself' (…), that is, the historical and structural changes to the 'state' and 'sovereignty'.

More recently, however, public policy scholars have been successfully striving to overcome methodological nationalism, which is demonstrated, for example, by Stone (2013); and Stone & Moloney (2019).

As it is widely recognised, policy diffusion, transfer and circulation are processes which, due to their increasing importance and visibility, became the object of an academic field that is now pretty vigorous and that is characterised by notable multidisciplinarity (Oliveira 2021). For our purposes in this paper, it will suffice to present, in a rather schematic fashion, the main characteristics of the two most important branches of that literature, i.e., those dedicated to policy diffusion and policy transfer. More recently, however, scholars have called attention to the need to recognise a distinct process, namely 'policy circulation'[1] (Oliveira & Faria 2017), which will not interest us in this work. Table 1, below, provides a useful summary:

Table 1 – Policy transfer and policy diffusion

	Policy Transfer	Policy Diffusion
Definition	"Policy transfer, emulation and lesson drawing all refer to the process by which knowledge about how policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political setting (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political setting". (Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000, 5)	"The process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among members of social system. It is a special type of communication in that the messages are concerned with new ideas". (Rogers, 1995, 5)
Dominance	Among political scientists and analysts of public policy and public management	Among sociologists, but increasingly utilized by political scientists
Methodological Orientation	Case studies and Comparative Analysis	Quantitative
Major terms and concepts	Policy learning, lesson drawing, Bayesian learning	Contagion, bandwagoning, herding, isomorphism
Major assumption	The process of change is political in the sense that policy learning is filtered by political institutions	The process of change occurs in social networks

	Policy Transfer	Policy Diffusion
Mechanisms of policy change	Varies between coercive and voluntary; e.g., emulation, elite network, harmonization through international regime and penetration by external actors and interests	Isomorphism, culture, international norms, best-practices
Outcomes	Bias towards convergence	Strong bias towards convergence

Source: Adapted from Levi-Faur & Vigoda-Gadot 2004.

International policy diffusion (or transfer) is a process that is promoted by a wide range of actors, both institutional and individual, pursuing quite distinct objectives. In their seminal article, Dolowitz & Marsh (2000) list the following actors that may be involved in policy transfer (and notice that policy diffusion is composed of several processes of policy transfer): elected officials, bureaucrats/civil servants, pressure groups, political parties, policy entrepreneurs or experts, consultants, think tanks, transnational corporations, and 'supranational institutions' [sic]. International organizations became particularly active in policy transfer and diffusion, and that is a process that only recently has been recognised more broadly by International Relations scholarship (Béland & Orestein 2013; Ervik, Kildal & Nilssen 2009; Faria 2018b; Fink 2013). If policy diffusion became such a widespread phenomenon, one that certainly was not inaugurated by neoliberal globalization, as there are examples of it even in the Hellenistic period (Dolowitz 2000), it is also possible to suggest that it has been an important foreign policy instrument for a long time. As an example, we could recall that 'foreign aid' and international development cooperation have relied not only on the provision of goods and technical assistance but also frequently on the sharing of policy instruments and expertise (Hoebink 2010; Besada & Kindornay 2013). Nevertheless, as already mentioned, the academic literature has not usually focused on foreign policy as a promoter of policy diffusion (Faria 2012).

As it is now widely recognised, foreign policy is not just an expression of the need to cooperate in an anarchical international system or a by-product of friction between the states. Foreign policy is, first and foremost, a 'governmental product,' as stated by Kenneth Waltz (1996). Furthermore, foreign policy is not just a specific realm of governmental action or, according to policy analysts' jargon, a 'sectoral policy.' It is increasingly a cross-sectoral policy, as it has an impact on other policies and may be influenced by the whole range of sectoral policies (Milani & Pinheiro 2013; Sanchez et al. 2006). It is not a coincidence, therefore, that in Brazil most ministries have departments or advisory committees dedicated to their own international relations (Faria 2021). As a matter of fact, as we have already stressed, policymaking is a process that has become increasingly internationalized in most areas (Faria 2018a).

That is another reason why it is important to understand that Foreign Policy Analysis should be regarded as a 'transdisciplinary puzzle,' as suggested by Charillon (2016). According to the author, foreign policy blends Administrative and Policy Sciences (the study of both the state and its bureaucracies, stressing state-society relations), International Relations (which emphasises the external contexts and systems), and Sociology (considering the societal parameter). The seemingly natural alliance between Public Policy and

Foreign Policy Studies, however, has not really come into being, despite the calls to bridge the gap and despite the great impact of 'Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games,' the famous 1988 article written by Putnam. This, still according to Charillon, is partly due to the existence of two very distinct communities of scholars, each ignoring the other's fields.

As we have already emphasised, Public Policy Analysis usually focuses on domestic processes and state bureaucracies, privileging policy-oriented insights. Public policy students sometimes believe that Foreign Policy Analysis is too general and outward-looking. On the other hand, foreign policy experts frequently believe that public policy 'remains too technical and focuses so much on so-called low politics' that it fails to bring anything to the understanding of 'grand strategies,' of war and peace issues (Charillon 2016: 3).

Hudson & Day (2020: 6) have stressed that foreign policy scholarship (or the subfield of Foreign Policy Analysis – FPA), in turn, has six hallmarks, namely: (a) it regards the explanation of foreign policy decision making as necessarily multifactorial; (b) it tests and combines variables from more than one level of analysis, being multilevel; (c) it is essentially multi-/interdisciplinary; (d) '[o]f all subfields of IR, FPA is the most radically integrative theoretical enterprise, (…) for it integrates a variety of information across levels of analysis and spans numerous disciplines of human knowledge.' It is, therefore, a 'bridging discipline,' as suggested by Roseneau; (e) the focus on the human decision-maker leads the field toward an emphasis on agent-oriented theory. 'States are not agents because states are abstractions and thus have no agency. Only human beings can be true agents;' (f) 'FPA theory is also profoundly actor-specific in its orientation, unwilling to 'black box' the human decision makers under study.'

It is also important to recall that the impact of foreign policy, which is frequently so hard to measure, remains under-evaluated. Two decades ago, Baldwin (2000: 167) stated that the 'field of foreign policy studies is preoccupied with the processes of foreign policymaking and has tended to neglect the outputs of such processes.' It is possible to say that this still holds. But if FPA has neglected the outputs, it should come as no surprise that foreign policy evaluation, as a governmental practice, is not widespread either, on the contrary (Faria 2018c). As a matter of fact, 'foreign ministries are still experimenting with how to integrate M&E [Monitoring & Evaluation] in the processes and organizational traditions of foreign policy' (Binder & Rotmann 2014: 2). We could also say that not only the outputs have been neglected but also some of the instruments employed to reach foreign policy goals, such as policy transfer and diffusion.

If the panorama sketched in the previous paragraphs still holds, as it is our belief, all the three academic fields (Public Policy Analysis, Foreign Policy Analysis and the scholarship dedicated to understanding policy diffusion and transfer) have not properly recognised the important role that policy diffusion and transfer can play in a country's foreign policy. It is clear, furthermore, that policy exportation, for instance, may also be quite relevant at the domestic level, for example helping to legitimise policies that are controversial at home or helping to increase or consolidate the popularity of a president. We may suggest, for example, that in Brazil the transformation of *Bolsa Família* – the conditional

cash transfer program inaugurated by Lula in 2004 – into an internationally acclaimed 'best practice' to be emulated by other developing countries (Silva 2017) contributed both to the domestic legitimacy of redistribution and the president's high levels of popularity, as well as his electoral victories (for an appraisal of how *Bolsa Família* helped Lula to be re-elected in 2006, see Hunter & Power 2007. See also Zucco Jr. 2013).

In a rather preliminary fashion, and before we can dedicate our main efforts to the Brazilian experience during Lula da Silva's government (2003-2010), we can put forward the proposition that policy diffusion may be both an instrument of a country's foreign policy or, maybe more frequently, just a byproduct. In other words, policy diffusion may be a purposeful and regular instrument of foreign policy or one of its non-intended consequences. Furthermore, policy transfer or diffusion may be promoted directly or indirectly by foreign policy. It is also relevant to remember that foreign policy may foster both exportation and/or importation of public policies. Here are a few examples that may be useful.

Examples of policy diffusion as a foreign policy instrument will be presented and discussed ahead, as this is our main concern in the paper. As a byproduct, we may recall that to become a member of an international organization, a country is frequently expected to adjust some of its domestic policies, related to human rights or macroeconomics, for instance, or that the membership is conditioned to the adoption of certain policies. A more concrete example is the criteria that the states willing to join the European Union are required to meet, the so-called 'Copenhagen Criteria,' which were established in 1993 and define standards that need to be reached, related to democratic governance, human rights and macroeconomic management (Bulmer & Radaelli 2004). To satisfy the entry requirements, the candidate is expected to adopt policies at home that are regarded as pertinent and diffused as such.

We should now give a few examples of policy transfer/diffusion being promoted directly or indirectly by foreign policy. Direct policy transfer/diffusion may be part of the so-called 'soft power' a nation tries to exercise to shape the behaviour of other states (Wang & Lu 2008). As we will see in a while, to build the international image of Brazil as a southern intermediate power willing to reform the main international institutions so that globalization might be less asymmetrical, Lula's foreign policy made Brazil become an active provider of cooperation for development (Oliveira 2020). As such a provider, the exportation of Brazilian technologies and policies in several fields (e.g., agriculture, health, social development, and democratic governance) was intentionally boosted (IPEA 2010). A hypothetical example of foreign policy indirectly promoting policy transfer/diffusion is when a country, to gain more influence in an international organization or regime, enhances its interest, ability or capacity to promote policy diffusion, even when the innovation being transferred was first implemented by another country.

Regarding the promotion of public policy exportation and importation by foreign policy, we may give the following hypothetical examples. If the transformation of a local policy innovation into a global model may to a large extent be the result of the intense work of policy entrepreneurs and international organizations, as demonstrated by Oliveira

(2016) in the case of participatory budgeting and by Osorio Gonnet (2018) regarding the diffusion of conditional cash transfer programs, that is a process that may also be the result of foreign policy activism. Arguably, that is the case of the transformation of conditioned cash transfer programs, such as the Mexican *Progresa/Oportunidades/Prospera* and Brazilian *Bolsa Família*, into internationally acclaimed 'best practices.' The role eventually played in that process by Mexican foreign policy is unknown to the author of this paper, but as we will see ahead, Brazilian foreign policy made important efforts in that direction (and the Brazilian Ministry of Social Development was also interested in that transformation, as it was expected that international recognition of the Brazilian experience could further legitimise income transference at home).

However, foreign policy objectives may also entail policy importation. For example, to align the country with a traditional or an emerging power, which is a typical foreign policy guideline for developing nations, that country may decide to implement at home well-known policies of that traditional or emerging power (policy diffusion analysts call this 'emulation'). In Latin America, it is probably the case that 'war on drugs' policies may have been adopted for at least three reasons: as an imposition by the United States, a response to domestic pressures, and/or an emulation of the US standard, aiming to get closer to the hegemon.

Given those general examples, we should now try to understand more thoroughly how foreign policy performs as a driver for policy diffusion. As it is widely recognised, countries employ various distinct strategies and instruments to accomplish their foreign policy objectives. That means that there are several kinds of foreign policy instruments or tools. A typology of FP instruments should include the following categories: (1) political, (2) economic, (3) cultural, and (4) military instruments. Political instruments encompass the various sorts of diplomacy; the building of international coalitions or alliances; the creation of international organizations or the instrumentalization of existing ones; and the promotion of international regimes. Economic instruments of foreign policy comprise foreign aid; economic and trade policies; and economic sanctions. There are at least three kinds of cultural instruments: the establishment and promotion of a national identity; the search for improving the country's reputation abroad through so-called 'nation branding,' which is the 'application of corporate marketing concepts and techniques to countries, in the interests of enhancing their reputation in international relations' (Kerr & Wiseman 2013: 354); and soft power. The military instruments of foreign policy are persuasion via military threat or pressure and the use of plain force, i.e., the making of war.

An interesting way to demonstrate how the promotion of policy diffusion has been frequently used as a means to accomplish foreign policy objectives is to present hypothetical examples of how PD may be associated with the several distinct foreign policy instruments. Table 2 summarises everything.

The fact that PD is so frequently promoted in association with all the most common instruments of FP certainly suggests that PD itself should be considered an important and usual instrument of FP, as we wanted to demonstrate. Next section will first present our main thesis, with the necessary details, and then proceed to its validation.

Table 2 – Policy diffusion and the traditional instruments of Foreign Policy

Instruments of Foreign Policy		Hypothetical examples of PD instrumentalization
1- Political Instruments	a) Diplomacy	Presidential diplomacy may include the promise to share social policy expertise
	b) International alliances	The broadening of a coalition may be achieved through development cooperation that encompasses policy transfer
	c) International organizations	To guarantee the support for the creation of an IO, the hegemon may be willing to transfer to the future members some of their national institutions or successful policies
	d) International regimes	The sharing of expertise in a given policy domain may be the very reason why regimes are created or expanded
2- Economic Instruments	a) Foreign aid	The transference of expertise in several policy domains is a frequent component of foreign aid
	b) Economic and trade policies	The establishment of trade agreements usually implies the national adoption of certain policies and/or institutions
	c) Economic sanctions	Economic sanctions may be alleviated or suspended provided that a certain policy is adopted by the target country
3- Cultural Instruments	a) National identity	Self-understanding of a country as a promoter of world peace may involve the exportation of national institutions and policies
	b) Nation branding	The promotion of the international image of a country as a leading representative of third world nations may include the diffusion of domestic development or social policies
	c) Soft power	South-South cooperation, which is usually understood as a form of soft power and frequently involves policy transfer, may be promoted to guarantee broader support for a country's claim in an international organization
4- Military Instruments	a) Persuasion (military pressure or threat)	Military pressure or threat may be employed to promote policy change in the target country
	b) Plain force (war)	War has eventually proven to be an efficient way to promote both regime and policy change by the enemy

Source: elaborated by the author.

The exportation of policy innovations as the backbone of Lula da Silva's foreign policy

Before we can further develop our argument that the exportation of Brazilian policy innovations may be regarded as the backbone of Lula da Silva`s foreign policy (2003-2010), let us first recall the main features of Brazilian foreign policymaking. Tables 3 and 4 make a long story short, as they present the contemporary legacies of the country's FP (Table 3) and its governance patterns (Table 4).

Table 3 – Contemporary legacies of Brazilian foreign policy

Few conflicts with the many South American neighbours, due to, among others, the early resolution of border disputes
Establishment of an important, albeit segmented, normative and institutional infrastructure to promote regional cooperation
Strong and insulated diplomatic bureaucracy, whose cohesion and hierarchy reinforce Itamaraty's resources in the foreign policymaking process
Diplomatic tradition acclaimed both domestically and internationally, and a history of precocious and active participation in the building of international institutions
Main foreign policy principles and objectives clearly defined by the current Federal Constitution (1988)
Diplomacy as the main instrument of Brazilian foreign policy
A national agenda that is scarcely internationalized; political parties only marginally interested in international affairs
Inward-looking society and state; economy relatively insulated from international influxes
A repertoire of various models of international insertion, experienced throughout the 20th century, dispersed in a continuum whose poles are 'ideological Americanism' and 'militant globalism'

Source: Faria & Lopes 2019

Table 4 – Brazilian foreign policy: governance patterns

Insulated policymaking processes, only eventually visible or permeable to civil society
Centrality of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Itamaraty) not only in foreign policy implementation but also frequently in its formulation
Changing patterns of presidential commitment to foreign policy formulation and management
Federal Legislative scantily empowered and traditionally uninterested in foreign policy
Until the turn of the century, foreign policy had not been an important issue for most Brazilian political parties
After many decades of insulation, the national business agenda and interests have become increasingly internationalized
Little social mobilization and demand concerning foreign policy

Source: Faria & Lopes 2019

In this section, we will present the main reasons why we believe it is possible to state that the exportation of Brazilian policy innovations was the backbone of Lula da Silva`s foreign policy (2003-2010). As it will be shown in the following paragraphs, the international diffusion of policy innovations that the country had and was developing in several areas, such as agriculture, health, education, social protection, and public administration, among others, was central to the achievement of the most important international objectives of the country during that period. These objectives were, with no particular order (Lima 2010; Ricupero 2010; Silva 2015; Vigevani & Cepaluni 2007):

a) The manufacturing of a renewed **international identity** for the country;
b) The promotion of **post-liberal regionalism** in Latin America;
c) The defence of **new or expanded roles for international organizations**;

d) The revitalization of the **South-South coalition**;
e) The promotion of systematic **bilateral cooperation** with **Latin American** and **African countries**.

Furthermore, when it comes to foreign policy instruments, and not only objectives, the exportation of Brazilian policy innovations may also be regarded as a central component of a fairly important instrument of the country's foreign policy under Lula, namely presidential diplomacy (Cason & Power 2009; Burges 2010). The personal engagement and leadership of the president in foreign policy are well known, and Lula's presidential diplomacy is even regarded as more intense than the one exercised by his predecessor, President Cardoso (1995-2002), who had earlier been foreign minister himself (from October 1992 until May 1993). When one compares the number of presidential international trips and countries visited throughout their eight years in office, the intensity of Lula's presidential diplomacy becomes immediately evident (Ribas & Faria 2011). The perils of the excessive usage of this foreign policy instrument are well known (Burges 2010; Ricupero 2010). However, its benefits are often recognised and even praised. According to Nina (2006: 5):

> Lula's image as an emerging and charismatic leader from a renewed left, capable of incarnating a new model of development – i.e., handling at home a sound economic policy and comprehensive social measures – enabled him to be regarded not only as a representative voice of the South but also as a bridge between developed and developing countries in the pursuit of a more balanced, fair and equitable economic order worldwide.

For our purposes in this article, it is important to emphasise that part of the huge international prestige acquired by Lula during his presidency (Anderson 2011; Onis 2008; Dauvergne & Farias 2012) may certainly be attributed to the fact that he also became known worldwide for: (1) his efforts as an agenda-setter, stressing the urgent need to address worldwide the problem of hunger and to promote poverty alleviation; and (2) his role as an international policy entrepreneur, always eager to disseminate Brazilian innovations abroad. Evidence of this are the international prizes received by Lula – among many others, in May 2010 he won the *World Food Day Medal* from FAO and was declared *Global Champion in the Fight Against Hunger*. In the following year, he won the 2011 *World Food Prize* (Faria & Paradis 2013; Nina 2006).

Let us now pay closer attention to the five foreign policy objectives of Brazil mentioned above and to the role played by policy exportation. We start with **(a) the manufacturing of a renewed international identity for the country**. Brazilian diplomats and foreign policy scholars frequently understand Brazilian international identity as encompassing the self-proclaimed traditions of pacifism, "*juridicismo*" (an emphasis on legally based relationships), pragmatism, realism, and the search for development, which has been the leitmotif of the country's diplomacy at least since the beginning of the 20th century (Lafer 2001; Ayllón 2006). Itamaraty usually portrays the country and its prestigious diplomacy

as traditionally engaged in the institutionalisation of the international system and the building of a peaceful and cooperative world order, one that should be more equitable and harmonious. Furthermore, Brazilian diplomats also work hard to keep alive the narrative of the country's foreign policy as a state policy whose stability and continuity are remarkable, particularly when compared to endemic Latin American instability. In the 1990s, that narrative started to build and incorporate the self-understanding of Brazil as a global player, a global trader, and an honest broker, given the country's role and capabilities as a credible and experienced mediator (Lafer 2001). Whereas there should be no doubt that Brazilian foreign policy during Lula's administration had no reason to disavow such a narrative, on the contrary, it is possible to say that important effort was made to reframe it.

The rise of Brazil in this period is widely recognised and well documented. As Gardini (2016: 12-13) stated in the first chapter of a book dedicated to understanding the 'Foreign policy responses to the rise of Brazil:'

> [T]he country itself has perceived its growing weight in regional and global affairs, and since the Cardoso administration it has started a narrative and a policy of more assertive international presence that was displayed in full under President Lula da Silva.

If in South America the asymmetries between Brazil and its neighbours are nearly self-evident, in that period the rise of the country and the state-led internationalisation of Brazilian companies (Ribeiro & Kfuri 2010) made those asymmetries even bigger, which occasionally came to hamper Brazilian ambitions in different realms, as vastly documented in the book just mentioned.

During a seminar entitled 'Leftist and progressive governments in Latin America and Caribe: appraisal and perspectives,' organised in 2011 by, among others, the Perseu Abramo Foundation (a think tank sponsored by Lula's Working Party, PT), Marco Aurélio Garcia, Lula's special advisor for international affairs and unanimously recognised as one of the main formulators of the Brazilian international strategies in that period, stated that 'Brazil does not want to be the South American Germany' (Maurício 2011). If the country's diplomatic activism and economic growth made neighbours uncomfortable, Brazilian authorities did their best to portray the country as a kind of 'post-imperial power.'

As it is widely recognised, during that period Brazil became an important player in the field of development cooperation (Mendonça & Faria 2015; Dauvergne & Farias 2012). Its role as an 'emergent donor' and a provider of humanitarian assistance and unconditional cooperation for development, provided after demand, as frequently stressed by Brazilian officials, involved to a large extent the sharing of Brazilian technologies and policy innovations. That was a hallmark of a foreign policy that understood itself as 'solidary' and 'humanist' (Faria & Paradis 2013). Instead of a leadership role in the region and the South-South coalitions eagerly fostered by the country during those years, the stated aim was to struggle together with other Third World countries to promote a more egalitarian world order. Therefore, Brazil came to be portrayed as a champion of inclusive growth both at home and abroad, which also implied the exportation of Brazilian technologies

and policy innovations. Whether that search for a renewed international identity for the country may be understood as a process of nation branding is a question that this article shall not address.

Another central objective of Lula's foreign policy was **(b) the promotion of post-liberal regionalism in Latin America**. During the so-called Latin American 'Pink Tide' or 'left turn,' regional institutions came to be regarded as a crucial instrument for the region's 'social turn.' As it is vastly recognised, Brazil played a leading role in that process, as the country struggled hard to promote convergence between the world vision of the neighbours, boost cooperation beyond trade, create new regional institutions (UNASUR and CELAC were probably the most important ones), and reform the old ones, such as MERCOSUR. During that period, Latin American regionalism became, to a large extent, 'policy-driven,' instead of 'norm driven' (Lima & Coutinho 2006), as regional institutions greatly intensified policy dialogues, advice and diffusion (Riggirozzi & Tussie 2012). UNASUR's health diplomacy, for example, encompassed regional policy diffusion, sectoral policy cooperation, extra-regional lobbying and joint negotiations that involved both collective policymaking and the sharing of national policy innovations (Riggirozzi 2014). That is why that 'third wave' of Latin American regionalism, labeled 'post-liberal,' 'anti-hegemonic,' and 'strategic,' also came to be known as 'multidimensional regionalism' (Ribeiro & Kfuri 2010).

As that 'third wave' of Latin American regionalisms reflected a 'commitment to social transformation and to overcoming asymmetries both within and between countries' (Gratius 2012: 27), in which policy diffusion played such a prominent role, the renewed Brazilian international identity and the country's 'humanist' and 'solidary' foreign policy seemed to reinforce each other.

The third objective of Brazilian foreign policy under Lula da Silva was **(c) the defence of new or expanded roles for international organizations**. As it was frequently stated by both Lula and Celso Amorim, the Brazilian diplomat who was foreign minister during the whole period (2003-2010) and was recognised in 2009 as the 'World's best foreign minister' by *Foreign Affairs* magazine blogger David Rothkopf (2009), the country would strive for the 'democratisation' of the international system (critics have suggested that the real goal was, instead, to guarantee a place for Brazil in the global governance oligopoly). As we have already emphasised, historically Brazil had systematically struggled to build a peaceful and institutionalised international system (Corrêa 2007; Fonseca Jr 2011). Such an engagement is evidenced by the fact that the country was among the first members, if not one of the founding members, of most intergovernmental organizations. Lula's foreign policy, while reinforcing the traditional objective of making the country a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, stressed the importance of multilateralism for Brazil and, more broadly, the need to strengthen international organizations. And if international organizations were to promote the sustainable development of both the periphery and the semi-periphery, development cooperation should be encouraged, particularly South-South cooperation.

Besides enhancing the country's bilateral cooperation, as we will see ahead, Brazil also emphasised triangular cooperation (Milani 2017), in order to increase the impact and legitimacy of the country as a provider of technical cooperation[2]. It thus transformed not only cooperation agencies of the developed world but also the IOs into partners of Brazil in the transference and diffusion of its policy innovations. There was also an emphasis on the production of alternative policy expertise, e.g., through the creation of institutions such as the International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth (IPG-IG), which was a partnership between the Brazilian government and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), whose headquarters are in Brasília. As a think tank, IPG-IG, which was founded in 2004, promotes policy dialogues and the diffusion of successful policies, including, of course, Brazilian innovations and expertise.

Additional evidence of the success of Lula's foreign policy in transforming policy diffusion into an invaluable instrument include the fact that several international organizations, such as Unicef, FAO, UNDP and the World Bank, have embraced Brazilian efforts to transform domestic policy innovations into 'best practices' to be emulated worldwide (Oliveira 2020). It is also important to recall that Brazil came to be regarded as 'the soft power great power' (Dauvergne & Farias 2012).

The fourth objective, one of the most important, was **(d) the revitalisation of the South-South coalition**. Brazilian foreign policy made its best effort to transform not only the country but also other Southern nations into legitimate and creative 'rule makers' and not only 'rule takers.' The sharing of Southern policy innovations was both symbolic and instrumental to the desired transformation. A good example, among many others, was the IBSA Forum (India, Brazil, and South Africa), which was created in 2003 and had 16 Working Groups linking policymakers, bureaucracies, social movements and experts from the three countries. These Working Groups strived to promote mutual learning and policy transfer in several areas (Faria, Nogueira & Lopes 2012). According to Crescentino (2017: 14):

> [The] Brazilian goal became the pursuit of greater autonomy, prompting in turn a multipolar international system and preserving or increasing an independence that would guarantee growth and development. This rhetoric was essential in South-South relations, positioning Brazil as one of the leaders of the Global South in order to challenge the rules of global governance. Brazilian foreign policy ran as a producer and disseminator of an alternative model of cooperation for development, intended to lead the reduction of asymmetries in the international system, and allowing a change of status in the countries of the South from receivers to suppliers.

In a book that analyses the 30 years of activities of the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (*Agência Brasileira de Cooperação*, ABC), Milani (2017: 103) emphasises how the Agency started diffusing internationally Brazilian policy innovations not only through the

multilateral system, particularly United Nations agencies and funds but also through the country's bilateral relations, 'mainly Latin-American and African.'

Last, but not least, another objective of Lula's foreign policy was **(e) the promotion of systematic bilateral cooperation with other Latin American and African countries**. The cooperation provided by ABC, whose budget greatly increased during Lula's government, relied to a large extent on the diffusion or sharing of several Brazilian policy innovations (Milani 2017). Kenyan professor Calestous Juma said once that 'for every African problem, there is a Brazilian solution' (Fonseca et al 2016). The fact that foreign minister Celso Amorim had repeated that phrase countless times may certainly be regarded as yet another evidence of the importance of policy exportation for Brazilian international strategies. Further evidence may be found in a 2011 report on South-South partnership between Brazil and sub-Saharan countries, jointly published by the World Bank and the Institute of Applied Economic Research (*Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada*, IPEA), a Brazilian government-led research organization. That report has a chapter dedicated exclusively to 'The knowledge connection' (*A conexão do conhecimento*) between the countries, which presents the 'Brazilian experience and good practices in several different areas that have called the attention of other developing countries, particularly in Africa' (Banco Mundial & IPEA 2011: 49). The report has a telling title: 'Bridge over the Atlantic' (*Ponte sobre o Atlântico*).

Still another piece of evidence of the success of Lula's administration in transforming policy diffusion into an important foreign policy instrument, this time concerning Latin America, was the suggestion made by the head of the Inter-American Dialogue research department that the Washington Consensus had been substituted in the region by the 'Brasília Consensus.' The so-called 'Brasília Consensus' was composed of an emphasis on macroeconomic stability, minimum wage valorisation, a priority given to social inclusion, plus the adoption of conditional cash transfer programs inspired by *Bolsa Família* (Gutiérrez 2012).

Conclusions

I have argued in this article that international policy diffusion should also be understood as one of the many foreign policy instruments and that it is a rather versatile one, as it can be coupled to most or perhaps all traditional foreign policy instruments of political, economic, cultural, and military character. It was also stressed that foreign policy can promote policy diffusion both directly and indirectly and that it may entail both policy exportation and importation. Hypothetical examples were presented together with empirical evidence of how Brazilian foreign policy performed as a driver for policy diffusion, particularly policy exportation, in several domains.

Furthermore, I have proposed that policy exportation may be regarded as the backbone of Lula da Silva's foreign policy (2003-2010). If we understand backbone as a structure sustaining a body and its movement, an important but certainly not the only or the most important one, there should be no doubt that the preceding discussion has validated

the proposition. Therefore, the article demonstrates not only that policy diffusion is a regular practice and an ordinary tool employed in cooperation for development or as a soft power strategy, as frequently highlighted by the specialized literature, but that it may be, and usually is, a central instrument for the achievement of all sorts of foreign policy objectives.

History has continually shown us that to achieve its goals, the state can and will use, depending on the circumstances, whatever instruments are at its disposal, or that can be seized, created, or mobilized. In the case of policy diffusion, the specialized literature has also revealed that the impact of any given policy that was borrowed or imported, for whatever reason and means, may be quite distinct from what was expected (Dolowitz & Marsh 2000; Oliveira & Pal 2018). Several studies, for instance, have already demonstrated the many negative effects of the adoption of Brazilian policy innovations in African countries, as a result of South-South cooperation promoted by Brazilian foreign policy, particularly during Workers Party administrations (e.g., Cabral 2016; Esteves et al. 2016). This article, however, could not tackle the important question of the constraints facing policy transfer and diffusion, and the reasons and expectations of borrower countries, as our discussion was focused on the Brazilian experience in a time when the country was eager to perform as a global player.

One should also bear in mind that policy diffusion usually entails processes and mobilises institutions, people, and networks whose characteristics, resources and interests vary greatly, depending on the policy communities involved. This means that the more policy diffusion is employed as a foreign policy instrument, the more urgent it will be to close the gap between the academic communities discussed earlier. Therefore, it is probably a good idea to follow the tradition and finish this article by presenting a few further questions for future investigation:

- How can foreign policy influence the four main elements of transnational diffusion: the initial *stimulus*, the *medium*, the social agents, and the outcomes (Solingen 2012)?
- The four mechanisms that promote policy diffusion are coercion, emulation, learning, and competition (Dobbin, Simmons & Garret 2007). What are the roles that foreign policy can play in these processes? What are the implications of the different mechanisms for the foreign policy objectives?

Concerning Brazilian foreign policy, it is important to say that more than ten years after the end of Lula's administration, the country has not only lost its capacity and interest in promoting the diffusion of its policy innovations but has also become an eager importer and a dedicated imitator of policies that largely seem to benefit neither the Brazilian people nor the country's main economic activities, but instead quite small domestic minorities and foreign interests.

Notes

1 'Circulation can be seen as a vast and continuous movement of production of models, emission, appropriation and translation of their contents by multiple actors (individuals or collective, governmental or non-governmental), which have different power resources. This movement is perpetuated by the means

of new emissions of the reframed public action instruments to other parts of the world. It is usually a circular process that also involves mutual learning and can go forward and backwards from one place to another, in a sort of long spiral' (Oliveira & Faria 2017: 22).

2 The definition for triangular cooperation provided by the United Nations is 'Southern-driven partnerships between two or more developing countries, supported by a developed country(ies) or multilateral organization(s), to implement development cooperation programmes and projects' (UNDP 2017).

References

Anderson, P. 2011. 'Lula's Brazil'. *London Review of Books*, 33 (7): 3-12.

Ayllón, B. 2006. 'La Construcción Histórica de la Identidad Internacional de Brasil: Permanencias y Tradiciones en la Política Exterior Brasileña.' *Revista Múltipla*,14 (20): 9-32.

Baldwin, D. A. 2000. 'Success and Failure in Foreign Policy.' *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3:167-182.

Banco Mundial and IPEA. 2011. *Ponte sobre o Atlântico – Brasil e África Subsaariana: Parceria Sul-Sul para o Crescimento*. Brasília: IPEA.

Béland, D and M Orestein. 2013. 'International Organizations as Policy Actors: An Ideational Approach.' *Global Social Policy*, 13 (2):125-143.

Besada, H and S Kindornay. 2013. *Multilateral Development Cooperation in a Changing World Order*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Binder, A; Rotmann, P. 2014. *Evaluating Foreign Policy Measures in Fragile Contexts. Lessons Learned and Recommendations*. Global Public Policy Institute.

Bulmer, S and C Radaelli. M. 2004. 'The Europeanisation of National Policy?' *Queen's Papers on Europeanisation*, 1.

Burges, S. W. 2010. 'The Possibilities and Perils of Presidential Diplomacy: Lessons from the Lula years in Brazil.' In: Rolland, D; Lessa, A.C. (Eds.). *Relations Internationales du Brésil: Les Chemins de la Puissance*. Paris: L'Harmattan, pp.185-195.

Cabral, L. 2016. 'Brazil's Tropical Solutions for Africa: Tractors, Matracas and the Politics of Appropriate Technology.' *The European Journal of Development Research*, 28 (3): 414-430.

Cason, J and T Power. 2009. 'Presidentialization, Pluralization, and the Rollback of Itamaraty: Explaining Change in Brazilian Foreign Policy Making in the Cardoso-Lula Era.' *International Political Science Review*, 30 (2): 117-140.

Charillon, F. 2016. 'Public Policy and Foreign Policy Analysis.' In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford, OUP.

Chatin, M. 2016. 'Brazil: Analysis of a Rising Soft Power.' *Journal of Political Power*, 9 (3): 369-393.

Corrêa, L. F. (Org.). 2007. *O Brasil nas Nações Unidas (1946-2006)*. Brasília, FUNAG.

Couto, C and G Absher-Bellon. 2018. 'Imitação ou Coerção? Constituições Estaduais e Centralização Federativa no Brasil.' *Revista de Administração Pública*, 52 (2): 321-344.

Crescentino, D. S. 2017. 'South-South Cooperation: Resistance or Continuity?' *Critical Studies Journal*, 3: 2-18.

Dauvergne, P and D Farias. 2012. 'The Rise of Brazil as a Global Development Power.' *Third World Quarterly*, 33 (5): 903-917.

Dobbin, F; B Simmons and G Garrett. 2007. 'The Global Diffusion of Public Policies: Social Construction, Coercion, Competition or Learning?' *Annual Review of Sociology,* 33: 449-472.

Dolowitz, D. 2000. 'Introduction.' *Governance,* 13 (1): 1-4.

Dolowitz, D and D Marsh. 2000. 'Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making.' *Governance,* 13(1): 5-24.

Ervik, R and E Nilssen (Eds.). 2009. *The Role of International Organizations in Social Policy*. Cheltenham, UK, Edward Elgar.

Esteves, P. et al. 2016. 'Is There a Brazilian Solution for Every African Problem? Brazilian Health Cooperation in Angola (2006-2015).' *Carta Internacional*, 11 (2): 152-176.

Faria, C. A. P. 2012. 'A Difusão de Políticas Sociais como Estratégia de Inserção Internacional: Brasil e Venezuela Comparados.' *Revista Interseções*, 14 (2): 335-371.

_____. 2018a. 'As Organizações Internacionais como Difusoras de Políticas Públicas,' *Revista Monções*, 7(13): 29-49.

_____. 2018b. *Políticas públicas e Relações Internacionais*. Brasília, ENAP.

_____. 2018c. 'Desencapsulamento, Politização e Necessidade de (Re)legitimação da Política Externa Brasileira: Razões e Percalços para o seu Monitoramento e Avaliação.' *Revista Tempo do Mundo*, IPEA, 4(1): 65-94.

_____. 2021. *Política Externa Brasileira: Formulação, Implementação e Avaliação*. Porto Alegre: Ed. Da UFRGS/CEGOV.

Faria, C, J Nogueira and D Lopes. 2012. 'Coordenação Intragovernamental para a Implementação da Política Externa Brasileira: O Caso do Fórum IBAS.' *DADOS Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 55 (1): 173-220.

Faria, C and C Paradis. 2013. 'Humanism and Solidarity in Brazilian Foreign Policy under Lula (2003-2010): Theory and Practice.' *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 7(2): 8-36.

Faria, C, D Coêlho and S Jard (Eds.). 2016. *Difusão de Políticas Públicas*. São Paulo: Ed. Da UFABC.

Faria, C and D Lopes. 2019. 'As Assimetrias Internacionais e as Desigualdades Domésticas na Política Externa de FHC e de Lula.' In: Arretche, M; Marques, E. C.; Faria, C. A. P. (Orgs.). *As Políticas da Política: Desigualdades e Inclusão nos Governos do PSDB e do PT*. São Paulo: Ed. UNESP, pp. 297-320.

Fink, S. 2013. 'When I Find Myself in Times of Trouble…: The Conditional Effect of International Organisations on Policy Convergence.' 2013. *European Journal of Political Research,* 52(5): 630-659.

Fonseca, B, E Capai, M Amaral and N Viana. 2016. 'Brazil's Failed Africa Project.' *Agência Pública*. [online] 9 Nov. Available at: https://apublica.org/2016/11/brazils-failed-africa-project/ [Accessed 19 May 2020].

Fonseca Jr., G. 2011. 'Notes on the Evolution of Brazilian Multilateral Diplomacy.' *Global Governance*, 17: 375-397.

Gardini, G. L. 2016. 'Brazil: The State of the Art of its Rise and Power Projection.' In: Gardini, G.L.; Almeida, M. T. (Eds). *Foreign Policy Responses to the Rise of Brazil. Balancing Power in Emerging States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 12-28.

Graham, E, C Shipan and C Volden. 2013. 'The Diffusion of Policy Diffusion Research in Political Science.' *British Journal of Political Science*, 43 (3): 673-701.

Gratius, S. 2012. 'The Rise of Latin American Regionalism: The Same Old Thing?' *Fundación Ideas, Discussion Paper*. Madrid, 32p.

Gutiérrez, E. 2012. *The Brasilia Consensus, a Model for Latin America*. [online] Inter Press Service. Available at: http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/10/the-brasilia-consensus-a-model-for-latin-america/ [Accessed 19 May 2020].

Hoebink, P. 2010. *European Development Cooperation. In Between the Local and the Global*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hudson, V and B Day. 2020. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Hunter, W and T Power. 2007. 'Rewarding Lula: Executive Power, Social Policy, and the Brazilian Elections of 2006.' *Latin American Politics & Society*, 49(1): 1-30.

IPEA. 2010. *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional: 2005-2009*. Brasília: IPEA/ABC.

Karch, A. 2006. *Democratic Laboratories: Policy Diffusion Among the American States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Kerr, P and G Wiseman. 2013. *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World: Theories and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lafer, C. 2001. *A Identidade Internacional do Brasil e a Política Externa Brasileira: Passado, Presente e Futuro*. São Paulo: Ed. Perspectiva.

Levi-Faur, D and E Vigoda-Gadot. 2004. 'The International Transfer and Diffusion of Policy and Management Innovations.' In: Vigoda-Gadot, E.; Levi-Faur, D. (Eds.). *International Public Policy and Management: Policy Learning Beyond Regional, Cultural and Political Boundaries*. NY: Marcel Dekker.

Lima, J.A.S. 2015. 'A Difusão de Políticas na Cooperação Técnica Internacional: Evidências da Cooperação Sul-Sul do Brasil.' *Mural Internacional*, 6(2): 171-185.

Lima, M. R. S. 2010. 'Tradição e Inovação na Política Externa Brasileira.' *Plataforma Democrática, Working Paper*, 3.

Lima, M and M Coutinho. 2006. 'Integração moderna'. *Análise de Conjuntura OPSA*.

Mendonça, J and C Faria. 2015. 'A Cooperação Técnica do Brasil com a África: Comparando os Governos Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002) e Lula da Silva (2003-2010).' *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 58(1): 5-22.

Milani, C.R.S. 2017. *ABC 30 anos: História e Desafios Futuros*. Brasília: Agência Brasileira de Cooperação.

Milani, C and R Lopes. 2014. 'Cooperação Sul-Sul e *Policy Transfer* em Saúde Pública: Análise das Relações entre Brasil e Moçambique entre 2003 e 2012.' *Carta Internacional*, 9(1): 59-78.

Milani, C and R Duarte. 2015. 'Cooperação para o Desenvolvimento e Cooperação Sul-Sul: A Perspectiva do Brasil.' In: Ramanzani Jr., H.; Ayerbe, L.F. (Orgs.). *Política Externa Brasileira, Cooperação Sul-Sul e Negociações Internacionais*. São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, pp.53-82.

Milani, C and L Pinheiro. 2013. 'Política Externa Brasileira: Os Desafios de sua Caracterização como Política Pública.' *Contexto Internacional*, 35(1): pp.11-41.

Milhorance, C. 2013. 'A Política de Cooperação do Brasil com a África Subsaariana no Setor Rural: Transferência e Inovação na Difusão de Políticas Públicas.' *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 56(2): 5-22.

_____. 2019. *New Geographies of Global Policy-making. South-South Networks and Rural Development Strategies*. New York: Routledge.

Nina, A. 2006. 'Action Against Hunger and Poverty: Brazilian Foreign Policy in Lula's First Term (2003-2006).' *Working Paper* No. CBS-83-07. Oxford, Centre for Brazilian Studies, University of Oxford.

Onis, J. 2008. 'Brazil's Big Moment: A South-American Giant Wakes up.' *Foreign Affairs*, 87(6): 110-122.

Oliveira, O. P. 2016. *Embaixadores da Participação*: *A Difusão Internacional do Orçamento Participativo a Partir do Brasil*. São Paulo: Annablume & Fapesp.

_____. 2020. 'Brazil Exporting Social Policy: From Local Innovation to a Global Model.' *Journal of Politics in Latin America*. First Published 20 January 2020 Research Article. https://doi.org/10.1177/1866802X19889757

_____ (Ed.). 2021. *Handbook of Policy Transfer, Diffusion and Circulation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Oliveira, O and C Faria. 2017. 'Policy Transfer, Diffusion, and Circulation: Research Traditions and the State of the Discipline in Brazil.' *Novos Estudos Cebrap*, 36(1): 13-32.

Oliveira, O and L Pal. 2018. 'New Frontiers and Directions in Policy Transfer, Diffusion and Circulation Research: Agents, Spaces, Resistance, and Translations.' *Revista de Administração Pública*, 52(2): 199-220.

Oliveira, O. P. et al. 2020. *Latin America and Policy Diffusion. From Import to Export*. New York: Routledge.

Osorio Gonnet, C. 2018. *¿Aprendiendo o Emulando? Cómo se Difunden las Políticas Sociales en América Latina.* Santiago: LOM.

Osorio Gonnet, C, M Oliveira and J Vergara. 2020. 'International Development Cooperation as One of the Triggers for the Process of Public Policy Transfer.' *Estudos Internacionais,* Vol.8, No.2, pp.8-26. https://doi.org/10.5752/P.2317-773X.2020v8n2p8-26

Pomeroy, M, B Suyama and L Waisbich. 2019. 'The Diffusion of Social Protection and Food Security Policies: Emerging Issues in Brazilian South-South Cooperation for Development.' In: Oliveira, O. P. et al (Eds.) *Latin America and Policy Diffusion: from Import and Export*. New York: Routledge, pp.93-114.

Putnam, R. D. 1988. 'Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games.' *International Organization*, Vol.42, No.3, pp.427-460.

Ribas, L and C Faria. 2011. 'A Política Externa Vista da Janela do Avião: A Diplomacia Presidencial nos Governos FHC e Lula.' *Anais do III Simpósio de Pós-Graduação em Relações Internacionais*. São Paulo, 08 a 11 novembro 2011.

Ribeiro, D and R Kfuri. 2010. 'A Nova Integração Regional e a Expansão do Capitalismo Brasileiro na América do Sul.' *Observador On-Line*, 5(4).

Ricupero, R. 2010. 'À sombra de Charles de Gaulle: Uma Diplomacia Carismática e Intransferível. A política Externa do Governo Lula (2003-2010).' *Novos Estudos Cebrap*, No.87: pp.35-58.

Riggirozzi, P and D Tussie (Eds.). 2012. *The Rise of Post-hegemonic Regionalism: The Case of Latin America*. London: Springer.

Riggirozzi, P. 2014. 'Regionalism Through Social Policy: Collective Action and Health Diplomacy in South America.' *Economy and Society*, 43(3): 432-454.

Rogers, E. M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations.* New York: Free Press.

Rothkopf, D. 2009. 'The World's Best Foreign Minister [online].' *Foreign Policy*. Available at: https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/07/the-worlds-best-foreign-minister/ [Accessed 17 May 2020].

Sanchez, M, E Silva, E Cardoso and P Spécie. 2006. 'Política Externa como Política Pública: Uma Análise pela Regulamentação Constitucional Brasileira (1967-1988).' *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, No.27, pp.125-143.

Santarelli, M and M Pomeroy. 2017. 'Difusão e Mobilidade de Visões de Segurança Alimentar e Desenvolvimento Rural nos PALOPS: Um Olhar desde a Cooperação Brasileira.' *Tempo Exterior*, No.34, Vol. XVII(II), pp.103-119.

Silva, M. M. S. 2017. *Poverty Reduction, Education, and the Global Diffusion of Conditional Cash Transfers*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Silva, A. L. R. 2015. 'Geometria Variável e Parcerias Estratégicas: A Diplomacia Muldimensional do Governo Lula.' *Contexto Internacional*, 37(1).

Stone, D. 2008. 'Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and their Networks.' *The Policy Studies Journal*, 36(1): 19-38.

_____. 2013. *Knowledge Actors and Transnational Governance. The Private–Public Policy Nexus in the Global Agora*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stone, D and K Moloney. (Eds.). 2019. *The Oxford Handbook of Global Policy and Transnational Administration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-22.

Solingen, E. 2012. 'Of Dominoes and Firewalls: The Domestic, Regional, and Global Politics of International Diffusion.' *International Studies Quarterly*, 56: 631-644.

Sugiyama, N. B. 2013. *Diffusion of Good Government. Social Sector Reforms in Brazil*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Thuswohl, M. 2011. 'Garcia: "Brasil não quer ser a Alemanha da América do Sul" [online].' *Rede Brasil Atual*. Available at: https://www.redebrasilatual.com.br/politica/2011/07/garcia-brasil-nao-quer-ser-a-alemanha-da-america-do-sul/ [Accessed 9 Jun. 2020].

UNDP. 2017. *Frequently Asked Questions: South-South and Triangular Cooperation*. [online]. Available at: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Development%20Cooperation%20and%20Finance/SSC_FAQ%20v1.pdf [Accessed 19 May 2018].

Vigenvani, T and G Cepaluni. 2007. 'A Política Externa de Lula da Silva: A Estratégia da Autonomia pela Diversificação.' *Contexto Internacional*, 29(2): 273-334.

Waltz, K. 1996. 'International Politics is not Foreign Policy.' *Security Studies*, 6(1): 54-57.

Wang, H and Y Lu. 2008. 'The Conception of Soft Power and its Policy Implications: A Comparative Study of China and Taiwan.' *Journal of Contemporary China*, 17(56): 425–447.

Zucco Jr., C. 2013. 'When Payouts Pay off: Conditional Cash Transfers, Clientelism, and Coting Behavior.' *American Journal of Political Science* 47(03): 810-822.

Acknowledgements

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Latin American Centre, St. Anthony's College, University of Oxford, UK (24 April 2018), as the Inaugural Lecture of the 2018 Rio Branco Professorship; and at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), UK (6 June 2018). The author is thankful to LAC/University of Oxford, CAPES, IDS, CNPq, FAPEMIG, and PUC Minas, for their

support; and Alex Shankland, Andrew Hurrell, Lidia Cabral, Tim Power, and the two anonymous reviewers selected by Contexto Internacional, for their invaluable comments and suggestions. Needless to say, the author is the only one responsible for the remaining shortcomings of the article.

About the author

Carlos Aurélio Pimenta de Faria is a Senior Associate Professor at the Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUC Minas), Brazil. He holds a PhD in Political Science (IUPERJ) and was Rio Branco Professor at the University of Oxford; a visiting scholar at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex; and at Umeå Universitet, Sweden.

Política Externa e Difusão de Políticas Públicas no Brasil de Lula da Silva (2003-2010)

Resumo: O artigo argumenta, primeiramente, que a difusão internacional de políticas públicas deve ser entendida também como um dos diversos instrumentos da política externa e que ela é um instrumento bastante versátil, uma vez que pode estar associada à maioria ou talvez a todos os tradicionais instrumentos da política externa: políticos, econômicos, culturais e militares. Ademais, o trabalho defende a tese de que a exportação de inovações brasileiras no campo das políticas públicas pode ser considerada a espinha dorsal da política externa do país durante o governo de Lula da Silva (2003-2010), uma vez que ela foi central para: (a) a produção de uma renovada identidade internacional para o país; (b) a promoção do regionalismo pós-liberal na América Latina; (c) a defesa de novos ou expandidos papéis para as Organizações Internacionais, o que era uma das prioridades da política externa do Brasil naqueles anos; (d) a revitalização da coalizão Sul-Sul; (e) para a diplomacia presidencial; e (f) para a promoção de uma cooperação bilateral mais sistemática com os vizinhos da América Latina e com os países africanos.

Palavras-chave: difusão internacional de políticas públicas; política externa brasileira; governos Lula da Silva

Received on 16 July 2020, and approved for publication on 2 February 2022.