

Chapter Three:

Results and Discussion



3.1 Prospects of Brazil-Indonesia Strategic Partnership

3.1.1 Defining and tracing the origins of strategic partnership between countries

The concept of strategic partnership is one of the most cited phrases in discussions related to foreign policy and international relations; however, its understanding is not clear. The development of strategic partnerships among emerging countries in international relations came about after the Cold War ended. During the Cold War, countries were aligned in blocs that were led by the rival superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union. After the Cold War ended, these countries found themselves on their own and started forming new bilateral alliances, in most cases with countries that were more powerful. Various countries define their foreign relations with other countries differently such as alliances or partnerships; however, when two nations consider their relations to be strategic, it is likely that their ties will develop on a new level. During the past 10 years, rising nations have been the target of strategic partnerships by both developed and developing nations. Despite the fact that strategic partnerships are a

crucial part of the foreign policies of many countries, there is no precise definition of the concept. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, “strategic” refers to anything that is associated with long-term goals and interest. Thus, by extension, strategic partnership may denote shared long-term goals and interests as well as ways that can be used to achieve them. In the real world, strategic partnerships are often linked to issues related to security or defense; however, a survey by Zhao on the various strategic partnerships adopted by various countries reveal that strategic partnerships are all-inclusive and deal with additional issues in bilateral relations including economic relations (banking, investment and trade), agriculture, health and education among others. A number of international relations scholars such as Alcides have refuted the idea of a set definition of strategic partnerships, maintaining that each strategic partnership is unique in terms of context and time; as a result, there are no unifying aspects of strategic partnerships. In addition, some international relations scholars have further maintained that the phrase, “strategic partnerships” is just a terminology that some countries deploy to create a perception that their ties are at a closer level. The debate on the definitions of the concept of strategic partnerships is beyond the scope of this study because this research has already identified a specific case for assessment: the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership.

Prior to exploring the future prospects of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership, it is imperative to look at the circumstances that resulted in the development of the concept. In the current international political scene, strategic partnerships play a pivotal role in the establishment bilateral relations between countries. A number of countries such as Vietnam have developed soft power and raised their global status through

strategic partnerships. After the end of the Cold War period, policy makers and researchers alike were hopeful about the prospect of a long-lasting and stable world peace. However, there have been significant challenges with regard to the achievement of this goal such as religious conflict witnessed all over the world, and risks associated with nuclear threats. Specifically, territorial and sovereignty disputes have increased during the 21st century, which have played a significant role in hampering development and cooperation between countries. At the bilateral level, issues associated with Cold War have yet to be resolved. In nearly half the time, the period of 1990-2013 saw the number of civil wars, conflicts and wars equal the number reported during the period of 1945-1989. In addition, the situation is becoming increasingly complicated due to the urgency associated with the development and security issues, and that multilateral mechanisms and international law are under threat posed by authoritarian and aggressive unilateralism. International law has been abused regardless of increasing instances of international protest. One of the leading risks hampering global security is terrorism. In addition, the prevalence and complexity of cyber-crime and cross-border crime is increasing. Also, resolving resources and trade disputes is increasingly becoming difficult. Managing environmental pollution and global warming requires a collective effort from various countries across the globe.

Most countries recognize the common goal of protecting human rights and guaranteeing stability by boosting cooperation in order to achieve development. In the realm of international relations, profound and daunting changes are being witnessed in the sense that the global power system is rapidly developing into a multipolar system characterized by an increase in democratic systems. More and more, less influential nations

are holding more sway over major nations and their voices being heard, and major nations are focusing on building their image through efforts aimed at enhancing global peace. Globalization, international integration and multilateral foreign relations have increased significantly. As a result, countries are adopting flexible and beneficial foreign policy relations that are guided by their national interests. This has resulted in a trend where countries are diversifying their foreign relations and forming new relationship frameworks that can effectively function in a complex international political system. The outcome of this trend has resulted in the development of a new cooperation instrument between countries: strategic partnerships. During the Cold War, blocs formed between the rival communist and capitalist countries. After the end of the Cold War, the communist blocs and its affiliates disintegrated. The nations affected started looking for new ways to build cooperation linkages. From an economic perspective, the global linkage model and division of labor was established during the Cold War; this has evolved to take on the form of inter-regional, regional and bilateral linkages such as Free Trade Agreements (FTA), Bilateral Trade Agreements (BTA) and the World Trade Organization, which is the highest level global economic linkage that emerged after the Cold War. With regard to security and political relations, political blocs have undergone significant changes. For instance, relations based on alliances against a mutual enemy are out-of-date since the conception of “enemies” has also changed. Currently, the global threats that form the common enemy against humanity include nuclear arms risks, terrorism, food insecurity, hunger, poverty, climate change, and economic stagnation. In addition, in international bodies like the UN, the alliances based on interests have replaced blocs, with interests being the common denominator that guides relations between countries.

The notion of forming strategic partnerships between countries in the post-Cold War era was first observed during the 1990s and was prevalent among major countries like China, Russia and the United States. Strategic partnerships entailed all aspects associated with the dealings between countries including culture, economics, peace and security. In developing a new form of cooperation after the Cold War, nations have refrained from adopting a Cold War-like liminary alliance. Countries seek a multilateral and flexible environment that can facilitate the achievement of development and stability. In the course of the Cold War period, countries ignored their development requirements at the expense of arms races, which resulted in various countries, most notably the Soviet Union, exhausting their resources. In the late 20th century, the notion of strategic partnerships as a linkage model was just an abstract idea due to the fact that its content had not yet been developed.

During the early 21st century, the adoption of strategic partnerships between countries increased significantly. As a result, the concept of strategic partnerships was an integral component of the foreign relations policies of various countries. Strategic partnerships can be perceived to be a type of foreign relations in which parties focus on strategic interests, extensive cooperation and shared interests. Strategic partnerships can be distinguished from alliances in the sense that both countries place emphasis on developing close cooperative ties in all aspects such as security, national defense, culture, economics and politics. In addition, strategic partnerships are based on the principle of not being explicitly hostile towards a stated country, implying that strategic partners should refrain from defining enemy targets. With regard to alliance relations, parties or allies are responsible for adopting actions when the interests of

one party are affected. Given the current nature and scope of international politics, strategic partnerships have become crucial in the development of several bilateral mechanisms like strategic dialogue on economics, national defense, security and politics. Alcides reported that these bilateral mechanisms play a significant role in sharing viewpoints and information, and encouraging trust while at the same time lessening the negative effects associated with differences and disagreements. Strategic partnerships usually entail shared interests; however, it is not guaranteed that political or economic differences will go away entirely. As a result, what is important in a strategic bilateral partnership is the manner in which they tackle issues associated with reducing differences and fostering cooperation. During particular times, differences are likely to overpower the similarities; however, this cannot be as a result of strategic partnerships.

Despite the increase in the use of bilateral strategic partnerships between countries, a formal definition of the concept is yet to be provided. The European Union, one of the international organizations known to enter into strategic partnerships, does not offer a clear definition of what the phrase “strategic partnerships” means in the various documents ratifying the strategic partnerships agreements. The EU only outlines the objectives that it seeks to achieve through the strategic objectives. In this regard, through strategic partnerships, countries and multilateral organizations want to collectively promote multilateralism while pursuing common challenges. Specifically, strategic partnerships seeks to establish common ground on issues of joint interest, supporting the political agendas of each other, and taking a common political action at both global and regional levels. Nevertheless, it is imperative to note that

the issues of common interest are likely to differ among various countries. For instance, for India, the issue might be the Afghanistan situation and stability at the global level; for China, the issue might be environmental protection, climate change and energy security; for United States, issues might be counter terrorism, conflicts with Russia regarding energy among others. Some scholars and researchers argue that there is no problem with the fact that conceptual clarity regarding the issue of strategic partnerships is inexistent. This is because some level of constructive ambiguity as well as flexibility is needed for a concept like strategic partnerships. Without a uniform conceptual definition of strategic partnerships, there is an opportunity for an incremental and pragmatic approach, trade-offs, concessions, and mutual adjustments. In addition, different countries enter into strategic partnerships for different reasons, which make it difficult to come up with unifying features of strategic partnerships. In addition, strategic partnerships have been interpreted and viewed differently by different countries. For instance, for the case of China, strategic partnerships ought to be stable and long-term, and surpass the differences that might exist in social systems and ideology. In addition, strategic partnerships ought to be mutual beneficial to both countries. Nevertheless, differences are likely to occur about the conflicts of interests and diverging perceptions with regard to the manner in which common challenges are handled. Some authors are of the opinion that the fact that there is no clear definition of the concept implies that there is the risk of the concept being over-stretched. Other scholars have expressed concerns that the phrase “strategic partnerships” is likely to create unfulfilled expectations. Hettne & Soderbaum looked at the meanings of both “strategy” and “partnerships”. Partnership denotes a cultural ideal regarding a relationship and is based on the presumption of

equal tasks and rights as well as the likelihood of dealing with the issue of collective development of the relationship. “Strategy”, just like strategic alliances depends significantly on the cooperation between the actors who have agreed to work collectively in addressing a specific issue. In this context, cooperation denotes common success and advantage. Therefore, strategy can be perceived to be a plan to achieve a long-term goal or interest. Some scholars are of the opinion that the role that strategic partnerships play in promoting multilateralism is still not clear. This is because strategic partnerships can only function as tools for promoting effective multilateralism when they are preceded by an evaluation of the interests of the strategic partners as well as the shared interests.

In order to better understand the prospects of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership, it is imperative to first examine the issue of strategic partnerships from the perspectives of individual countries in order to determine whether their cooperation could be fostered between these two countries and differences kept at a minimum after the signing of the strategic partnership agreement. The following subsections analyze the issue of strategic partnerships from the perspective of both Brazil and Indonesia. Other scholars

3.1.2 Overview of Brazil’s strategic partnerships

Even before the dawn of formal strategic partnerships, Brazil had in the past pursued closer relations with nations that are deemed a good fit for

its foreign policy and domestic goals. After the Cold War ended, Brazil found strategic partnerships to be crucial in achieving its goal of transforming from a global trader and regional power to a global actor and creating a multipolar world. Therefore, the foreign policy of Brazil has been primarily characterized by universalism, which involves refraining from exclusive alignments to one superior power but rather forming relations and alliances across the globe. As a result, multilateralism has been perceived as the most suitable tactic with regard to shaping the international order as well as the framework that guides Brazil's global strategic partnerships and foreign policy.

On the face of it, the selective nature of most strategic partnerships appears to be inconsistent with the universalism principle. However, Brazil has refrained from entering into exclusive and rigid alliances. As Whitman & Rodt explains, the development of strategic partnerships for Brazil draws upon the country's consistent advocacy for universalism, which adds selective approximation; this helps Brazil to adapt its foreign policy while taking into account international constraints as well as opportunities for the partnerships that may present itself. As a result, strategic partnerships, pragmatism and universalism in the case of Brazil foreign policy can be perceived as a form of selective universalism, with strategic partners acting as indicators of Brazil's commitment to universalism. It is imperative point out that Brazil lacks a formal doctrine that articulates the conceptual basis of its foreign policy priorities; this in turn, provides Brazil with an opportunity to make use of a circumstantial and flexible approach with respect to its strategic objectives. Understanding Brazil's strategic partnership approach as well as the role that it plays in achieving its foreign policy goals requires the need to critically examine the pertinent

initiatives that Brazil has undertaken in building strategic partnerships.

3.1.2.1 Evolution of Brazil's approach towards strategic partnership.

During the Cold War, the foreign policy approach adopted by Brazil was characterized by a number of features including the adoption of a pragmatic approach with regard to relations with world powers, especially the US; an emphasis on the preservation of independence and sovereignty; a commitment to supporting national development; and alignment towards Western values. At the time, Brazil had limited resources but had the goal of becoming an industrial, developed economy while at the same time enhancing its global position and influence; as a result, Brazil recognized that the most viable option was to adopt a cooperative and favorable approach to its foreign relations with developing countries, neighboring countries, and great powers. The outcome was that multilateral cooperation was a key attribute of Brazil's foreign policy. Nevertheless, the failure of the North-South Dialogue in the mid-1970s because of conflicting views between developed and developing nations halted Brazil's ambitions for adopting a multilateral foreign policy. As a result, Brazil embarked on the adoption of a pragmatic approach to foreign policy with the primary objective of making bilateral partnerships a core component of its foreign relations. In addition, the development needs of Brazil meant that Brazil had to secure access to technological, material and financial resources; as a result, their foreign policy was largely shaped by their development needs. At that time, Brazil had identified Japan and Germany as being capable of helping it to achieve technological and economic development by offering access to technology and capital as well as market opportunities. In the cases of

Japan and Germany, the bilateral relationship entailed crucial social, economic and political ties that laid the foundation for mutual trust. Nevertheless, the scope of these partnerships differed. For instance, the Brazil-Germany bilateral relationship focused on technological, industrial and capital interests, and resulted in the signing of the 1975 Agreement on Cooperation on Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. This agreement has been cited as playing a crucial role in enhancing Brazil's capacity to establish and operate nuclear energy plants. On the other hand, the Brazil-Japan partnership focused on agricultural technologies; this played a pivotal role in helping Brazil to grow into the second largest exporter and producer of soya globally. In addition, this relationship helped to lessen Japanese dependence and improving its food security. It is evident that the early forms of Brazil's bilateral partnerships (though not formally referred to as strategic partnerships) were successful. Despite the fact that they involved privileged nations, they played a pivotal role in improving the technological capabilities of Brazil and resulted in a significant growth in Brazil's exports and economy. In addition, these bilateral relationships reduced Brazil's reliance on the US, and helped Brazil and its partners to position themselves on the global map.

Despite the fact that the first bilateral partnerships adopted by Brazil brought about significant developments, Brazil was not protected from the consequences of economic crisis witnessed during the late 1970s and early 1980s. With the countries under the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development experiencing economic stagnation, Brazil made the decision to increase its focus on the regional market. As a result, Brazil prioritized its relations with Argentina, and in 1985, both Brazil and Argentina started a bilateral economic integration project that

was largely driven by the need for a collective action during significant external economic crises. Brazil-Argentina relations were hallmarked by the 1988 Treaty for Integration, Cooperation and Development, which played a leading role in the establishment of the Southern Cone Common Market in 1991. MERCOSUR generated greater investment and stronger trade relations and helped in increasing the strategic value of the bilateral relationship between Argentina and Brazil while at the same enabling both partners to maintain pace with the increasing regionalism at the international level. Although the Brazil-Argentina cooperation efforts were not recognized as a formal strategic partnership, several scholars who analyzed this relationship during the 1980s and 1990s understood its strategic importance. Nonetheless, the convergence witnessed on open markets and liberal reforms failed to result in a convergence in foreign policy. Brazil maintained a universalist approach whereas Argentina sought a privileged alliance with the United States. These differences in international strategies inhibited Brazil and Argentina from cooperating on key international affairs in the course of the 1990s. During the 1990s, President Fernando Henrique's administration embarked on establishing closer ties with emerging nations like South Africa, Russia, China and India. These initiatives placed emphasis on the expansion of trade relations; however, during this time, Brazil did not have the comprehensive political framework that would make these ties strategic partnerships. In addition, President Fernando's administration focused on revitalizing Brazil's bilateral relations with developed nations. It is evident that this second phase of Brazil's bilateral relations was primarily characterized by the quest for regional integration.

President Luis Inacio Lula da Silva (2000-2010) expanded and diversified

Brazil's strategic partnerships. This is evident by the fact that Brazil emphasized the strategic value accrued from each of its bilateral relationships. During this time, Brazil reaffirmed the universalism of its foreign policy and importance of global partnerships; these measures were taken as corrective measures to address the extremely defensive foreign policy adopted by President Cardoso. Under President Lula, Brazil increased its activity at the global level through a number of strategies such as multilateralism, ad hoc coalitions, inter-regionalism, regionalism and bilateral initiatives. Moreover, strategic partnerships were a crucial diplomatic instrument aimed at strengthening and reconciling Brazil's engagement at bilateral, regional and global levels. This was contrary to Brazil's previous policies of using strategic partnerships as bilateral tools to achieve narrow domestic goals. As a result, President Lula emphasized South-South relations along with bilateral engagements with other rising countries like Russia, China and South Africa on the basis similarities and shared perspectives on key global issues. Similarities included aspects such as increasing relevance in the global economy, large populations and large territories; whereas shared perspectives on key global issues included the desire to create a multipolar global order, reform the United Nations, promote environmental preservation, inclusion and social equity, and consolidate the multilateral trade system. Nevertheless, the emphasis on developing nations did not inhibit Brazil from pursuing partnerships with both developing and developed countries. Indeed, the number of strategic partnerships that Brazil entered into increased to 21, which is a reaffirmation of the universalistic nature of Brazil's foreign relations. Out of the 21 strategic partnerships, 10 were agreements with developed countries, 5 were with other rising nations, 5 with developing countries, and 1 with the European Union. Despite the fact that Brazil's diplomatic

discourse placed emphasis on the value of South-South relations, the greatest proportion of strategic partnerships entailed developed nations. In addition, contrary to preceding bilateral relations, contemporary strategic partnerships adopted by Brazil are more encompassing in terms of the policy scope and that the current strategic partnerships are more likely to address the core global issues. This has led to Brazil developing ambitious and heterogeneous agendas characterized by multilateralism and bilateralism relations coexisting, which is manifested in Brazil's membership in groups like BRICS and IBSA.

3.1.2.2 Major issue areas and goals of Brazil's strategic partnerships.

In order to explore the prospects of a Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership, it is imperative to analyze the major issue areas and goals of Brazil strategic partnerships in order to determine whether they would complement the issue areas and goals of Indonesia's strategic partnerships. Present day strategic partnerships adopted by Brazil are characterized by flexibility, indicate several foreign policy interests of Brazil, and are heterogeneous. The strategic partnerships place an emphasis on a various policy field, with top priority placed on economic issues (finance, investment and trade), culture and education ranking second, science and technology ranking thirds, and defense issues ranking fourth. The inclusion of defense issues in foreign policy agendas of strategic partnerships is a somewhat novel development, indicating Brazil's concerns in terms of enhancing its military capabilities, which have been deteriorating in the recent years. Other issue areas that are included in Brazil strategic partnerships are health, environment, agriculture, social policies and political dialogue, which constitute some of the most crucial

areas where Brazil has managed to develop substantial expertise that has allowed it to participate in trilateral development initiatives. The five main goals of Brazil's strategic partnerships include:

I. Developing and enhancing its technological

capabilities. With the strategic ambitions and economic needs of Brazil growing, Brazil has prioritized technological innovation and development. According to Alcides, this goal is crucial for the Brazil, especially at a time when Brazil's competitiveness is declining in areas such as environmental sustainability, energy security and efficiency, maritime, space and air activities and information technology among others. In addition, this goal is crucial for Brazil to offset the rapid increase in competition in both external and domestic markets. During the 1970s, Brazil's partnerships with Japan and Germany had the primary goal of developing its technological capabilities. This goal continues today, as indicated by Brazil's strategic partnership with France (defense and nuclear sectors especially nuclear submarines), and Ukraine and Russia (space activities, especially developing geostationary satellites and satellite launching vehicles).

II. Expansion of the scope of bilateral relations and

strengthening mutual engagement. Strengthening bilateral relations by increasing the levels of interaction and mutual benefits and interests constitutes a key component of Brazil's strategic partnership with countries such as Australia, Turkey and Venezuela. For instance, in the case of the Brazil-Venezuela strategic partnership, the primary interest in widening the scope

of the bilateral relationship can be attributed to the importance of gas and oil for the economy of Venezuela, resulting in significant emphasis on investment and trade.

III. Promoting regional integration and cooperation. With economic and political regionalism becoming a key pillar of Brazil's foreign relations policy since mid-1980s, bilateral partnerships with a number of major countries in South America were raised up to strategic partnership status. There is no doubt that cooperation with Argentina was the most appropriate for meeting Brazil's needs. Brazil has also been targeting Peru and Venezuela (as previously mentioned) as strategic partners. This is because of the fact that these countries are strategically located and better positioned to articulate the interest of Brazil as well as increase the economic presence of Brazil in South America, which is a top priority with regard to regional integration. In addition, apart from the fact that Venezuela is a major player in the Amazon region and a key energy resources supplier, it also plays a significant role in enabling Brazil to enhance its economic and political presence in Central America, and particularly in the Caribbean region. In the case of Peru, a significant part of the country is situated in the Amazon and provides the best route to the Pacific Coast. Furthermore, Peru is a key economic and political player in the Andean Region. These two examples of strategic partnerships indicate the efforts by Brazil to strengthen its bilateral initiatives while at the same developing a South America that is stronger economically and politically. In this regard, bilateral initiatives adopted by Brazil serve the role of

promoting regional integratio

IV. Fostering inter-regionalism. Brazil is currently on a mission to build its image as a global and regional player; as a result, it is better positioned to play a major role in establishing economic and political relations between South America and Asia, Africa and Europe. A case in point is the EU-Brazil Action plan, which has the objective of promoting bi-regional cooperation between the EU and Latin America as well as strengthening EU-MERCOSUR relations. In addition, Brazil has also identified Indonesia as a key strategic partner in strengthening ASEAN-South America relations. This is the primary motivation underpinning the Brazil-Indonesia Strategic partnership agreement signed in 2013. This is also true for the strategic partnership between Brazil and other countries such as South Africa and India. Through strengthening its bilateral economic relations with other countries and regions, Brazil is positioning itself to engage its neighbors in inter-regional economic activities. For example, currently, an expanded MERCOSUR is taking part in trade negotiations with the EU. Nevertheless, some major countries in the region such as Colombia, Chile and Peru are challenging this strategy and have opted to strengthen economic relations within the Pacific Rim individually.

V. Promoting reforms in major regimes and multilateral institutions as well as influencing governance. Brazil considers strategic partnerships to be a crucial tool that can be used to influence governance mechanisms and initiate reforms in

multilateral institutions in order to adapt them to modern day economic and political circumstances, and strengthen multilateralism. It is important to point out that Brazil has been opposed to the frozen decision-making and institutional frameworks of the major multilateral institutions on grounds that these frameworks provide an opportunity to be strategically relevant, especially for countries envisioning a change with regard to the structural orientation of the global order. It is also evident that changing the global order is and has always been a key driving force for Brazil in entering into strategic partnerships with countries that support Brazil's request for representation in the UNSC. In addition, Brazil is constantly in search of strategic partnerships with countries that play key roles in advocating for reforms such as China, United Kingdom, France and Russia, along with other rising powers like South Africa and India.

3.1.2.3 Outcomes of Brazil's strategic partnerships.

Despite the fact that Brazil has been an active seeker of strategic bilateral relations, its growing global presence has resulted in a number of countries such as Norway and multinational bodies like the EU establishing closer relations with Brazil, which expands the scope and list of strategic partnerships. There is no doubt that strategic partnerships have played a crucial role in helping Brazil to boost its profile as an international player with both developed and developing countries. Strategic partnerships with developed countries have helped Brazil in accessing advanced technologies and financial, material and human resources; increasing Brazil's recognition of its international status; and

supporting some crucial political demands by Brazil such as securing a permanent representation in the UNSC. Strategic partnerships with other rising nations have been instrumental in increasing Brazil's political and economic dominance in Asia, Africa and its own region. In addition, strategic partnerships with other rising countries have created a new trend in North-South and South-South relations, which has implications for current greater powers (this is discussed in a later section of this thesis).

However, Brazil has yet to reconcile its foreign policy agenda with the agenda of developed nations. Despite the fact that Brazil has the objective of enhancing its global profile and ensuring that there is equitable distribution of power in the international system, developed nations are asking Brazil and other rising nations to demonstrate greater commitments towards upholding the current global order and are calling on Brazil to take greater responsibilities in the scope of its region. This is one of the challenges that Brazil has faced when trying to forge strategic partnerships with developed nations, including members of the EU. At the moment, Brazil's strategic partnerships place emphasis on sectorial initiatives such as with Japan and Germany (focus on renewable energy), France (focuses in the defense sector) and Russia (focuses on space cooperation).

From another point of view, strategic partnerships can be divided into short-term and long-term outputs. There are some strategic partnerships that are oriented towards strengthening bilateral agendas and have the primary objective of advancing policy objectives in the short-term and medium-term. An example of this form of partnership is the

Brazil-Venezuela strategic partnership, as evidenced by the substantial increase in investment and trade flows. With regard to Brazil using strategic partnerships to reorder the global power system and initiate more reforms on multilateral structures, the outputs of strategic partnerships need to be examined over a longer period of time. It is this view that this thesis attempts to predict the likely outcome of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership. Currently, Brazil has maintained privileged relations with countries belonging to IBSA and BRICS with the aim of increasing its visibility, enhancing the profile of these organizations, and promoting convergence between member states in global issues such as development assistance, global security, environmental sustainability, and global and economic governance.

Perhaps the most significant indication that Brazil is a leader in its region is that it is the only country in Latin America that has the ability and capacity to pursue international ambitions. The question is whether Brazil's strategic partnerships with countries in other regions such as Indonesia will be useful in helping it achieve its goal of reordering the global power system. In addition, while Brazil is certainly on the rise, will its strategic partnership with Indonesia fast-track its trajectory to the top? In order to address this question, it is necessary to examine strategic partnerships from the perspective of Indonesia in order to ascertain whether there is a convergence between the goals and ambitions of the two countries. A convergence could imply that the prospect of Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership is likely.

3.1.3 Overview of Indonesia's strategic partnerships

Economic growth and democratization in Indonesia have increased its status on the regional level. Nevertheless, its economic growth has yet to provide Indonesia with the resources necessary to make it more influential at the global level, either in the military or diplomatic domain. McRae opines that it is while Indonesia seeks to achieve global power status, he argues that the strategy to achieve this is not clear in the long-term, and certainly not in the near future. The political transformation witnessed in Indonesia has enabled the country to become outward-looking. Democratization has also played a significant role in enhancing Indonesia's "reformer credentials". As a result, the country's on-going 15 years of democratic rule in provides it with soft power with regard to its relations with other nations that are currently experiencing political transition as well as with other nations that are already democratic. Nevertheless, it is imperative to note that there are precise limits to the soft power that Indonesia possesses as a result of its democratization, in the sense that Indonesia has a limited ability to support democracy in other countries. With respect to this, it is evident that Indonesia has not made strong attempt to convince its neighboring countries about the merits associated with democratization. In addition, at the time of writing this thesis, Indonesia has yet to initiate any effort aimed at promoting democracy outside its region. Indonesia may claim that it tried to promote democracy in Myanmar; however, it is not clear whether any engagement by Indonesia actually played a meaningful role in causing political transformation.

Due to the rapid economic growth witnessed in Indonesia recently, some observers argue that the issue is not whether Indonesia will rise; instead, the issue is how high the country will rise. The last decade saw Indonesia report average annual economic growth of 5.7%. In 2012, Indonesia had the 16th largest economy in the world, an improvement from 27th in 2000. In addition, while there is no doubt that Indonesia's economic influence is on the rise, the country has failed to exploit its political diplomacy to increase economic access. It can also be observed that Indonesia is not an emerging or a significant donor. OECD estimates reveal that Indonesia's expenditures on overseas development aid in 2010 were about \$10 million. This is very low when compared to China's, India, South Africa and Brazil's overseas expenditure on development aid, which were \$2 billion, \$640 million, \$118 million and \$500 million respectively. Again, it is imperative to stress that the persistent economic growth in Indonesia is likely to provide the country with extra resources that are required to address these constraints; however, this not likely to take place for some time.

3.1.3.1 Indonesia's foreign policy features.

Regardless of the uncertainties related to the future power of Indonesia, the country remains a significant power regionally and geographically since it is a link to the various trade routes. To this end, it is imperative to understand what the kind of global and regional actor Indonesia is likely to become in future, rather than debating whether Indonesia will become a middle or great power. When examined from this viewpoint, the features of Indonesian foreign relations can be deduced.

The first feature of Indonesian foreign relations is the government's

portrayal of the country as great power despite the reality that it currently only has the ability to be a middle power. Various international relations scholars agree that Indonesia's foreign relations agenda is underpinned by two conflicting influences. The first influence relates to the fact that Indonesia aspires to be an international player, which is an ambition that can be attributed to its geographical size. The country's constitution mandates that Indonesia is outward-looking which takes the government to task to contribute to the global order based on social justice, permanent peace, and independence. As a result, Indonesians expect that their government be capable of influencing global events, which is an aspiration that Indonesian democratic government has to address. Since it became democratic, Indonesia has embarked on creating an image of an "outward-looking country" and has tackled domestic stability issues after adopting a democratic government system. However, Indonesia faces the challenge of lacking sufficient resources and influence to address a number of foreign policy issues demanded by its citizens. As mentioned earlier, economic growth in Indonesia is not sufficient enough to result in military or diplomatic influence. A case in point is Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which Indonesians have demanded the government to play a more active role in resolving the issue. However, there are limitations for Indonesia when trying to act on issues beyond its borders. Indonesia actually co-sponsored the bid by Palestine to become permanent member of the UNESCO and the UN. In addition, Indonesia has been extremely vocal regarding the issue of Palestinian Independence and has conveyed symbolic gestures in support of Palestine especially capacity-building programs.

Foreign policy experts such as Indonesia, Brazil discuss efforts to expand

bilateral ties argue that Indonesia's incapability to have any influence in the Middle East has forced the country to redirect its focus on issues that the country thinks it is capable of making a difference, an example being the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this regard, through ASEAN, Indonesia has been able to persuade the five countries with nuclear weapons to sign the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty.

The relationship between the foreign policy goals of Indonesia and its limitations lead to over-reaching global agenda that is executed using limited means. It is not surprising that Indonesia is capable of influencing global affairs using the "power of ideas". As a matter of fact, some of the key successes in Indonesian foreign policy can be attributed to Indonesian ideas that were adopted while proposals by other countries were rejected. A case in point is the formation of East Africa Summit (EAS) as ASEAN+6 rather than ASEAN+3, which reflected Indonesia's wish to include more countries in order to counter the influence of China. China had insisted on keeping the forum small. However, the issue of concern is whether or not Indonesia's "power of ideas" will be adequate to propel the country to a global player status. According to McRae, a foreign policy expert, Indonesia can exploit its power of ideas to influence global affairs; but this is only possible when the country does not experience an external crisis that is likely to uncover its lack of influence.

The second characteristic of Indonesia's foreign relations is that has strategic partnerships with both the United States and China; however, it has refused to create an alliance with either of these countries. A key principle of Indonesia's foreign relations is "free and active" foreign relations. The logic strategy behind the non-alignment in its foreign

relations is that it gives Indonesia the impression that it is capable influencing the larger powers that it has entered into strategic partnerships with, but in practice, Indonesia's ability and capacity to influence either China or the United States is somewhat limited. Indonesia has had turbulent relations with both China and the United States in the course of history. After gaining independence from the Netherlands following World War II, the first president of Indonesia, Sukarno, who ruled during 1945-1967, adopted a foreign policy characterized by non-alignment and supported communist activism; the United States perceived this approach to foreign policy issues as a threat to its national interests, resulting in the high tensions between Indonesia and the US. Successive administrations have also adopted a foreign policy characterized by non-alignment. With regard to China, Indonesia suspended diplomatic ties from 1967-1990. Nevertheless, the onset of democratization saw Indonesia formalize and expand its relations with both China and the United States. With regard to its relations with the United States, the core driver has been the fight against religious extremists, resulting in a strategic partnership agreement signed in 2010. Indonesia and China had entered into a strategic agreement in 2005. In both these partnerships, bringing bilateral tensions to an end is not articulated. However, it is imperative to note that the foreign policy community in Indonesia is wary of China; this can be attributed to Chinese interfering with the disunity observed in ASEAN. In addition, Indonesia is skeptical about the intentions of China in region in future, which led to Indonesia's uneasiness about the strategic partnership. This is why Indonesia had called for the East Asia Summit to include New Zealand, Australia and India in order to reduce China's influence in the region. Regardless of Indonesia's preference for the US, the country's

strategy towards the emerging and established powers in Asia is aimed at binding each of these powers in multilateral institutions. Specifically, the East Asia Summit has the primary objective of countering China's rise.

The third aspect of Indonesia's foreign relations is that ASEAN offers a stage through which the country can play a broader international and regional role. The centrality of ASEAN is a permanent attribute of the foreign policy of Indonesia. ASEAN comprises of the immediate geographic region that surrounds Indonesia, where most of Indonesia's interests are engaged directly. From a diplomatic point of view, the ASEAN "plus" forums like the ASEAN Regional Forum and the East Asia Summit offer Indonesia a stepping stone to try and play wider regional and global roles. As Alcides explains, the East Asia Summit provides Indonesia with an opportunity to expand its adjacent environment beyond just the ASEAN. In addition, the East Asia Summit is the only forum in the region that the US president visits annually. Nevertheless, the centrality of ASEAN has a number of drawbacks. There is no doubt that Indonesia has expectations of playing a leadership role in the ASEAN region; however, in actuality, Indonesia cannot devote its foreign policy agenda only to the group. For example, Indonesia had made proposals to form a regional human rights body and ASEAN Security Community, which were rejected. Unity in ASEAN is needed in order to ensure ASEAN effectiveness; however, ASEAN has been struggling to be cohesive with regard to its position on the South China Sea dispute. Internally, ASEAN has failed in finding resolutions to contentious issues. It has been projected that the target date of forming an ASEAN community by 2015 will be missed. Its attempts to address the Cambodia-Thailand border dispute failed, with these two countries seeking the adjudication of the

International Court of Justice. This was particularly embarrassing for Indonesia as it had led the ASEAN group when it unsuccessfully tried to resolve the conflict.

Overall, it can be argued that from the geographic location, size of population and the economic potential of Indonesia, the country should be poised to play a larger role in global issues in the future. But in reality, at least in the course of the next 5 years, Indonesia is unlikely to separate from the status of a middle power and emerge as a powerful international player; this could only be possible in the more distant future. Having provided an overview of Brazil and Indonesia's foreign policy approaches, the following section explores the possibility of a strategic partnership between these two countries lasting in the longer-term. Are their ambitions at the global and regional level consistent with each other? Are their combined resources, both political and economic sufficient to form a formidable strategic partnership that can propel each of these countries to the global center stage? These concerns are addressed in the following subsection.

3.1.4 Outlook of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnerships

There is no doubt that both Brazil and Indonesia are emerging giants in their respective regions. In order to explore the prospects of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership, it is helpful to profile these countries with regard to their ambitions regarding becoming key regional and international players. A profile analysis can provide meaningful insight

regarding the outlook of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership. A profile analysis of Brazil indicates that strategic partnerships have been a crucial aspect of the country foreign policy during and after the Cold War. Brazil is ambitious with transforming its profile from global trader and a regional power to a rising international actor that is capable of influencing global affairs. Apart from becoming a global player, Brazil has the objective of creating a more equitable and multipolar global order. Brazil's foreign policy community believes that in order for the country to achieve its ambitions of becoming a global player and restructuring the global order, the country should refrain from entering into exclusive and rigid alliances; as a result, the country's foreign policy should draw upon the concepts of strategic partnerships, pragmatism and universalism. This is evident in Brazil's approach to using circumstantial and flexible foreign policies. Similar ambitions of becoming an influential global player are held by Indonesia. As mentioned earlier, a feature of Indonesia's foreign policy is that Indonesia has been cultivating an image of great power regardless of the fact that country is currently only capable of being a middle power. It is evident in literature that Indonesia has aspirations of becoming a key regional and global player, just like Brazil. The preface of Indonesia's constitution requires the country to be outward-looking, which means the government bears the responsibility to make contributions to the global order. To this end, Indonesians expect the government to have the capability of influencing global events. However, unlike Brazil, Indonesia is faced with a myriad of challenges with regard to accomplishing this objective. For instance, Indonesia has demonstrated little influence with regard to its ability to support democracy beyond its borders. In addition, the significant economic growth witnessed in Indonesia is not yet sufficient to translate into political or military influence outside its borders.

The underlying inference is that, unlike Brazil, which has sufficient resources, in Indonesia more resources that are needed for external influence, both militarily and diplomatically. Regardless of the limitations that Indonesia faces with regard to exercising its influence overseas, Indonesia is capable of using its “power of ideas” in order to advocate for its foreign policy agenda, which was identified earlier as one of the areas of foreign policy successes that Indonesia enjoys. Based on their ambitions to become global players, it can be argued that the prospect of strategic partnership between Brazil and Indonesia is brighter. Given the weight of their ambitions, the Brazil-Indonesia partnership is capable of developing into a formidable force that could influence global affairs, with Brazil using its economic and political influence while Indonesia uses its “power of ideas”.

In addition, analysis of the stages of evolution of the strategic partnerships that Brazil has entered into since the 1970s reveals four distinct stages, which included looking for technologies, securing capital, pursuing regional integration, and embarking on modern day strategic partnerships. One can argue from the evolution of Brazil’s approach to strategic partnerships that the country is at maturity stage with regard to its strategic partnerships. As a result, strategic partnerships are best at enabling Brazil to realize its global ambitions of becoming an influential actor at both regional and global levels. Significant economic developments witnessed in Brazil can be attributed to strategic partnerships. In addition, it is through this economic growth and development that Brazil to become a key regional player and is currently on its trajectory to becoming an influential global player. When compared to the four stages of strategic partnerships in the context of Brazil, it is

evident that Indonesia is still in first phase; that is, its strategic partnerships are still focusing on looking for capital and technologies. Indonesia has also tried to achieve regional integration, something that has been successful as evidenced with its influence on ASEAN +6. However, it is clear that Brazil is way ahead of Indonesia with regard to the use of strategic partnerships as a crucial component of foreign relations.

Another observation regarding to Brazil's foreign relations is that Brazil has embarked on increasing its activity on the global level using a number of strategies including multilateralism, ad hoc coalitions, inter regionalism and bilateral initiatives. Brazil considers strategic partnerships to be a crucial diplomatic instrument that can be used in strengthening and reconciling the country's engagement at bilateral, regional and global levels. Another aspect of Brazil's strategic partnerships relates to the emphasis that it places on South-South relations, which has resulted in Brazil developing heterogeneous agendas that are typified by bilateralism and multilateralism relations coexisting simultaneously. The fact that Brazil emphasizes South-South strategic partnerships makes Indonesia a perfect candidate for the country to expand its influence in South East Asia. Indonesia is also looking for strategic partnerships with other rising powers as a means of increasing its influence at the global stage. This similarity with regard to the approach used in establishing strategic partnerships foretells a bright outlook for the Brazil-Indonesian strategic partnership. In the realm of international relations, differences in approaches to foreign relations between two countries are likely to hamper continued relations between strategic partners. An example is the strategic partnership between Argentina and Brazil, which was obstructed based on the differences in international strategies that played

a role in obstructing collaboration between these two countries when it comes to global matters. In addition, similar international strategies have been established to foster closer ties between strategic partners. The strategic partnerships adopted by Brazil are typified by flexibility and heterogeneity. Similarly, Indonesia makes use of a “free and active” active approach to foreign relations characterized by lack of alignments. Non-alignment has made Indonesia believe it is capable of influencing major powers like China and the United States. Another similarity in foreign relations approach between Brazil and Indonesia relates to the use of multilateralism through regional organizations to consolidate regional and global influence. For instance, Brazil uses MERCOSUR whereas Indonesia uses ASEAN as the primary platform for its foreign policy. In addition, the fact that Brazil has identified Indonesia as a key strategic partner in strengthening ASEAN-South America relations, which is the primary driver of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership, signed in 2013.

Another dimension that can be used to predict the outlook of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership is the major issue areas and the goals of strategic partnerships from the perspective of both countries. From the perspective of Brazil, this includes economic issues (finance, investment and trade), culture and education, science and technology, and defense. The identified goals of strategic partnerships adopted by Brazil include developing and enhancing its technological capabilities, expansion of the scope of bilateral relations and strengthening mutual engagement, promoting regional integration and cooperation, fostering inter-regionalism, and promoting reforms in major regimes and multilateral institutions as well as influencing governance. Other issues that Brazil’s

strategic partnerships seek to address include health, environment, agriculture, social policies and political dialogue. In the case of Indonesia, the main issue area associated with strategic partnerships is to increase its influence beyond its borders. Despite the fact that Indonesia has unsuccessfully used strategic partnerships to increase its influence, given time, the successes of strategic partnerships reported by Brazil can be replicated in Indonesia.

Overall, based on the analysis above, it can be suggested that the prospects of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership look good. This is based on the premise that both countries have similar ambitions of becoming global influential actors, both are using the same international strategies, both are rising powers, and that both countries can use the partnership foster inter-regionalization. Therefore, in the longer-term, this strategic partnership may play a significant role in propelling Brazil and Indonesia from their current middle power status to greater power status.

3.2 Impacts of the Brazil-Indonesia Relations on the Global Balance of Power

Predicting the future with certainty is obviously impossible; nevertheless, predicting the immediate future with relative accuracy based on current realities and tendencies is possible. The Cold War has ended and the

United States is no longer facing the persistent aggression threat from its adversary, the Soviet Union despite the fact that Russia still poses a threat albeit insignificant when compared to the Soviet Union during the Cold war era. The fall of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the United States as a superpower came as a surprise to many people. As Amorim argues, the world is increasingly becoming dynamic, which also leads to the concept of power becoming dynamic. According to McRae, the distribution of power in the global system comprises of three distinct features: military power, which is mainly unipolar, economic power as primarily multipolar, and translational relations that are beyond the control of the government, which mainly entails non-state actors. Following the end of the Cold War, the US emerged as the only superpower. Nevertheless, some power shifts have been observed because of the onset of globalization, market forces, the emergence of powerful democracies, and the strengthened bilateral and multilateral relationships between these emerging countries. The balance of power strategies adopted by countries, and security and regional alliances has been a common feature in history. Shifts in power tend to produce responses by established powers in order to create a new balance of power with the primary objective of continuing the already existing global order. The current global order is characterized by an unexpected increase in the number of democracies, global prosperity and sustainable peace between the greater powers; these are indicators of American preferences. The perceived decline of the United States is understandable, based on to the country's large and growing fiscal deficits together with the persistent growth of Turkey, Brazil, Indonesia, India, and China and other countries, which are pointers of an apparent shift in the global balance of power, especially in the economic domain. In

addition, the apparent decline of the United States can be attributed to the fact that the United States is gradually losing status in many parts of the world because of a number of factors such as using torture on terror suspects, Guantanamo detention facilities, and the invasion of Iraq.

Given their foreign policy goals and ambitions, the strategic partnership between Brazil and Indonesia will play a significant role in shaping the global order. As a matter of fact, restructuring the global order into a more equitable and multipolar world is one of the foreign policy objectives of these countries. Therefore, the convergence in foreign policy objectives is likely to translate into significant impacts on the global order. According to Alcides, the strategic relationship between Brazil and Indonesia has both strategic significance and global impact due to the fact that both are emerging countries. As Whitman & Rodt explain, Brazil and Indonesia have to collaborate in order to achieve their goals of a multipolar global order. For the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership to be a success, both countries have to make use of the opportunity offered by their shared interest in global affairs, which is likely to result in an increase in the centers of power in the global order. It has been acknowledged that the world is gradually entering a multipolar phase with regard to global governance, particularly with the increase in the powers of emerging countries as well as the rise of the South. More importantly, it has been suggested that the progress towards a multipolar world will be accelerated by the strengthening of bilateral relations between these emerging countries, which is the case with the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnerships. Many authors are of the opinion that with the economic stagnation witnessed in United States and the Eurozone, emerging countries are acquiring more wealth, increasing their consumption power

and the political clout required to rearrange and influence the global order in a manner that will favor them. The underlying inference is that centers of power in the global order are increasing, and strategic partnerships form one of the foreign policy tools that countries can use to consolidate power and influence global affairs. Will the North allow strategic partnerships such as Brazil and Indonesia's provide direction with regard to global governance? Can Brazil and Indonesia and other global actors present a better leadership role in the numerous political domains as well as decision-making centers at the global center-stage? According to Vieira & Alden, it is unlikely that the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership or any other strategic partnership involving developing countries will challenge United States dominance; however, such partnerships will reduce the influence of the North in global affairs. Brazil and Indonesia have a foreign policy objective of creating a peaceful, just and fair world using multi-polarity. Based on their stance against unipolarity, it can be argued, despite the fact that the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership cannot replace unipolarity, that it is likely to fast-track the progress from unipolar global order to a multipolar one.

3.3 The Implications for Current Great Powers

Regardless of the prospect of a fast-tracked progress towards a multipolar world, it is evident that the United States still remains the

world's economic and military giant. The rise of new powers and the fact that these countries are strengthening their bilateral relations, and are determined to restructure the world order by ensuring that centers of power are distributed equally, is likely to have an impact on the global balance of power. It is highly likely that a multipolar global order implies a novel mix of leading nations that will be tasked with the responsibility of influencing the direction that global affairs will be taking. Currently, the rising nations such as Brazil and Indonesia are playing the supporting role to the existing global powers. The current powers are still leading with respect to their political influence as well as decision-making domains such as the United Nations, and in investments and trade. The implications of the strengthened bilateral relations between emerging countries is that the current powers should not take this strategic partnerships for granted because these countries are committed and determined to restructure the global order. International relations and policy makers have examined the implications for the current powers as a result of the multi-polarity attributed to the strategic partnerships between emerging countries. Brazil and Indonesia have explicitly expressed their interest in promoting a multipolar system and establishing a new global order characterized by no country seeking to achieve hegemony or take part in power politics aimed at monopolizing global affairs. One of the tools through which these emerging countries are using to create a multipolar world that is equitable is through the use of strategic partnerships. As a strategy, these emerging countries, particularly Brazil and Indonesia have refrained from engaging in privileged bilateral relations with the current world powers, especially the United States. In addition, these countries have refrained from aligning themselves to any other power, which means that current powers have to devise counter

measures if they are to retain their status quo. With regard to the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership, the prospects for a joint approach to multi-polarity are existent in aspects such as global governance. The ability of the Brazil-Indonesia strategic partnership in resulting in a multipolar world depends significantly on its effectiveness in fostering inter-regionalism in the sense that Indonesia as a strategic partner will expand Brazil's influence in Southeast Asia whereas Brazil as Indonesia's strategic partner will help in increasing Indonesia's influence beyond its borders. While some emerging countries have maintained closer ties with the United States and are more likely to take the interests of the United States into consideration, others such as Brazil and Indonesia have been defied the US and have shown disregard for including the interests of the United States in their strategic initiatives with other countries.

Because of the shifts in the global balance of power, the geopolitical importance of greater powers is also changing. For instance, the view that the United States is the sole superpower is becoming out-dated given the existing geopolitical realities. The rising countries are creating new power centers and are consolidating their power by strengthening their bilateral relations using strategic partnerships. The implication of this for the current greater powers is to acknowledge that multi-polarity is eroding their influence; as a result, they are no longer playing the dominating role with respect to global affairs. Therefore, the current powers can make use of the approach adopted by the emerging countries, which involves the use of bilateral strategic partnerships and multilateralism to consolidate their own centres of power. It is evident that rising countries such as Brazil and Indonesia are refraining from entering into exclusive and committing partnerships with greater powers, which implies that these emerging

countries are more committed to restructuring the global order. Thus, as an alternative, greater powers should acknowledge multi-polarity and emphasize on North-North strategic partnerships.