

**Post-Hegemonic Regionalism
in Latin America:**

**the role of idealism in the regional projects of
UNASUR and ALBA during the Pink Tide**

January 2019

Thesis International Relations

“Seeking United Latin America, Venezuela's Chávez Is a Divider” was the headline of a New York Times article in 2006, signalling the controversy between ideals and impact of Pink Tide politics of regionalism (Forero, 2006). Although more than a decade has past, the impact of the efforts of regionalism made during that time remains disputed. During the period which has been called ‘the Pink Tide’ the practices of regional policy and regional idealism were contradictory and at the same time entangled. The kind of regionalism which was inspired during this period was said to be extraordinary, and even though it may not continue along the same lines it holds the possibility to impact regionalism in Latin America in practice, as well as the understanding of regionalism in Latin America in theory. During the Pink Tide new regional organizations were created in which regional development and cooperation was coordinated in line with the ideals of the political left. This implies that the regional bodies hold a political character. This leads to a complication once the national elections turn the other way. Regionalism in Latin America during the Pink Tide was politicized, and for that reason the regional bodies which were operating during the time are no longer operative now that elections have turned the region towards the right. The high amount of leftist idealism has made the regional bodies incompatible with the current political situation. However, it uncertain to what extent this idealism is executed, or used as a rhetoric strategy. Thus, the regional bodies are assumed to be highly infiltrated by leftist ideology, but in exactly what manner this ideology influences the regional institutions is not clear. Therefore this work will go into depth considering the manner in which idealism plays a role within the regional bodies affiliated with the Pink Tide. The role and function of idealism in the regional organizations related to post-hegemonic regionalism will be investigated, in order to find an answer to the following research question:

What is the function of idealism in Latin American Pink Tide politics of regionalism?

By investigating the role of idealism in the institutions affiliated with Pink Tide regionalism, an insight will be provided concerning the functioning of Latin American politics. The political character of regional bodies will be analyzed, which holds significant impact for the possibility of continuation after a different election result. Furthermore the role idealism has in Latin American politics of regionalism may provide insight in how regionalism in this region functions, despite political

tendency. Although the political situation in Latin America has been subject to change it continues to be of importance to analyze and understand the politics of regionalism which took place during this period. There are several reasons for this; firstly there is the impact this period has had on regionalism, and the manner in which countries within the region interact with one another. Secondly what has happened can from now on be used as a historical example, which can be misused if the underlying influencing factors are misinterpreted. And finally, the Latin American political situation has been subject to radical changes various times, going from left to right in a way which undermines the continuation of regional projects. Therefore change in political tendency is the norm, which therefore should render research irrelevant but rather be subject to research itself.

The structure of this work is as follows: in the first chapter a theoretical framework will be put forward, touching upon the main debates concerning regionalism and the applicability of regionalist theory for understanding the Latin American case. In the second chapter a political context will be provided, discussing what has been called the rise of the 'Pink Tide' and how this political change throughout the region affected regionalism. In the third and final chapter, two cases of regional organization related to the Pink Tide and the kind of regionalism is proposed are discussed. The organizations the Bolivarian Alliance for the people of our America (ALBA) and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) are considered to be the main bodies which represent post-hegemonic regionalism and are therefore chosen for. By analyzing the manner in which these bodies function and considering what role idealism holds the content of the three different chapters come together, providing an insight to the role of idealism in post-hegemonic regionalism and create an addition for the discussion concerning the impact this had on regionalism. Although the political situation in the region has since changed, the insight gathered will continue to be of importance due to its addition to the debate concerning Latin American regionalism in general and will provide guidance for putting changes to the situation of regionalism in perspective. Thus this works aims to provide an addition to the theoretical discussion as well as provide new insights for understanding contemporary Latin American politics of regionalism.

Chapter I

Regionalisms and the driving forces behind it: a theoretical approach

This chapter will provide the conceptual definitions and the academic discussion that will form the base for the analysis in this work. First of all the definition of regionalism will be made clear, observing the differences in definitions and clarifying what is exactly considered to be regionalism for the continuation of this work. This will be followed by a discussion of the complications of euro-centrism in studies of regionalism, and the notion of non-western regionalism will be discussed, opposing theories of non-western regionalism against an academic discussion which has mainly been focused on a western understanding of the European Union (EU). In this section, the academic debate concerning the international validity of regionalism will be debated, as some argue it is limited to European versions of regional integration. Regional efforts in Latin America can sometimes be analyzed through this framework; however there are new occurrences of regionalism which cannot be accounted for. This will lead to the concept of post-hegemonic regionalism. In the final section, in order to understand what drives regionalism specifically in Latin America. This section will discuss the pragmatism versus idealism debate, which questions which holds a more determining role in seemingly idealistic regional efforts. In this way the discussion goes from a world-wide phenomenon of regionalism, takes into account important critical arguments for analyzing regionalism outside of Europe, and then focuses on the more specific, post-hegemonic regionalism taking place in Latin America during the period of the Pink Tide.

Regionalism

There are several interpretations towards the concept of regionalism. There is little consensus in academia on what the term entails, and concepts of regions, regionalism and regionalization are often contested (Fawcett, 2004). This can partially be ascribed to the political nature of a region, and the connected regionalism, as arguably “all regions are socially constructed and hence politically contested” (Hurrell, 1995, p. 334).

The debate concerning regionalism refers to a wide variety of distinct processes, which have caused some authors to break up the term into different analytical categories. Hurrel has done so, distinguishing between regional cohesion, state-promoted regional economic integration, regional inter-state cooperation, regional awareness and identity and regionalization, which are all considered to be part of the over-arching concept of regionalism (Hurrel, 1995). Other authors have opted for a more over-arching approach, providing a focus in their definitions which entangles regionalism from regionalization, two terms which are often confused for their likeness. The following definition is provided by Schulz, Soderbaum and Ojen: “Regionalism represents the body of ideas, values, and concrete objectives that are aimed at creating, maintaining or modifying the provision of security and wealth, peace and development within a region, i.e. the urge by any set of actors to reorganize along a particular regional space” (Schulz, Söderbaum, and Öjendal, 2001). An important aspect to point out within this definition is the weight given to a specific aim for regional organization and or cooperation. Consequently, when such processes occur without intending to do so, one cannot speak of regionalism. This leads to the disentangling of the concept of regionalism and that of regionalization. The two are very much alike, but the intention for one creates the other. Often the different terms are used interchangeably with one another, adding unnecessary complexity to an already complicated debate (Fawcett, 2004). What sets apart regionalism from regionalization is the intent for an increase in regional interaction and cooperation. It can be defined as follows: “Regionalization denotes the (empirical) process, which can be defined as a process of change from relative heterogeneity and lack of cooperation towards increased cooperation, integration, convergence, complementarity and identity in a variety of fields, such as culture, security, economic development and politics, within a given geographical space” (Schulz, Söderbaum, and Öjendal, 2001). Although it is valuable to keep the two terms apart, it must be recognized that they at times overlap and in addition influence one another. “If regionalism is a policy or project, regionalization is both project and process” creating an situation in which regionalization can precede regionalism, but can also be a consequence of regionalism (Fawcett, 2004, p. 433).

There is a wide variety of definitions of regionalism and interpretations of definitions of regional which might result in the notion that “understanding

regionalism requires a degree of definitional flexibility” (Fawcett, 2004, p. 431). Acknowledging the complexity of the term, for the duration of this work the definition of regionalism provided by Schulz, Söderbaum, and Öjendal will be applied. This definition is opted for due to its conciseness as well as the clear distinction between regionalism and regionalization, which is of importance for analyzing the Latin American case. Furthermore these authors have been acknowledged for their expertise in the field of regionalism, and have been relied upon for various works concerning regionalism. The subject of study will be regionalism rather than regionalization, due to the explicit aim for regional cooperation and solidarity within the elected left governments during the Pink Tide. The notion of regionalization will be of additional value in understanding the circumstantial influences of how the region interacts without processes in which regionalism is aimed for.

Euro-centrism in Regionalism

In this section the discussion will be outlined concerning whether or not euro-centrism is problematic within the field of regionalism, and what various authors argue for in order to tackle this issue. Because the European Union (EU) is considered as the region in which regionalism has developed the most, many concepts and theories concerning regionalism are developed based on an understanding of what took place in the EU (Kleinschmidt and Gallego Perez, 2017). However, this poses the issue of disentangling the contextual occurrences from the general theory. It can be argued that theories devised in relation to Europe cannot be used to analyze regionalism in other regions of the world, as the situational differences create complications in the analysis (Malamud, 2010). This has been an acknowledged critique to the academic debate, as: “Avoiding Europe-centeredness has been an ongoing issue in the study of regionalism among developing countries and for critical scholarship in the field of international relations” (Söderbaum, 2009, p. 490). Various efforts have been made to create a more balanced study of regionalism, sometimes without considering the European case at all. However, this does not suffice as a solution, as Europe provides “the most advanced instance of regionalism in world politics” (Soderbaum 2009, p. 490). Therefore, the study of

comparative regionalism cannot afford to overlook or ignore the European case (Warleigh and Rosamund, 2006).

The complicated nature of the discussion of euro-centrism in studies of regionalism has led to various proposed strategies, to improve the academic variety or create a situation in which Europe can be taken into account, without automatically posing as the ideal example. It appears there is no consensus within academia on how to tackle this issue. One proposed strategy is to expand the study of regionalism, abandoning the focus on the European Union and search for new concepts of regionalism outside the EU (Acharya, 2016, p. 109). This attempt to diversify regionalism has been critiqued by others, arguing that an unjustified amount of relevance is given to concepts found outside what is considered to be mainstream regionalism. It is argued that too much relevance is ascribed to instances of 'Southern solidarity' in the quest for widening the perspective of the study of regionalism (Hurrell, 2016). Söderbaum manages to combine the complications of several arguments and considers that "The challenge for comparative regionalism is to both include and transcend European integration theory and practice" (Söderbaum, 2009, p. 490). The European case provides a rich example on which academic theories can be based and tested, however in order for such theories and concepts to have any general feasibility, the study of regionalism has to transcend the European case, and broaden its focus in order to include alternative theories, only then a more advanced debate about regionalism will be reached (Söderbaum, 2009).

Applicability of Eurocentric Regionalism in Latin America

As Latin America is one of the regions in world with several projects of regionalism over time, it has often been used to test theories developed concerning EU integration to test their universal validity (Malamud, 2010). However, a significant flaw is pointed out regarding theories developed around the EU concerning integration or regionalism: the regional development of the EU is a singular case, and therefore any theory build around it will merely explain the European case rather than providing "systematic explanations for general phenomena" (Malamud, 2010, p. 650). This explains why academics attempt to test their validity, both Latin America

and other regional efforts around the globe, yet simultaneously provides a continuity of euro-centrism in studies of regionalism. As a consequence of these efforts forms of regionalism are often compared or upheld to the European example, rather than analyzed on their own. Malamud argues for investigating the Latin American case in order to draw conclusions from it which holds the capability of improving theories of regional integration which are currently based on the European case (2010). Kleinschmidt and Gallego Perez analyze the academic efforts to understand Latin American regionalism, and argue that either the regionalist efforts are considered irrelevant, or they do not follow “the pattern established by European integration” (2017, p. 10). However, no alternative analysis is consequently offered, and the relevance of Latin American forms of regionalism is left undetermined (Kleinschmidt and Gallego Perez, 2017). They continue to call for a more flexible approach in analyzing regionalism, in which processes which fit the EU type of integration are not excluded but rather put alongside a broad spectrum of possibilities in which regions can be interpreted (Kleinschmidt and Gallego Perez, 2017). However, the ‘failure’ to establish EU-style ‘classical’ styles of supranational integration which is considered as ‘established’ (Kleinschmidt and Gallego Perez, 2017) is considered as a failure of integration in general. An important argument is added to the discussion by Acharya, whom points out an essential tendency regarding regionalism in other areas than Europe. Comparing outcomes of regionalism in different regions of the world in terms of integration is flawed, as there is a different desired outcome from regionalism in southern regions opposed to European regionalism (Acharya, 2016). Whereas the integration theories are closely linked with regionalism in the EU, regionalism in Latin America, and other regions of the Global South for that matter, are often devised in order to gain autonomy, and therefore do not prioritize integration (Acharya, 2016). This can be observed over the course of Asian regionalism; due to a history of being subjected to imperialism sovereignty is given a much higher importance than in Europe, where the different nation-states have pooled their sovereignty (He and Inoguchi, 2011). Asian regionalism does not aim to create a transnational body with the capacity and authority to act, but instead: “Asian regionalism is more interested in each state empowering itself primarily on a national basis, and secondarily with the help of partial and pragmatic regionalist arrangements” (He and Inoguchi, 2011, p. 172). Thus a similar prioritization of autonomy over integration can be found. This autonomy refers to both political and

economic institutions, and it can be observed in several regional projects that countries prefer to maintain the national autonomy regarding these issues rather than integrating on such matters with other actors in the region. It is therefore not surprising that integration levels are low in the Latin American region. (Kleinschmidt and Gallego Perez, 2017).

On a more theoretical level, a discussion is put forward concerning the root of regionalisms. It is analyzed that regionalism in Europe is rooted in a different discipline than regionalism in Latin America: Perrotta (2012) argues that European integration theories are derived from social sciences, whereas similar integration situated in Latin America come from the disciplines of Political Economy. Tussie and Riggiozzi (2015) even continue along the lines of this argumentation, and in addition specify that Latin American regional integration comes from a regional vision in International Political Economy. This adds to the argument of an increase in in-depth analysis of Latin American regionalism, due to the distinct practices and roots.

The Importance of Economic Factors

Another important factor concerning regionalism and the questionable applicability of theory to the Latin American case is the presumed importance of economic cooperation. A group of scholars under the name 'New Regionalists' have argued that: rather than an EU-focus, there is a focus on economics in the study of regionalism. Regionalism is considered "to be taking place within and modeled by neoliberal economics, responding to the pressures and constraints of a globalised economy" (Riggiozzi, 2012, p. 422). This is not merely an European tendency, as can be seen in Latin America's application of Open Regionalism. Open regionalism is labeled this way as it is outward-oriented, aiming to provide a medium to cope with the challenges of economic globalization (Söderbaum, 2009). Mercosur is one of the institutions considered to be part of this open regionalism's framework, as it is modeled after the EU in order to deal with (among other economic actors) the EU (Söderbaum, 2009). The concept of open regionalism is in contrast with the inward-oriented model which was applied before (Söderbaum, 2009). Policies of open regionalism are characterized by their economic focus. Jayasuriya analyses the scholarly debate concerning regionalism to have evolved mainly around issues with

an economic tendency, such as trade liberalization, and the role of the US as a hegemon or a leader of governance building (Jayasuriya, 2009). The New Regionalists have pointed out this tendency and attempt to counter it by giving more weight to the role of informal, non-state agencies, thus embracing new forms of regionalism. However in the Latin American case such organizations are considered to be weak, and such actors were mainly found in the economic domain (Riggirozzi, 2012).

Yet there are more aspects to non-economic forms of regionalism, and these are prominent in Latin America. The roles of identity, social cohesion and social networking have not been taken up in the debates concerning regionalism until recently (Riggirozzi, 2012). However the changes in political economy of Latin America call for a refocus of the discussions of regionalism (Riggirozzi, 2012). Within the realm of post-neoliberalism, one can observe the creation of regional spaces which offer alternatives to policy making (MacDonald and Ruckert, 2009). These regional spaces were integrated with the new political climate and the social mobilization and political ideals which came into being as a regional swing to left was observed (Riggirozzi, 2012). The regional projects which have come along during the phase of post-hegemonic regionalism have displayed a move away from open regionalism, and consequently Riggirozzi argues that the term regionalism itself becomes 'elusive' and suggests that the concept of regionness captures these projects better due to the attribution of importance to collective practices, consensus and identity in a region (Riggirozzi, 2012).

To elaborate on this concept coined by Riggirozzi, regionness refers to the level of organized relations of social, political and economic relevance, build upon shared goals and values, with an inherent sense of belonging, together with institutions which create the possibility for the region to act autonomously in the international context (Hettne and Söderbaum, 2000). In Riggirozzi and Tussie (2015) the concept is divided in two sets of dynamics, the first entailing the sense of belonging, regional interaction and self-recognition, the second referring to cohesive action towards the outside. This untangles internal and external factors of the concept, which makes the separation in policy clear. The argument made by Riggirozzi (2012) is that although this term has been applied to analyze social cohesion in the EU, it has not been used

for an analysis of Latin America, due to the focus on US relation and the inter-American region.

Post-hegemonic regionalism

The regionalism which took place in Latin America during the Pink Tide is named post-hegemonic regionalism as it flowed from the post-hegemonic moment which took place in Latin America as a move away from neoliberalism (Deciancio, 2016). During this moment trade-driven integration was criticized and consequently other ways of regional integration were considered (Dabene, 2012) “The agenda of post-hegemonic and post-liberal regionalism seeks to understand the scope of regional cooperation beyond trade while highlighting the political spaces from which to rework regional normative frameworks and practices of governance” (Deciancio, 2016, p. 115).

Post-hegemonic regionalism emerged in Latin America as it coincided with a turn away from neoliberalism. The term post-hegemonic refers to the period after which the influence of the hegemon is diminished. Post-hegemonic and post-liberal regionalism are grouped together in this sense, although post-hegemonic consists of the period after hegemonic influence, whereas post-liberal refers more to the period in which the (neo)liberal status quo is rejected. In the case of Latin America, what is rejected is the hegemony of the US through neoliberal policy implementations. Thus both post-hegemonic and post-liberal are used in academia, referring to the same occurrences in practice. The terms post-hegemonic regionalism and post-liberal regionalism are more often used together, for example in the article *‘Post-Liberal Regionalism in Latin America and the Influence of Hugo Chávez’* written by Chodor and McCarthy-Jones in which the focus is described as “This article traces the shift in regional integration in Latin America from the ‘open regionalism’ of the 1990s to the current ‘post-hegemonic’ regionalism” (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013, p. 211). These authors discuss these types of regionalism against the previous ‘open regionalism’ as both post-liberal regionalism and post-hegemonic regionalism are characterized by a move away from open regionalism (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). They observe a twofold divide in a historical perspective regarding Latin American regional integration, with both the ‘Bolivarian vision’ and Pan-americanism providing the basis of regional integration efforts from time to time

(Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The main difference identified between these visions is the repulsion of US influence in the region opposed to a type of regionalism in which the US functions as the hegemon (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). For the continuation of this work, this will be referred to as post-hegemonic regionalism, although the possible distinctions between post-liberal and post-hegemonic will be acknowledged.

What characterizes this post-neoliberal or post-hegemonic order, is a political focus which is more explicit than previous regional attempts which sought to gain independence or an increased autonomy from external forces (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The emphasis is laid on politics here, as the processes of regionalisms are linked with an aim for a regional political agenda which can be determined from within the region itself without obstacles or obligations determined from outside. Development is one of the key policy issues, and within post-hegemonic regionalism lies the aim to create an arena which allows for an 'endogenous' development strategy, entailing that development is not to follow the direction which is proposed by the US, but rather to focus on social aspects, to create a development coming from within (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). This strategy is different from similar efforts on a national level, as it includes an aim to straighten out "developmental asymmetries between countries in the region" (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013, p. 215). However, regional efforts from post-hegemonic regionalism go further than a focus on trade or countering US opposition, offering alternatives for regionalism which are significantly different from earlier literature on types of regionalisms (Gardini, 2011). The projects related to post-hegemonic regionalism can be observed to be less focused on economic or political issues, but instead focus on regional identity formations, aspiring to establish a regional consensus regarding social issues and how these relate to economic matters (Gardini, 2011).

The Dynamics of Ideology and Pragmatism

The relationship between ideology and pragmatism in (especially foreign) policy is often presumed as dichotomous, whereas in reality it is a dynamic relation in which

influences of both are present at all times (Gardini and Lamberts, 2011). It is argued that a more thorough understanding and analysis is necessary when observing seemingly ideological actors, in order to attain a correct understanding of their public policies and external relations (Hayes, 2013, p.176.) In other words, a theoretical divide is presumed whereas in reality these underlying factors are intertwined. Especially when analyzing the movements of the Pink Tide this theoretical framework adds to the analytical discussion, as: “Seemingly contradicting points of Pink Tide governments actually display the dynamic tension between idealism and pragmatism” (Lambert, 2011, p.2). The dynamics between these two concepts will be useful in analyzing post-hegemonic regionalism within the period of the Pink Tide.

Gardini notes that ideology may not be considered a causal factor to the creation or implementation of foreign policy, however, its influence can be divided into three categories. The first refers to an ‘analytical prism’ in which problems are considered and solutions are pondered (Gardini, 2011). Secondly ideology can provide a guide for action, and lastly once a certain course is chosen, ideology can provide legitimization or justification for these decisions (Gardini, 2011). Therefore ideology is essential in analyzing foreign policy decisions.

Important to note is that the working definition provided by Gardini refers to ideology in foreign policy, not ideology itself. The definition is provided as follows: “An ideological foreign policy emphasizes principles and doctrinaire solutions over adaptability and the practical consequences of assertions and actions. Compatibility with established principles is the key criterion with which to assess the merit of foreign policy. Although ideological stances are clearly not necessarily dogmatic, a foreign policy based on ideology prioritizes preconceived positions and remedies over their actual viability and usefulness. An ideological foreign policy may be associated with and characterized by relatively short-term planning and a personalized vision of international relations related to a specific leader or administration rather than to a consistent national interest” (Gardini, 2011, p. 17).

However, ideology is not unconstrained in its influence: “There is a widespread sense that consideration of ideals and aspirations on the one hand, and their practicality with regard to existing constraints on the other, constitutes a sort of

continuum with various intermediate combinations possible” (Gardini, 2011, p. 15-16). Gardini has tried to disentangle influences of ideology from more pragmatic policies, and has therefore come up with a definition of what consists of a pragmatic foreign policy. This is described as follows: “A pragmatic foreign policy is a foreign policy based on the principle that the usefulness, workability, and the practicality of ideas, policies and proposals are the criteria of their merit. It stresses the priority of action over doctrine, of experience over fixed principles. Strong emphasis is placed on evaluation of assertions and actions according to their practical consequences. A pragmatic foreign policy may be associated with and characterized by medium-term planning and state, rather than government, policy” (Gardini, 2011, p. 17).

There are different ways and different reasons why ideology can exert more influence than pragmatism. A trend which can be observed is that poor countries have more ideological tendencies than further developed nations (Gardini, 2011). In this way negotiating power on an international level can be increased, as both the country itself and the regional body with specific ideological ideas will strengthen their negotiating position. “A country lacking substantial power may opt to rely more significantly on the support of international allies, or attempt to play them off each other (often adopting appropriate ideological stances) in order to extract as many gains as possible” (Gardini, 2011, p. 22). This sheds light on the complex interaction between ideology and pragmatism, as this quote displays a choice to align with certain ideological tendencies, but arguably merely for pragmatic reasons. Ideology is not merely a luxury which can only be afforded when there is an abundance of resources. On the contrary ideology itself can be considered a resource, especially in international politics. This can be seen in for example the case of Cuba, which has been given a lot of attention for several decades due to its ideological stance (Gardini, 2011). Were it not for its distinctiveness of political ideology, Cuba itself would not have been a very influential nation.

At the same time, the inherit ideas of an ideology are not set, but differ for each actor. It is also possible to have an ideology of pragmatism, if that is believed to be an intrinsic value of a nation’s foreign policy (Fermandois, 2011). Or, to have an ideology of continuation, which is often considered as an idea of stability, but which generates considerably different actions than an ideology for which a revolution is necessary (Fermandois, 2011). Thus, if a country is committed to an ideology of

stability, a policy choice may appear pragmatic whilst at the same time being determined by ideology. Thus a complicated interplay between pragmatism and ideology can be observed, and whichever has the determining influence can be for various reasons or objectives. Therefore it will provide a useful analytical tool in assessing the driving forces behind decision-making processes regarding projects of post-hegemonic regionalism.

Chapter II

Political Context: the Rise of the ‘Pink Tide’

In this chapter a context will be provided to analyze the forms of regionalisms which were a consequence of Pink Tide politics. First of all, a historical context of Latin American regionalism will be discussed, followed by a discussion of what has been named ‘the Pink Tide’. The regional institutions which were created during this period and to what extent they consists of kind of regionalism which is rooted more dominantly in idealism rather than in pragmatism will provide the content of Chapter III.

Historical Perspective on Regionalisms in Latin America

In order to analyze the factors of post-hegemonic regionalism today it is important to place it within a broader spectrum, and analyze how it is in line or contrasts with the kinds of regionalisms which took place in the region before. Latin America has been subject to various waves of different forms of regionalisms. The author Riggiozzi, has identified three different waves in the analysis of regionalism from a historical perspective. This analysis is used in this work as it provides a coherent overview of the historical tendencies of regionalisms in Latin America, which will make it possible to identify overarching trends. This will help to analyze which aspects of post-hegemonic regionalism are in line with the past and which are perpendicular in nature.

The first is labeled ‘old’ regionalism, and consists of the wave of regionalism which occurred reacting to the European economic integration (1957) and was therefore focused on economic integration across Latin America, in order to gain a better bargaining position in global economics (Riggiozzi, 2012). This strategy was linked with the development strategy of that period, which consisted of import-substitution through industrialization.

The second wave identified by Riggiozzi is identified as ‘new’ regionalism.

This wave was characterized by the belief that the trend of market-led globalization was a process which could not be halted or influenced, and was therefore to be accepted and embraced if development was to be achieved (Ruggirozzi, 2012). This perception was omnipresent in both political and ideational spheres; consequently this wave went hand in hand with a similar focus on economic aspects (Ruggirozzi, 2012). During this period alignment with the US grew closer, which led to the design of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), which was to be finalized in 2005 (Ruggirozzi, 2012).

In a sense, the first two waves of regionalism can be understood to be causal to the third, as these especially the embrace of neoliberalism in the second wave and the increased connection with the USA did not lead to the expected and promised developmental progress (Ruggirozzi, 2012). In this period, resistance to neoliberalism grew and a distinct break with the above-mentioned waves can be observed. Ruggirozzi fails to provide a definition of the third wave, but speaks of the emergence of post-hegemonic regional project in Latin America, with an emphasis on social and political aspects, distinguishing it from various other regionalism(s) in the region (2012). Other authors, discussing the same period and analyzing the kind of regionalism which took place, have categorized it as either post-liberal or post-hegemonic regionalism (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013).

Adding onto this analysis of different waves is the identifying of two competing regional visions in Latin America (Chodor and McCarthy Jones, 2013). These provide an extra layer of insight in regard to the analysis of different waves made above. At times one was more dominant than the other, which results in different results of regionalisms. Over time there are two underlying visions which influence the regionalism in Latin America in each wave to a certain extent. On the one hand there is the notion of pan-Americanism, in which the region is considered to be both north and South America. This is related to several regional bodies, such as the Organization of American States (OAS), the Inter American Treaty for Mutual Assistance (TIAR) and was embodied in the pursuance of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) which “sought to ‘lock in’ the neoliberal reforms achieved over the previous decade, thus entrenching the American political and economic model in the region, while also opening up new and favorable markets to American capital” (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013, p. 214). On the other hand there is the vision of

a united Latin America, proposed by Simon Bolivar, creating the ideological roots of Latin American regionalism (Deciancio, 2016). Already at the time of independence revolutions the idea was created that the region moved ahead as a whole, and the notion of ‘continental unionism’ was included in diplomatic declarations (Deciancio, 2016). The Bolivarian Vision pursues a greater autonomy from the US and the global economy while at the same time engaging in regional efforts for unity and shared development (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). A shift between the underlying vision can be observed in the 1990s, as enthusiasm for the FTAA was decreasing because the hegemonic intentions of the US became increasingly clear, simultaneously with a loss of faith in neoliberalism economics (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013).

This historical analysis leads us to the period in which the ‘Pink Tide’ took place, a politically turbulent period, which will be discussed extensively in the following section. As this wave consist of a distinct focus in projects of regionalism, the different political factors and economic aspects will be discussed, in an effort to analyze the rise of the Pink Tide and its consequences for Latin American regionalism.

The ‘Pink Tide’ and Political Characteristics

The election of Chavez in 1998, with his inauguration the year after, was the first of a succession of electoral successes by leftist political leaders (Weyland, 2010). Other political leaders, whom identify themselves and are considered to be part of the left, were elected in Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Bolivia and El Salvador (Weyland, 2010). Furthermore in Mexico and Peru the left parties almost won the election too, which adds on to the perception of a Pink Tide. In addition there were also political parties situated in the centre or centre-left, such as the Kirchners in Argentina, which can be considered to be left-leaning. Together this results in an unprecedented level of left-governance in the region (Weyland, 2010). Not all academics consider the same countries to be part of the Pink Tide. Other academics considered Argentina and Venezuela to be the most prominent, followed by Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Uruguay and Paraguay (Riggirozzi, 2012). The shared political

ambition of these countries is to “search for an alternative to the orthodoxy of neoliberal political economies” (Riggirozzi, 2012, p. 430). This has led to the use of the term ‘the Pink Tide’, with pink as a reference to the socialism which is embodied in this political movement rather than the red which is related to communism. Furthermore within Pink Tide politics it is neoliberalism which is opposed, instead of capitalism in communist thought (Enríquez, 2013).

There are several limitations and critiques concerning the term ‘the Pink Tide’ which will be given attention in this paragraph. One critique of the term is that it consists of an oversimplification. In one sense this refers to the suggested collective move to the left, and in another sense to a coherent action of those whom are turning to the left. Concerning simplification in terms of participating countries, the use of the term suggests that the entire region of Latin America is politically moving to the left, but it must not be forgotten there are still powerful right-wing governments prevalent, pursuing the line of neoliberalism and close connections with the USA (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). Another issue is the consideration of a left success when, although the election was won by a left political party, a coalition is made which ends up to be situated in the centre, or even centre-right (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). There is a significant trend towards the left, however it must not be forgotten there is not a collective and coherent move across the entire region. Concerning the simplification in terms of shared political tendencies, it can be argued that the various left governments across the region, and their supporting institutions do not share the same political profile at all: there are severe differences concerning the manner in which they combine populism, nationalism and socialism and the manner in which governments execute their work (Lievesley, 2009). A similar variety can be observed concerning the stance towards neoliberalism, although some states reject it, others consider it a necessary or unavoidable evil, while others continue to embrace it (Lievesley, 2009). The variations can be so great that: “To talk about ‘the Left’ in Latin America is misleading because there is more than one, and the older sort remains” (Petras, 1997, p. 17). Naturally there are similarities as well, such as the aspirations to alleviate poverty and the aim for a regional voice, yet altogether these countries differ to such an extent that they cannot be considered to follow one clearly defined political profile (Lievesley, 2009). Acknowledging the limitations of the term ‘the Pink Tide’, it continues to be useful concept as it groups together the

elections of left-leader throughout Latin America, and although variations in political stance should not be overlooked, the overall tendency towards the left and their pursuit of regionalism is of importance when discussing the direction of the region overall.

The political ambitions and policies of Pink Tide governments will be discussed in this section, first by providing a general tendency and secondly by looking more specifically into the levels of commitment, which results in a spectrum of the more radical and other more moderately acting governments. Each of the Pink Tide governments had shown great aspirations towards severe changes during the electoral process, aiming to “ameliorate the negative social consequences of the prevailing neoliberal capitalism” (Enríquez, 2013, p. 612). The electoral shift to the left has brought along political parties whom are committed to a greater equality and/or to a better amount of control over the economy (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). In order to achieve this goal, the political structure was to be reorganized to a more inclusive system, thus protecting the poor and other marginalized groups, which had been particularly affected by the previously dominant neoliberal system (Enríquez, 2013).

Within the politics of the Pink Tide, two political pillars can be identified, the first concerns a domestic policy of post-neoliberalism, in which the economy is reformed to a more equal, distributive structure, and the second concerns an anti-imperial international stance, concerning a firmer stance opposed to the USA’s influence in the region, resulting in the call for a stronger and more connected region within Latin America in order to make this a valid possibility (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). These ambitions may have contradictory aspect in practice because although social objectives are of high importance in political ambitions, achieving a position of the region within the global capitalists economy may lead to a need to compromise on the social initiatives (Cammack, 2005). In other words, achieving a strong regional stance within a global perspective may require some sacrifices on the national level regarding social change.

In order to challenge to dominant global structure of power, in which the US is represented through institutions like the WTO and the IMF, it is necessary such South-South structures are fortified (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). It is therefore not

surprising that one key issue of the left politics is that of ‘new continentalism’ which concerns the region as a medium through which ambitions of reducing US influence can be realized; this regards political influence from the US but also economical influence, as the US promoted neoliberal policies through the ‘Washington Consensus’ such as reducing state influence and privatizing state services, in combination with an opening up of the economies to the global market (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). Thus through regional integration a more independent foreign policy was aspired (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). It can therefore be said that in order to create a situation in which domestic political goals will be viable and sustainable, an international structure is necessary to support it. One country which refutes neoliberalism and attempts to change the economic structure does not have a high chance of success, yet if a numbers of states create alliances and do so collective, their endurance is more probable.

In summary, two political ambitions are entrenched in the Pink Tide countries, on the one hand a driving force to achieve social objectives, and on the other hand a rejection of neoliberal economics, both of which can be observed in both an internal (domestic) and external (international) sense. However, to continue the discussion of Pink Tide politics, it is necessary to discuss another categorization, as not all Pink Tide governments are committed to the same political ambitions in the same way. By acknowledging the differences in politics between Pink Tide countries their political undertakings can be considered more precisely.

Identifying a Divide: the ‘Radical Left’ and the ‘Izquierda Permitida’

In the efforts to analyze the political background of the Pink Tide, some authors have chosen for creating two categories, relating to the political ambitions of certain countries (Madrid, Hunter and Weyland, 2010). It remains disputed whether or not a simple divide into two categories is valuable, or whether more complex classification schemes provide a better framework for analysis (Weyland, 2010). On one side of the spectrum there are the more assertive countries with a more radical perspective, and on the other a more lenient countries with moderate ambitions. The appellations

differ between some authors, as some call them the ‘contestatory left’ and the ‘moderate left’ (Madrid, Hunter and Weyland, 2010), and other consider them the ‘radical left’ and the ‘izquierda permitida’ (Webber and Carr, 2012). Some opt not to use the term radical, as in a historical perspective those governments which are now considered radical do not resemble the governments in the 1960s and 1970s whom were labeled as the radical left, and therefore discusses this category as ‘the contestatory left’ (Weyland, 2010). Despite the difference in the names of the categories, there appears to be a consensus on what the categories entail, although which countries belong to which category is subject to the analysis of political events.

One must note the distinction between *izquierda permitida* and the other has been criticized, as it would pose the *izquierda permitida* to the *izquierda auténtica*, suggesting the first to have less content than the latter (Perla et al., 2013). The *izquierda permitida* displays left sentiment yet continues to follow the rules set by the neoliberal system, whereas the radical challenges this and makes efforts to change the system all together, a task of which the plausibility is critiqued. The *izquierda permitida* continues with the neoliberal structure yet seeks to co-opt political movements which are more radical (Webber and Carr, 2012) There is a focus on poverty-alleviation programs and social protection, rather than attempting to change the economic system (Madrid, Hunter and Weyland, 2010). Economic changes are made, yet these do not attack the underlying issues which are causal to the extreme inequalities in the system (Webber and Carr, 2012). Therefore there is a critique that the same issues will only be reproduced on the long term. Furthermore US policies, considered imperial, are adapted to rather than opposed or refuted (Webber and Carr, 2012). At the same time this can be considered as a more prudent approach, respecting both political and economic constraints which are encountered (Weyland, 2010).

Opposing this category within the left politics in Latin America is the radical left. The radical left argue that capital needs of a country are not of the same level of importance as human needs, and make various efforts to downplay the importance of capital in society (Webber and Carr, 2012). The radical left has ambitions which are directly going against the norms set by the international system, “the more radical wing challenges neoliberalism, defies structures of globalization, and attacks the political opposition” (Weyland, 2010, p. 3). This entails challenging the capitalist

world order, imperial hegemony and neoliberalism, however, governments that have sought to do so have yet to be successful, which raises question about the possibilities of doing so (Webber and Carr, 2010).

The essential difference between this group and the more radical left is that, although there are similar ambitions, the *izquierda permitida* is not willing to push the boundaries of the liberal democracy and the market economics in order to realize these ambitions (Madrid, Hunter and Weyland, 2010). The apparent divide within the left has the possible consequence that the left of the Latin American region will end up divided rather than creating a united regional political position (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009).

An underlying cause to such different approaches can be found in the development of the political parties. The moderate parties have had a longer course of development, shifting to the centre around the late 1980s, embracing market reforms of that time, and over the years developing organizational rules and structures (Madrid, Hunter and Weyland, 2010). On the other hand is the radical left, which emerged from the growing dissatisfaction in the mid-1990s, which not have sufficient time to create institutions and therefore remains to be a more personalistic and fluid movement (Madrid, Hunter and Weyland, 2010). The level of satisfaction with governance appears to be causal to the development of either a radical or a moderate approach. This can be observed as old left parties and their leaders were considered functional and the economy (based on neoliberal principles) was doing relatively well, whereas the more radical left parties rose in countries where poor governance was prevalent and neoliberal economic policies has never rendered great success (Weyland, 2010). This is illustrated by the fact that “in Venezuela and Bolivia the established parties were victims of poor governance in the 1990s” whereas the political situation in more moderate countries had a different origin, as “Chile and increasingly Brazil have had well institutionalized party systems” (Weyland, 2010, p. 19 -20).

Chapter III

Regional organizations and the Functions of Idealism

In this final chapter, the two main regional projects during the Pink Tide will be analyzed: the Bolivarian Alliance for the people of our America (ALBA) and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR). Their commitment to idealism in relation to practical possibilities of their ambitions will be put into perspective. The aim is to provide an understanding concerning the function of idealism in regional projects related to post-hegemonic regionalism. This will entail an investigation concerning to what extent these institutions are pragmatic and to what extent they are idealistic, as well as the underlying reasons for these approaches. Concerning national politics, it has been analyzed that: “Seemingly contradicting points of Pink Tide governments actually display the dynamic tension between idealism and pragmatism” (Lambert, 2011, p. 2). In this chapter, the dynamic relation between these two concepts will be considered on the level of regional projects related to the Pink Tide, analyzing to what extent they embody an idealist form of regionalism rather than a pragmatic reaction to the previously existing forms of regional projects in which neoliberalism was embedded. In this way the function of idealism in the regional projects related to the Pink Tide politics of regionalism will be investigated.

Both of these regional projects, ALBA and UNASUR, are considered to be part of the regionalism which has been categorized as post-hegemonic. The regional projects which emerged during this phase have created new spaces for deliberation and other policies which are not based in economic principles of neoliberalism but rather on a transnational form of solidarity (Riggirozzi and Tussie, 2012). This does not entail that all forms of capitalism or liberalism were refuted, but rather that “their centrality is being displaced with new valid and genuine alternatives to open, neoliberal integration” (Riggirozzi and Tussie, 2012, p. 10). Within what is considered the post-liberal or post-hegemonic regionalism, the parameters of what regionalism entails were redefined (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). Rather than focusing on economic integration, which is inherit to mainstream regionalism, key issues could be found in a political framework (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The political issue on a regional level was that of regional autonomy, entailing a

closing off of political influence from outside region, so that political issues could be defined and managed within the region itself (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The cases of regional institutions, which will be discussed in this section, will shed light on to what extent these parameters were executed as envisioned, thus analyzing to what extent they are more ideological or pragmatic.

To introduce the subjects of study briefly, prior to starting the analysis: UNASUR as an institution was created in 2008, although it can be argued that the Summit of South American Presidents in 2000 was the first step towards this regional body (Riggirozzi, 2012). In 2004, a third summit created the South American Union of Nations (SACN) which was later institutionalized as UNASUR (Riggirozzi, 2012). The ambitious regional project pursued integration, and in 2004 the ambitions were categorized into three: to create convergence between MERCOSUR, the Andean Community and Chile by means of trade agreements, to advance physical infrastructure throughout the region and to pursue political cooperation (Riggirozzi, 2012). During the process in which UNASUR was shaped and created, Chavez held a different understanding of the purposes of regionalism, which he continued to embody in another regional institution: ALBA (Riggirozzi, 2012). ALBA was created in 2004, with the following states signing as members: Venezuela and Cuba (since 2004), Bolivia (since 2006), Nicaragua and Dominica (since 2008), Ecuador and Antigua y Barbuda and San Vicente (since 2009), and St Lucia (since 2013) (Cusack, 2018).

UNASUR, a pragmatic strategy for achieving ideals

UNASUR fundamentally aspired to create a more autonomous position towards external influences while at the same time providing an institution which is concerned with issues beyond trade, focusing on issues such as democracy, identity, defense, social development, physical integration and inclusion (Riggirozzi, 2012). An important characteristic of UNASUR was that ideological consensus was not required or pursued, but rather the regional body embraced different discourses from the member-states (Riggirozzi, 2012). However, a unified position could be observed regarding the defiance of external influence from the US, strengthening the regional position (Cusack, 2018).

This enabled the institution to take a political stance, without one ideological identity. This became clear in the escalating political situation in Bolivia, where Morales was given ‘unconditional support’ in contrast to the critical accusations made to the political regime by the US (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The role of UNASUR was of a regional political nature, as they made it clear “that the rest of the region would not recognize a Bolivian government not led by Morales” (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013, p. 216). In this way, UNASUR had taken a role of monitoring democratic order in the region, clearly refuting external influence. Previously the OAS had taken this function, monitoring elections and the democracies in the region, yet this body was considered to be exerting US influence over the region (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The fact that UNASUR was attempting to take over this role as a regional body without US influence demonstrates a clear objective of countering US interference. This aligns with the previously mentioned ideological consensus, which is harder to find on other issues. This line of policy was continued in the establishment of the South American Defense Council (SADC), which aimed to provide a regional defense strategy so that the US will no longer be needed in defense cases (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). Therefore, it could be argued that UNASUR had managed to create a regional obstacle for US influence in the region, creating a space in which the region can define its own political agenda (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013).

This coincides with the agreement in the region concerning the countering of US influence. On other issues, it is clear that UNASUR was not able to reunite contrasting visions concerning policy. UNASUR has not been successful in creating functional regional cooperation on all issues, and especially financial regional policy has been absent (Belem Lopez and Pimenta de Faria, 2016). This can be linked back to the differing ideological views which could not be integrated into one regional policy. However, on other issues it managed to be able to create regional coordination of policy, such as health (Belem Lopez and Pimenta de Faria, 2016). The issue of economic integration was contentious due to the ideological inclusiveness of UNASUR, with the consequence that no agreement can be found on such issues, due to the lack of ideological alignment (Cusack, 2018).

The role of Brazil in UNASUR is worth mentioning as well. Although the

regional body is not comparably linked to Brazil as ALBA is with Venezuela, Brazil was considered to have a leading role. Brazilian national ideology holds ideas of universalism and a greater role for Brazil in the global sense, for which regional leadership would hold a pragmatic role as to achieving this. Thus, if “priority is given to cooperation with Southern countries, not through notions of solidarity, but to advance Brazil’s regional leadership and hence global standing” (Saraiva, 2011, p. 57), this may not be in line with the regional ideology of post-hegemony but takes part due to pragmatic influences. Yet at the same time, it does not oppose or counter the ideals of post-hegemonic regionalism, but instead enables them. Thus, rather than ascribing this to either pragmatism or idealism it serves to show the dynamic relation of influence these concepts can hold for policy decisions.

The difference in acceptance of members with differing levels of commitment to ideological aspirations displays a level of pragmatism from UNASUR. The clear goal to diminish US influence and especially interference in the region has a greater feasibility if the region was united in achieving this goal. Therefore the acceptance of members whom might not support the pillars of post-hegemonic regionalism to the same extent as countries such as Venezuela, displays a compromise made. The opposite was conducted by ALBA, as it only accepted members whom strictly adhered to the Bolivarian ideology, and critiqued other countries in the region whom continued to integrate regionally based on neoliberal foundations, such as MERCOSUR and the Andean Community (CAN) (Gardini, 2011). The fact that ALBA continued along this course although it has a potentially divisive effect on regionalism in Latin America, shows that ALBA was not willing to be pragmatic and compromise on its ideals. At the same time, even Venezuela, the strongest advocator of ALBA and the underlying ideas, was a member-state of MERCOSUR. This conveys the complexity of the analysis, as the pragmatism of UNASUR may increase the feasibility of achieving idealistic goals. Thus, being pragmatic may be of practical use for idealism, whereas the refusal of ALBA of those less committed had the potential of undermining the aspirations stemming from its idealism. This displays that idealism holds a different function in UNASUR than in ALBA, as in UNASUR idealism serves as a unifying goal without being allowed to create division.

Thus, UNASUR can be characterized as a political regional institution, which

opted for a pragmatic approach for achieving the shared ideals. The limitations this entails is that the issues on which there is no ideological agreement remain unaltered, yet this appears to be a compromise the institution is willing to make. The region was united in this institution in terms of rejection US interference and influence, taking over functions from other institutions in which the US is believed to have a clear influence. In this way UNASUR acted in a manner which can clearly be categorized as post-hegemonic. However, the other factor to which post-hegemonic regionalism is linked, the rejection of the neoliberal economy, was not executed in a similar way. Therefore UNASUR can hardly be classified as post-neoliberal. Although trade is not prioritized in UNASUR, as it is mainly a political body, simultaneously UNASUR is pursuing the creation of a South American free trade area (Malamud and Gardini, 2012). This can be ascribed to the disagreement which prevails on such issues, which makes the regional body unable to enact change.

ALBA, an idealistic example

ALBA held a different function in the same spectrum of post-hegemonic regionalism. And within ALBA idealism held a different function too, as it provided a set of restricting rules, because idealism was believed to be normative. An important difference with UNASUR was that, although aspirations coincide concerning US influence, the defiance of a neoliberal order was considered equally important. Arguably these are connected, as in a neoliberal economy within a global structure of capitalism the influence of countries such as the US will be eminent (Cammack, 2005). It pursued radical transformation on a more ideological level, attempting to create a model of development in which solidarity is given priority over economic competition (Riggirozzi, 2012). Ideological discourse has been omnipresent in the creation of ALBA (Riggirozzi, 2012). It has distinguished itself from other regional projects, due to its unique policy of transnational projects of solidarity, in terms of socio-economic and welfare projects on a regional level (Riggirozzi, 2012). Merely by providing an example of that such a policy is possible, ALBA has created a possible strategy for implementing the anti-neoliberal rhetoric which has been widely used in Pink Tide countries (Riggirozzi, 2012). ALBA thus provided an example of the alternative, which has the potential of inspiring the other left-leaning countries in the

region. This can serve as an explanation for why ALBA is not willing to compromise for a more pragmatic approach, if it would do so, the function of an idealist example would be weakened.

The ideal of post-neoliberalism is hard to envision in practice for many, and therefore examples or even suggestions of how this ideal could be realized are of great importance. The proposed alternative consisted of a form of trade based on ‘complementarity’ in which the motivation behind trade is not monetary wealth but rather a satisfaction of social needs (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). Competiveness in local economies was not pursued, instead exchanges are searched for which can be complementary for both parties (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). The distance from the neoliberal economic policies was enlarged by accepting trade without monetary values, exchanging one thing for another service, making calculations of profit impossible (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). By creating networking schemes across the region in which knowledge was shared and collaboration is facilitated, ALBA had created an alternative development paradigm (Lievesley and Ludlam, 2009). This alternative development was also pursued in the establishment of a regional development bank, so that development independent of demands from institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank can be achieved (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). Thus, although the feasibility of several projects can be questioned at the time, “ALBA nevertheless provides at least a broad outline of an alternative to neoliberalism”, which created policy options for the wide variety of countries whom had accepted anti-neoliberal rhetoric to some extent (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013, p. 220). The notion of providing an example of the alternative is important, especially in context of the political developments which followed after the Pink Tide. The example provided by Venezuela, and therefore the same applied to ALBA, was a negative one. The lack of a successful example can be linked to the end of the Pink Tide. This may have been negative in outcome, yet it does not take away the role of example which Venezuela and therefore ALBA held. ALBA may not have succeeded in its goals, yet the role of example and the connected political influence in the region continued. Thus, the lack of success influenced the regional politics in a similar way as the initial success inspired.

The manner in which such examples can function on a regional level is different than on a national level, because on a regional level there is a lack of binding agreements which increase the gap between rhetoric and policy. This lack of policy implementation by ALBA has led to a critique: “More than anything else, ALBA is a concept” (Gardini, 2011, p. 239). This statement is made due to the ideological nature of the regional project, in combination with the relative small effect on policy it has made. There was a significant gap between the idealistic rhetoric and the implemented policy. Although a difference in ambitions and policy is the norm, especially “foreign policy is an area relatively prone to the divergence of words from deeds” (Malamud, 2011, p. 87). This could be ascribed to the regional agreements, which often lack enforcing terms. Additionally the multiple allegiances of various countries in Latin America increased the flexibility of regional agreements, in which a high level of noncompliance is tolerated (Malamud and Gardini, 2012). “Simultaneous membership reveals, on the one hand, a degree of inconsistency of national choices and, on the other, an increasing gap between political declarations and diplomatic action” (Malamud and Gardini, 2012, p. 124). This relates to both pragmatism and idealism at the same time. The incoherent dynamics between the national and the regional, as on the one hand regional policy can be considered as an extension of national policy (Gardini, 2011), and on the other hand it can be observed that national policy was not limited by regional agreements, due to the increased complexities of adherence and compliance due to multiple alliances (Gardini and Malamud, 2012). Regional behavior can also be interpreted as an extension of national foreign policy, in which the call for regional solidarity was rather more rhetoric than a policy strategy (Hayes, 2013). Whereas the conceptual discussion concerning regionalism was highly ideological, the implementation displays the tension between what was aspired and what was feasible (Gardini, 2011). This can even be considered as a pragmatic choice, as “the rhetoric of integration captures hearts and minds, the media’s attention, and votes; its actual content and implementation, including pragmatic compromise and bargaining, do not” (Gardini, 2011, p. 246). “Ideology at a rhetorical level, largely addressed at a domestic constituency, has been frequently eclipsed by pragmatism in the actual practice of diplomacy” (Chrimes, 2011, p. 1567).

ALBA represented an extension of the Venezuelan national objectives of

socialism in a regional sphere (Riggirozzi, 2012). This is of importance for several reasons, first of all because the regional project would not have been possible without the Venezuelan resources, and secondly because the creation of ALBA can be linked to a Venezuelan argument for leadership in the region. In addition it determined that once the economic prosper of Venezuela diminished, the project of ALBA did not endure. During the Pink Tide it was already pointed out that the oil revenues of Venezuela were a causal factor for the enablement of such an ideological regional project, resulting in a questionability of continuation without said resources (Riggirozzi, 2012). Entailing that Venezuela would not be able to initiate the several ideological projects it has launched, were it not for their economic resources at the time. A level of pragmatism can be found in the fact that Venezuela's prosperity was derived from in the international economics of oil, which were then used to fund a project to defy the international neoliberal system. The controversy is clear, yet was not considered as detrimental to the post-neoliberal project. Thus it was easier to be ideological when resources were available, clearly linking the necessity of pragmatic means and ideological projects. The second issue concerns pragmatism from a national perspective, namely that the Venezuelan national position within regional politics was strengthened by the leading position in a regional institution (Gardini, 2011). However, concerning ALBA and Venezuela, it is almost impossible to untangle the national and the regional, as the two were so intertwined. Even in Venezuela, the most prominent advocator of post-neoliberalism, the underlying economic structure had not been altered on a fundamental level, signaling that the term post-neoliberalism is an idealistic appellation, where counter-neoliberalism would be more accurate (Cusack, 2018). The same argument can be made regarding the regional organizations which embody post-hegemonic regionalism: although in ALBA a regional cooperation beyond trade was aspired trade was still central to the cooperation it enables (Malamud and Gardini, 2012). And finally, not considering the finite economic resources and the lack of sustainability it entailed can be considered as a refusal of pragmatism.

Thus, in order to characterize the role of ideology in ALBA, it must be taken into account that ALBA served as an ideological example, for which pragmatic compromises would negatively impact the example set. Idealism was understood to hold a normative aspect, that is: if one adhered to the ideology they would be

critiqued if at the same time policy deflected something else. However, at the same time, the gap between rhetoric and policy in practice was rather accepted on a regional level, especially due to the complicated situations of overlapping membership which constrain binding agreements. Therefore, a level of pragmatism can be found in the lack of policy implementation: the strength of the ideological rhetoric could be maintained without dealing with the consequences of the severe implications an overthrow of the neoliberal system would entail. ALBA was the advocator of an alternative, for which it would be undesirable to compromise on ideals. It functioned also as a critical voice, pointing out the flaws of those whom adhered to the same ideology yet failed to execute it. Yet the critique was rarely turned inwards, although from the outside this contradiction did undermine the credibility of the ideology.

Contradicting Ambitions for Latin American Regionalism

Latin America has numerous regional bodies and institutions, with varying levels of contradictions and opposing ideologies underlying them. This raises the question to what extent there is a prevalent disagreement on what regionalism should look like in Latin America. Even during a time in which a majority of countries were politically aligned, no agreement could be observed in regionalism. The quantity of distinct regional institutions has the capability of undermining regionalism in general, as “ALBA, and UNASUR in their current formulation are not only incompatible, but also dysfunctional in terms of the objectives they purport to pursue” (Gardini, 2011, p. 236).

In both regional bodies a clear rejection of US influence in the region can be seen, with UNASUR taking over regional functions that were previously executed by US biased bodies and with ALBA’s powerful rhetoric against US interference. Therefore, post-hegemonic-ness in terms of a deterrence of extra-regional external influences was present in both regional bodies. However, the other pillar of post-hegemonic regionalism, an aspiration to create regionalism in which trade is not a central but rather considered as a means of achieving goals such as solidarity and social equality, cannot be observed in the different regional bodies equally. This is

often understood as the post-neoliberal aspect. However, ‘post-neoliberal’ governments have “tended to be perhaps surprisingly pragmatic, especially in so far as the economy is concerned, where policies work with the grain of a liberalized global economy” (Grugel and Riggirozzi, 2012, p. 5).

A linkage can be made to the divide between the radical left and the izquierda permitida, as “the moderate and contestatory lefts are not only conceptual constructions but also act as loose coalitions in the real world” (Weyland, 2010, p. 4). It can be observed that the two different groupings interacted more intensely between each other, drawing inspiration from each other but also countering each other on certain points (Weyland, 2010). In addition it was possible to observe a leading country within each group, with Venezuela for the radical leaning countries and Brazil for the ones with a more moderate approach (Weyland, 2010). The aim for regional leadership displays a realist form of pragmatism as their global standing would benefit from an increase in regional influence (Saraiva, 2011). However, this is not without consequences as the difference in political stance undermined the collective leftist efforts, as the two groups are opposing each other within the region, with Chavez challenging Brazil’s claim to leadership, Morales undermining Brazilian oil interests, and Lula da Silva decreasing Venezuelan influence in El Salvador (Weyland, 2010). It can therefore be stated, that: “underneath the diplomatic surface of leftist brotherhood there has been unease and tension between the two camps” (Weyland, 2010, p. 4).

However it can also be argued that the variety of regional projects undertaken from these differing points of view within the left side of politics could at times complement one another (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). This can be observed in the apparent competition for regional leadership between Brazil and Venezuela which took place during the Pink Tide. Due to the different focus areas of the Brazilian regional vision and the Venezuelan regional vision, they can pursue regional projects parallel to one another without obstructing each other’s ideals (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013). Naturally on other occasions they did clash, yet during that period: “there appears to be enough commonality and commitment to an independent Latin American region to overcome existing and future differences” (Chodor and McCarthy-Jones, 2013, p. 221).

The different regional bodies and how they interact make the analysis of efforts of regionalism in Latin America all the more complex. Various countries are member-state of differing or competing projects, which can be considered as an undermining effect regarding the issues on which there is no agreement. ALBA rejected efforts such as MERCOSUR and CAN, whereas UNASUR worked closer together with MERCOSUR. Another interpretation is that different regional organizations have the possibility of complementing one another, as their political focus is often on different areas (Weyland, 2010). This can also be referred to concerning the fact that ALBA created less policy than UNASUR: although they might have contradicted each other, UNASUR took a more pragmatic approach whereas ALBA was more an advocator of political ideals. Although ALBA did not execute them in policy as much as UNASUR, the arguments made by ALBA were heard and thus influenced UNASUR policy due to overlapping membership. In the academic debate the conclusion was drawn that the possibility for regional integration is consequently decreased, yet this does not entail regional cooperation will be affected equally (Gardini and Malamud, 2012). However, it is questionable if integration was ever the goal in Latin American regionalism, where autonomy is given such importance, both on a national and regional level (Acharya, 2016).

The discussion concerning the impact of a competition for regional leadership on regionalism continues to be of interest despite the changing political situation in Latin America. During the Pink Tide this rivalry could be considered to have an undermining effect, despite the similarities in political alignment between countries in the region. Although the political alignment has changed in the years that followed, so has the rivalry for regional leadership. If this rivalry is considered to undermine efforts of regionalism, regionalism in Latin America may have overcome an obstacle when the position of Venezuela diminished. On the other hand this leads to the question of whether or not the left-leaning political consensus holds a larger potential for regionalism. Therefore the insight from politics of regionalism and the rivalry for regional leadership continues to be of importance for analyzing regionalism despite severe changes in the political environment. Although further research would be necessary to draw any conclusions, the influences on regionalism regarding political similarities between the different countries on the one hand and a

rivalry for regional leadership on the other hand hold the potential of creating important insights in the understanding of regionalism in Latin America.

Conclusion

In the regional projects which embody post-hegemonic regionalism in Latin America during the Pink Tide, idealism is central. However, the role of idealism differs to a great extent. In ALBA idealism is prioritized, aiming to create an example of a true alternative, and making use of the strength of idealistic rhetoric. The complexities of implementation are not given as much attention, which is merely possible due to the accepted gap between rhetoric and practice, for which the variety of regional organizations with overlapping membership despite contradicting ideals is causal. In UNASUR idealistic consensus is not prioritized, a pragmatic choice which had made it possible for the institution to make several important steps towards reducing US influence in the region. The plausibility of reducing US influence is greatly improved by the large membership of UNASUR. At the same time the large membership has led to a wide variety of political aspiration, and because of this UNASUR has not been able to find or create consensus on various other issues, such as economic issues. This can be considered as a compromise, unifying on what can be agreed upon rather than advocating for issues on which no consensus can be reached. The ideological commitment can be considered somewhat reduced because of this, yet the counter-hegemonic achievements in practice display a clear ideological direction.

Referring back to the research question: ‘What is the function of idealism in Latin American Pink Tide politics of regionalism?’. First of all it can be concluded that the function of idealism in post-hegemonic regionalism is not a set one. It differs between the two regional bodies which were discussed, and will differ from these in other regional bodies, as well as on a national level of regional cooperation. At all times the function and influence of the idealism is determined by the dynamic interaction with pragmatism. In other words, at all times the level of idealism is influenced by the determined goal at that time, and accordingly the level of idealism is altered to suit a specific goal. In ALBA the determined goal was significantly different than in UNASUR, which led to a situation in which ALBA held closer to idealist values than UNASUR, whereas UNASUR allowed for pragmatic influences to achieve the idealistic goal of decrease US influence. Thus the function of idealism in Latin American Pink Tide politics of regionalism is used as a tool for inspiration, as well as a means of uniting the region against US interference. How this function is

executed is fluid, and the influence of ideology is continuously altered in relation to the pragmatics of strategy.

By analyzing the two regional bodies which are affiliated with post-hegemonic regionalism, it can also be analyzed to what extent the type of regionalism is pragmatic or based in idealism. Reconsidering the notion of post-hegemonic regionalism, which is understood to “go beyond the scope of trade or opposition to US hegemony, and offer alternatives for regionalism which are not included in earlier literature regarding regionalism” (Riggirozzi, 2012, p. 421-422). In both regional bodies a clear rejection of US influence in the region can be seen, with UNASUR taking over regional functions that were previously executed by US biased bodies and with ALBA’s powerful rhetoric against US interference. Therefore, post-hegemonicness in terms of a deterrence of extra-regional external influences is present in both regional bodies. Yet the second pillar of post-hegemonic regionalism, in which the neoliberal centrality of trade is criticized, is not implemented to the same extent.

The rough divide in Latin American perspective concerning the left ideals is institutionalized in UNASUR and ALBA, with UNASUR providing a more moderate model in comparison to the more radical socialist model provided by ALBA (Riggirozzi, 2012). It is therefore not surprising that Brazil was considered to have a leading position in UNASUR, whereas Venezuela had taken the lead in ALBA (Riggirozzi, 2012). A difference can also be seen in terms of policy making agendas, as ALBA remains unclear whereas UNASUR social development and policy are gaining prominence in the region (Riggirozzi, 2012). The lack of policy creation from ALBA can be explained by that “regionalism in Latin America describes several on-going projects as being concerned less with political decision-making or economic benefit, but far more with regional “identity formation”, that is, with the “redefinition of regional consensus over social and economic resource sharing” (Gardini, 2011, p. 13).

In the academic debate there are several voices arguing that the diversity in regionalism has created a situation in which the envisioned aspirations of regionalism are undermined (Gardini, 2011 & Cusack, 2018). “However, in Latin America, regionalism, although meant to be an expression of unity and solidarity, has become a stark reflection of Latin American diversity and heterogeneity. Even in

the presence of supposedly ideological affinities between a majority of the current left-leaning administrations, Latin American regionalism is characterized by a number of competing projects, whose rationales and agendas are often divergent, if not incompatible” (Gardini, 2011, p. 235). This is especially interesting because the political consensus in the region was one which aspired solidarity. In addition it raises questions concerning the connection between left politics and regionalism, as regional cooperation is not merely pursued by left politics, but at the same time the ideals of solidarity were. Gardini argued at the time it would be hard to foresee the success of one regional project to prevail over others, and that at best coexistence could be continued with a large gap between discourse and practice (Gardini, 2011). However, it can be argued that the notion that one regional project should prevail can be considered to be based on mainstream regionalism with the single case of the EU.

The dynamics of change which are present in the national politics can also be observed in the regional politics of Latin America. When the left-leaning administrations left governments across the continent the regional projects which had been build up in the decade before were not altered to suit the new political tendency but rather abandoned all together. This displays another clear difference with the EU case which signals that Latin American regionalism functions in a distinct manner. This characteristic of Latin American politics holds a great impact on the situation of regionalism in present, as political affiliations go from left to right in a radical manner, projects of regionalism which are considered as part of the ‘other’ side of the political spectrum are departed from once elections change governance. This leads to a situation in which continuation is hampered, where new regional projects arise frequently. Thus, although the aim for regionalism is present in both sides of the political spectrum (ascribed to the creation of numerous regional projects) continuation of regional projects is limited due to the political label of each project. Further research would be suggested concerning the function and role of ideology in politics of regionalism of right-leaning governments, to create a more complete view of the role of ideology in regionalism. This would also add to the issue of continuation, as it would create an understanding to what extent these differing regional politics can be united or are truly incompatible.

Arguably the variety of competing regional projects can be considered as representing a different political order for regionalism. Institutions such as ALBA and UNASUR have been said to ‘represent different pathways to regional building’, despite their differences (Riggirozzi, 2012, p. 421). Like the different models of democracy with differing political systems of parties and coalitions, the different pathway to regional building which occurs in Latin America does not only refer to the different nature of post-hegemonic regionalism, but also to the diversity and heterogeneity of the regional political structure represented in the plural form of regionalisms in Latin America.

Thus, although the wide spectrum of regional projects in Latin America may have appeared fragmented, even in a period in which there was nearly a regional political consensus, several arguments need to be kept in mind while assessing such a conclusion. First of all, it must be remembered that the European Union with a regional monopoly is not to be taken as the only possibility of successful regionalism (Riggirozzi, 2012). The variation of regionalisms represents the diversity, as there is not one homogenous Latin America (Belem Lopez and Pimenta de Faria, 2016). And finally, keeping in mind that integration is not necessarily pursued, as in Latin American regionalism autonomy is prioritized over integration (Acharya, 2016). Instead, co-operation is pursued, and the variety of regional bodies creates a situation in which there are numerous possibilities and strategies for this. In this way, the examination of the main regional projects related to post-hegemonic regionalism has created valuable insights for both Latin American regional politics as the theoretical debate concerning regionalism.

References

- Acharya, A. (2016). Regionalism beyond EU-centrism. *The Oxford handbook of comparative regionalism*, 109-130.
- Briceño-Ruiz, J. (2010). From the South American free trade area to the Union of South American Nations: The transformations of a rising regional process. *Latin American Policy*, 1(2), 208-229.
- Cammack, P. (2005). 'Signs of the Times': Capitalism, Competitiveness, and the New Face of Empire in Latin America. *Socialist register*, 41(41).
- Chodor, T., & McCarthy-Jones, A. (2013). Post-liberal regionalism in Latin America and the influence of Hugo Chávez. *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research*, 19(2), 211-223.
- Chrimes, P. (2011). Latin American foreign policies: between ideology and pragmatism.
- Corrales, J. (2010). The Repeating Revolution. Leftist Governments in Latin America: successes and shortcomings, 28.
- Cusack, A. K. (2018). *Venezuela, ALBA, and the Limits of Postneoliberal Regionalism in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Springer.
- Dabène, O. (2009). *The politics of regional integration in Latin America: theoretical and comparative explorations*. Springer.
- Dabene, O. 2012. Explaining Latin America's Fourth Wave of Regionalism. Regional Integration of a Third Kind. *Paper for delivery at the 2012 Congress of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) Panel "Waves of change in Latin America. History and Politics"*.
- Deciancio, M. (2016). International Relations from the South: A Regional Research Agenda for Global IR. *International Studies Review*, 18(1), 106-119.

Enríquez, L. (2013). The paradoxes of Latin America's 'pink tide': Venezuela and the project of agrarian reform. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 40(4), 611-638.

Fawcett, L. (2004). Exploring regional domains: a comparative history of regionalism. *International Affairs*, 80(3), 429-446.

Fernandois, J. (2011). Pragmatism, ideology, and tradition in Chilean foreign policy since 1990. In *Latin American Foreign Policies* (pp. 35-52). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Forero, J. (2006, May 20). Seeking United Latin America, Venezuela's Chávez Is a Divider. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/20/world/americas/20chavez.html>

Gardini, G. L. (2011). Latin American foreign policies between ideology and pragmatism: A framework for analysis. In *Latin American foreign policies* (pp. 13-33). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Gardini, G. L. (2011). Unity and diversity in Latin American visions of regional integration. In *Latin American Foreign Policies*(pp. 235-254). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Grugel, J., & Riggirozzi, P. (2012). Post-neoliberalism in Latin America: Rebuilding and reclaiming the State after crisis. *Development and Change*, 43(1), 1-21.

Hayes, B. (2013). Gian Luca Gardini and Peter Lambert, eds., *Latin American Foreign Policies: Between Ideology and Pragmatism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Bibliography, index, 272 pp.; hardcover \$85. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 55(1), 176-178.

He, B., & Inoguchi, T. (2011). Introduction to ideas of Asian regionalism. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 12(2), 165-177.

Hettne, B., & Söderbaum, F. (2000). Theorising the rise of regionness. *New political economy*, 5(3), 457-472.

- Hurrell, A. (1995). Explaining the resurgence of regionalism in world politics. *Review of International Studies*, 21(4), 331-358.
- Hurrell, A. (2016). Towards the global study of International Relations. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 59(2).
- Jayasuriya, K. (2009). Regulatory regionalism in the Asia-Pacific: drivers, instruments and actors. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 63(3), 335-347.
- Kleinschmidt, J., & Gallego Pérez, P. (2017). Differentiation theory and the ontologies of regionalism in Latin America. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 60(1).
- Lambert, P. (2011). *Latin American foreign policies: between ideology and pragmatism*. Springer.
- Lievesley, G. (2009). Is Latin America moving leftwards? Problems and prospects. Lievesley, G. and Ludlam, S. *Reclaiming Latin America: Experiments in Radical Social Democracy*, 21-36.
- Lievesley, G., & Ludlam, S. (2009). Introduction: A “Pink Tide “. *Reclaiming Latin America: experiments in radical social democracy*, 1-18.
- Lievesley, G., & Ludlam, S. (2009). Conclusion: Nuestra América—the spectre haunting Washington. *Reclaiming Latin America: Experiments in Radical Social Democracy*. Edited by Lievesley, Gerladine, and Steve Ludlman. London: Zed Books, 221, 1-13.
- Macdonald, L., & Ruckert, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Post-neoliberalism in the Americas*. Springer.
- Madrid, R. L., Hunter, W., & Weyland, K. (2010). The policies and performance of the contestatory and moderate left. *Leftist governments in Latin America: Successes and shortcomings*, 140-80.
- Malamud, A. (2010). Latin American regionalism and EU studies. *European Integration*, 32(6), 637-657.

- Malamud, A. (2011). Argentine foreign policy under the Kirchners: ideological, pragmatic, or simply Peronist?. In *Latin American Foreign Policies* (pp. 87-102). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Malamud, A., & Gardini, G. L. (2012). Has regionalism peaked? The Latin American quagmire and its lessons. *The International Spectator*, 47(1), 116-133.
- Petras, J. (1997). Latin America: The resurgence of the left. *New left review*, (223), 17.
- Perla Jr, H., Mojica, M., & Bibler, J. (2013). From guerrillas to government: the continued relevance of the Central American left. *The New Latin American Left: Cracks in the Empire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 327-356.
- Perrotta, D. (2012). La integración regional en América del Sur como objeto de estudio:¿ en pos de la construcción de un campo. *Trabajo presentado en III Jornadas de Relaciones Internacionales “Discutiendo las bases del diálogo regional en la dinámica de la política internacional*.
- Riggirozzi, P. (2012). Region, regionness and regionalism in Latin America: towards a new synthesis. *New Political Economy*, 17(4), 421-443.
- Riggirozzi, P., & Tussie, D. (2012). The rise of post-hegemonic regionalism in Latin America. In *The Rise of Post-Hegemonic Regionalism* (pp. 1-16). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Saraiva, M. G. (2011). Brazilian Foreign Policy: Causal Beliefs in Formulation and Pragmatism in Practice. In *Latin American Foreign Policies* (pp. 53-66). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Schulz, M., Söderbaum, F., & Öjendal, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Regionalization in a globalizing world: a comparative perspective on forms, actors, and processes*. Zed Books.
- Warleigh, A., & Rosamond, B. (2006, April). Comparative regional integration: Towards a research agenda. In *Description of Workshop for the ECPR Joint Sessions, Nicosia, Cyprus* (pp. 25-30).

Weyland, K. (2010). The performance of leftist governments in Latin America. *Leftist Governments in Latin America*, 1-27.

Webber, J. R., & Carr, B. (Eds.). (2012). *The new Latin American left: Cracks in the empire*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.