

Thesis Internship Seminar Msc Political Science

Supervisor: Dr. F. de Zwart

Second reader: Prof. D.C. Thomas

Date: June 12, 2015

Maxim N. Stunt

S0935468

Words: 9.959

The Quest for Multipolarity:

Argentine and Brazilian Autonomism in the Crimea Crisis and Beyond

Introduction.....	2
The Ineptitude of Mainstream Theories: Liberalism and Realism.....	4
A Constructivist Alternative.....	7
Methodology: a Discourse Analysis.....	10
Brazilian Identity in Foreign Policy.....	13
Argentine Identity in Foreign Policy.....	16
Brazilian Discourses on the Crimea Crisis.....	17
Argentine Discourses on the Crimea Crisis.....	20
The Quest for Multipolarity.....	23
Conclusions.....	25
Bibliography.....	27

Introduction

The transfer of Crimea to Russia in March 2014 – later admitted by president Putin as a planned annexation¹ - was received in the West with a combination of deep astonishment and fierce rejection. Eschewing from a military response, the EU and the US opted for a strategy of economic sanctions and political isolation. The first component of this strategy seems to have worked fairly well. Sanctions, in combination with plunging oil prices, brought the Russian economy on the verge of collapse by the end of 2014. The second objective however, to isolate Russia politically, did not materialise. The Western narrative of an isolated Putin proves unconvincing. Western media were quick to portray a Putin eating alone during the November 2014 G20 summit in Australia². Nevertheless, the pictures did not show, that there was in fact a person sitting with Putin at the table – namely, Brazilian president Dilma Rousseff (see Reuters 2014).

The Brazilian-Russian tête-à-tête was not the only indication that isolation of Russia failed. A prominent step that aimed for the isolation of Russia was United Nations (UN) resolution 68/262 that highlighted Ukrainian territorial integrity. This resolution, titled “Territorial integrity of Ukraine” was adopted on March 27, 2014. The resolution stresses Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity, and calls upon all states to refrain from the disruption or the modification of Ukraine’s borders. It also dismisses the validity of the Crimea referendum of March 16, calling upon all states and other actors to not recognise the resulting change in the status of Crimea (United Nations 2014a). It was adopted with 100 votes in favour, but 58 countries abstained and 11 voted against (United Nations 2014b, 17).

¹BBC, “Putin reveals secrets of Russia’s Crimea takeover plot”, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-31796226> (Accessed March 13, 2015). This annexation is a rather politicized topic in which this essay does not wish to take position. Moreover, it is important to stress that the annexation of the Crimea is only one episode in the Ukraine crisis, which initiated in January 2014 and lingers on until the day of writing. This essay does not aim to give an exhaustive overview of the conflict in Ukraine, nor of the Crimea crisis. As will be explained in this introduction, this study solely aims to analyse the position of Argentina and Brazil regarding the transfer of Crimea to Russia, which was legitimised through a referendum incompatible with Ukrainian constitution.

² Heather McNab, “From Vlad to worse,” *Daily Mail*, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2836488/From-Vlad-worse-snubbed-airport-sit-dinner-shunted-edge-family-photo-condemned-world-leaders-s-no-wonder-President-Putin-Russian-leave-G20-summit.html> (Accessed December 29, 2014)

This resolution offers an interesting case of this isolation policy. The votes against the resolution are obviously perceived as support for Russia, to which the resolution is clearly directed. Motives for such support are straight-forward; for example, Syria relies heavily on Russian support in its civil war. More interesting is the widespread abstention on this resolution, while it basically stresses the UN ground rules as formulated in the Charter. Among the 58 countries were 14 from Latin America and the Caribbean, which was a heavy blow for the US and its allies. Countries such as Brazil and Argentine refused to speak out against Russian aggression, although they claim to be a fierce supporter of the liberal international order of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention. It was precisely the refusal of countries like Brazil to reject the annexation of Crimea that ran counter to most Western expectations (Stuenkel 2014).

The disenchantment with this position is mostly due to the inability of mainstream international relations (IR) theories to explain the Latin American impartiality. From a liberal perspective, one could expect those countries that cherish liberal values to utilise multilateral institutions to resolve international disputes. From that point of view, the UN resolution provides a logical forum to protect national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Moreover, a realist approach does not satisfactorily explain this behaviour either. If these states were guided by national interest, one would expect them to side with the US and its Western allies. The US is a major economic partner and the military hegemon in the Western hemisphere. Although Astrada and Martin (2013) stress the increased Russian interest in the region, economic relations with Russia are still meagre, and Moscow's geopolitical clout in the region is limited.

This essay addresses this lacuna. It therefore examines the position of two major Latin American countries: Argentina and Brazil. Although these countries differ significantly, they also bare major similarities. Both countries are rooted in Western political culture and acclaim liberal values of non-intervention and territorial integrity. They are the two greatest political powers of South America, where both seek political hegemony. Likewise, they equally refrain from criticising Russia on the violation of these norms. Also, both countries are better served by currying favour with the US and support the UN resolution. Nonetheless, both countries abstained from voting on the UN resolution.

This paradox results in the following question: what motives guided Argentina and Brazil in their position concerning the Russian annexation of Crimea? To confront this paradox, this essay starts off by firstly demonstrating the inability of mainstream IR theories to explain the position of these states. Then, it offers a constructivist approach, with a focus on state identity, to address the research question. To provide the necessary background on Brazilian and Argentine identity, it draws on an extensive literature review. Subsequently, it employs a discourse analysis on the statements communicated by the leaders of these countries during the Crimea crisis. The argument advanced here is that self-identification of grandeur requires an autonomous foreign policy, which proved incompatible with supporting the UN resolution on Crimea. The Crimea crisis is not an isolated case: the pursuit of multipolarity, which facilitates autonomy, is a constant feature in Argentine and Brazilian foreign policy.

The Ineptitude of Mainstream Theories: Liberalism and Realism

The case under scrutiny concerns a vote on a UN resolution. The UN's predecessor, the League of Nations, was a point of reference for liberal theorists. After the costly First World War the perception emerged that war was irrational (Hollis and Smith 1990, 18). Liberalism as IR theory is rooted in the eponymous political ideology, emphasising freedom, equality, free trade and constitutionalism (Dunne 2008, 110). In liberalism's domestic analogy, liberal states aim for the extension of their ideas to the international realm. Establishing institutions and the rule of law, as Dunne (2008, 110) puts it, liberals strive for "domestication of the international".

Contemporary liberals like neoliberal institutionalists ceded some optimism about the establishment of liberal world order. Especially since the Second World War, liberals embraced the assumption that the international system is anarchic – that is, lacking overarching authorities. Nonetheless, liberals did not drop the claim that anarchy can (at least partly) be overcome, and the end of the Cold War re-launched the liberal expectations conferred on international organisations and enforcing international law (Dunne 2008, 110). Along with neorealists, neoliberals perceive states as key actors, albeit not the only actors. States are indeed rational – i.e. pursuing their interests – but for neoliberals, institutions do facilitate cooperation to the benefit of all (Lamy 2008, 132-133). International organisations thus, perform a crucial role in the view neoliberal institutionalists (Jackson and Sorenson 2006, 110).

Both Argentina and Brazil do in fact espouse a culture of liberalism, continuously stressing their adherence to international law. For example, the liberal principles that guide Brazilian foreign policy international relations are anchored in the constitution: Brazil adheres to, among other things, national independence, non-intervention, equality between states and peaceful resolution of conflicts. Thus, if these countries strived for the internationalisation of the liberal values, they would actively engage in the defence of these norms. Thus, valuing the international order and the prevalence of international law, liberalism would expect them to denounce the Russian annexation of Crimea, which is widely regarded as a violation of the UN Charter.

Argentina and Brazil did in fact in previous cases act in accordance with neoliberal institutionalist predictions. Argentina never misses the opportunity to use international organisations (whether Mercosur³, UNASUR⁴, or the UN) as a platform to advance its claims on the Falklands (Pinkerton and Benwell 2014, 15-16). One of the Brazilian main foreign policy objectives is actually aimed at enhancing its position in an international organisation: its bid for a permanent seat in the UN Security Council (Gardini 2012, 15). Likewise, in the Crimea case neoliberal institutionalism would expect actors to turn to international institutions to overcome anarchy. One would thus expect Argentina and Brazil to seize the opportunity to make use of the UN platform do denounce the unilateral change of international borders. Apparently, this is not the case here, and liberal theory leaves us without an explanation of the behaviour of Argentina and Brazil.

Realists however, are not too surprised that the UN is bypassed in the international stage. From a realist point of view, states establish institutions primarily to serve their interest (Lamy 2008, 134). However, the question remains what realism would expect these countries to do in this very situation. Although contemporary realists moved away from some of its classical assumptions - Kenneth Waltz' (1979) structural realism is perhaps the most prominent example – the core assumptions have been maintained. Firstly, realism is state-centric, focussing on the state as principle actor of international relations. These states pursue their national interest,

³ Mercosur, or Mercosul in Portuguese (Common Market of the South), is an economic union founded by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay. Venezuela joined in 2012.

⁴ The South American Union, comprising all sovereign countries on the continent.

aimed at survival. More pessimistic about anarchy than liberals, realists think states rely on self-help in order to secure their survival. Since states are rational, they will attempt to accumulate their power in order to safeguard their survival (Dunne and Schmidt 2008, 93).

From a realist perspective, one would argue that the countries under scrutiny would make the following calculation. With regard to the UN vote, the favour of two competing major powers – the US and Russia - is at stake. Supporting the resolution means supporting the US-led alliance, whilst rejecting it implies allying with Russia. Bearing the overall goal of survival in mind, states should thus consider which country offers most resources to enhance their power. The US is, after Brazil, the second trading partner for Argentina (CIA World Factbook 2014a). For Brazil too, the US is the second trade partner; and for both, bilateral trade with Russia is negligible (CIA World Factbook 2014b). Moreover, these comparisons only concern the US and Russia; adding up trade with the EU, also a major stakeholder in the Crimea crisis and US ally, the economic interest calculation between Russia and Western countries becomes even more contrasting. Last but not least, Ukraine itself is a strategic partner of Brazil: the two countries are engaged in far-reaching space technology cooperation since 2002 (Montserrat 2005; 2010).

Nonetheless, other than economic resources should be taken into account. It is hard to argue which geopolitical motives could be at work. Some might argue that impartiality is the way to go if one likes to maintain cordial ties with all actors involved. From a realist perspective however, this argument does not hold sway: Machiavelli (1992 [1532], 89), spiritual father of realism, warned that such a stance will disappoint both antagonists, and weaken the position of the neutral actor:

A prince is also respected when he is either a true friend or a downright enemy, that to say, when, without any reservation, he declares himself in favour of one party against the other; which course will always be more advantageous than standing neutral [...] In either case it will always be more advantageous for you to declare yourself and to make war strenuously; because, in the first case, if you do not declare yourself, you will invariably fall a prey to the conqueror, to the pleasure and satisfaction of him who has been conquered, and you will have no reasons to offer, nor anything to protect or to shelter you.

If realism demands to come clean, one could argue that the BRICS alignment would then push Brazil into supporting Russia, but the geopolitical implications of BRICS membership are unclear. Until now, the BRICS lack any military structure that could improve the Brazilian power position. More importantly, nor the US, nor the Russian Federation is a military threat to these countries. And if they were, putting the cards on the US would be a safer bet, considering the superior US Navy. Above all, the Rio Treaty of 1948 provides for collective defence of the Americas (Gardini 2012, 93). Thus, since neither economic nor geopolitical gains bolstering the countries' power appear decisive, realism does not satisfactorily explain the behaviour of the cases.

A Constructivist Alternative

The dissatisfaction with realist and liberal perspectives urges for a theoretical alternative. Such an alternative can be found in constructivism⁵. At the heart of this approach is the idealist position that reality is a social construction. This starkly contrasts with most IR theories, which are primarily materialist. This contrast is not surprising, considering that constructivism is originally not an IR theory, but a social theory. It rose to the ranks of international relations theory when Alexander Wendt (1992, 395) declared that “anarchy is what states make of it”. Nonetheless, as a social theory, it does not make substantive claims on the behaviour of actors in international arena. Rather, constructivism offers a framework to explain behaviour. What this specific behaviour would be then, depends on the ideas, norms and culture that guide the particular actor (Barnett 2008, 162).

Consequently, constructivism juxtaposes itself to mainstream IR theories by treating interests as dynamic rather than static, and subjective rather than objective. Other than from material factors, interests also derive from ideational factors. For example, Wendt (1992, 398) claims that “identity is the basis of interests”. One cannot attribute certain interests equally to all actors – they might differ from state to state according to their respective particularities. Interests are thus

⁵ Like there is not one realist or liberal theory, this essay claims to employ *a* constructive approach rather than *the* constructivist approach. Various constructivists employ various ideational factors to explain behaviour. For example, Katzenstein (1996a) focusses on domestic factors whereas Finnemore (1996) highlights international norms in explaining IR. For a more extensive overview, see Hurd (2008).

formed ‘within’ the state, not purely determined ‘outside’ the state. Instead of exogenous and given, interests endogenous and socially constructed (Price and Reus-Smit 1998, 267; Ruggie 1998, 864; Wendt 1992, 392-394).

Constructivists like Wendt (1992, 397) highlight that identity- –“relatively stable, role-specific understandings and expectations about self” - is fundamental in shaping those interests. For example, although Argentina and Chile have somewhat of a similar position in the world, diverging identities produce diverging interests. Departing from the notion that interests are exogenous and given, constructivists to explore factors like identity to identify endogenous interest that guide actors. As will be elaborated in the following chapters, Brazil and Argentina cherish an identity of a great nation. This self-identification calls for autonomist foreign policies which to express this greatness. Consequently, as we see in the case of the Crimea crisis, these identity-based policies often run counter to the expectations derived from mainstream IR theories.

The stress on factors like identity leads some to the mistaken perception that constructivism, unlike its mainstream counterparts, is non-rational. Such an assumption results from conflating rationality with the pursuit of material interest, and denies the rationality behind the pursuit of ideational interests. Constructivism in fact is rooted in, inter alia, the ideas of Max Weber (Jackson and Sorensen 2006, 164; Ruggie 1998, 869-861). Sociologist scholar and Weber expert Stephan Kalberg (1980), distils the Weberian notion of rationality from Weber’s classics *Economy and Society* (1968 [1921]) and *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie* (1972 [1920]). Kalberg (1980) signals four types of rationality which are based on various types of social action. For example, formal rationality is based on means-end rational type of social action (*zweckrational*), whereas substantive rationality is rather value-rational, or *wert-rational*⁶. Whereas the former type of social action is, according to Kalberg (1980, 1151-11) aimed at “purely pragmatic and egoistic interests”, the latter is steered by a “value postulate” – originating in for example friendship, socialism or Calvinism (Kalberg 1980, 1155). In value-rational action, the pursuit of a specific value prevails above the mere consequences (Hollis and Smith 1990, 77).

⁶ Formal rationality is also means-end rational, but constitutes a bureaucratic application of rules, laws (Kalberg 1980, 1158). Kalberg (1980, 1149) considers the fourth type of rationality, hypothetical rationality, neither means-end rational nor value-rational. Weber’s writings are prone to many explanations. Etzioni (1988) for example, provides a similar, but different, interpretation of Weber’s rationality.

From this distinction of types of rationality emerge the zweckrational approaches of neorealism and, to a lesser extent, neoliberalism on the one hand, and the more *wertrational* constructivism on the other⁷. Again, the Weberian notion of value-rational behaviour does not imply non-rationality; rather, it is another type of rationality. Such values in Weberian sense are similar to the ideational factors constructivists contribute to interest formation – values, but also norms, culture and identity (see Katzenstein 1996a). As Wendt (1992, 398) himself recognised, constructivism does not deny actors pursue their interests; rather, they are based on identities.

Nonetheless, constructivism distinguishes itself from mainstream IR theories on other aspects than the perception of rationality. As mentioned, constructivism is primarily concerned with ideas. However, the constructivist focus on ideas does not deny the existence of material forces; rather, it perceives material forces through the lens of social concepts (Hurd 2008, 301). Or, as Wendt (1995, 73) puts it, “material resources only acquire meaning for human action through the structure of shared knowledge in which they are embedded”. Also, they tend to be somewhat reluctant about the overtly positivist approach that neorealists and neoliberals – whether or not explicitly – espouse. Instead, constructivists claim to come to *plausible* logical and empirical interpretations. In this manner, they prefer small-t truth claims over Big-T truth claims (Price and Reus Smit 1998, 272). This stance is compatible, Adler (1997, 326) argues, with the Weberian notion of *Verstehen* (to understand), which aims to explain social action in the light of its meaning, advocating that “action must always be considered from within” (Hollis and Smith 1990, 72). This does not put constructivism in diametrically opposed position to traditional positivism; rather, it stresses the epistemological limits inherent to social science.

Nonetheless, for its criticism of materialism, positivism and the mainstream IR notion of rationality, constructivism is often identified with idealist, anti-positivist critical theories such as postmodernism, poststructuralism, and feminism. But the constructivist appeal on interpretation does relegate it to the realm of interpretivism and anti-positivism; as De Zwart (2002), signals, it is a mistake to deduce relativism from the practice of interpretation. Discourse analysis consists of interpretation, which is not to be equalled to “cognitive relativism” (De Zwart 2002, 495). For

⁷ Although institutions are means for neoliberals, one could argue that there is also a value-rational aspect in this theory: liberal values equally produce value postulates. The contrast with regard to types of rationality is thus sharper between constructivism and realism than with liberalism.

its nuanced position, constructivism has been accused from the alternative field of masked rationalism and materialism (Price and Reus-Smit 1998, 260). Critical theorists disqualify neutral theorizing as impossible, as generalisations cannot be disconnected from power structures⁸ (Price and Reus-Smit 1998, 268). Not surprisingly, Adler (1997) and Smith and Owens (2008, 178), conclude that constructivism holds somewhat of the middle between mainstream IR scholars and relativist and interpretative theorists, effectively bridging both theoretical and methodological ends.⁹ Constructivists shun from both overt mainstream IR positivism and nihilist critical theory anti-positivism.

Constructivism's emergence led mainstream theorists to incorporate social aspects like ideas into realism or liberalism. Nonetheless, such studies as performed by Goldstein and Keohane (1993, 9) usually resort to mainstream positivism, concluding that one can say "relatively little about the impact of broad world views on politics." They defect, in Ruggie's (1998, 7866) words, in the face of "the pull of neo-utilitarian precepts". Likewise, neorealists like Krasner (1993) depicts ideas as mere reflections of the material world that serve, in Adler's (1997, 324) words, to "justify material causes". Neoliberals like Fukuyama (1989) too adapted to the post-Cold War order, paying more attention to ideas in international politics. Nonetheless, this focus is generally on liberal ideas, whereas constructivists focus on ideas in general (Jackson and Sorensen 2006, 163). Mainstream theorists thus, albeit accepting reluctantly the role of ideas, differ from constructivists for their materialism (realists) or the restriction of the scope of ideas to merely liberal ideas (liberals).

This essay employs a constructivist approach. It does not neglect material forces, but focusses on the role of ideas (Adler 1997, 323). Also, it acknowledges that actors are rational, albeit perceiving rationality not merely as means-end driven, but integrating value-rational behaviour as well. The interests actors pursue are thus not considered exogenous and given, but endogenous and socially constructed. Thereto, it embraces Wendts' (1992, 398) assumption that interests are

⁸ The sole sentence does not treat alternative approaches with due respect. However, the aim here is not to give a complete theoretical *tour d'horizon*; the objective here is put constructivism in its academic context. Adler (1997), Price and Reus-Smit (1998) and Smith and Owens (2008) perform the former task.

⁹ This essay does not claim, nor does it aim, to give an exhaustive overview of the distinctions between constructivism, rationalist and interpretive theories. For constructivism with regard to structure-agency and other dichotomies, see Adler (1997).

identity-based. Thus, in explaining political behaviour, and the interests that underlie it, this essay explores the identity of the actors under scrutiny.

Methodology: a Discourse Analysis

To address the research question, the focus will be on the identities of cases of study. State identities are thus considered the independent variable of this study, whereas the stance in the Crimea crisis constitutes the dependent variable. This is not to say that identities are considered fixed or absolute entities. Nor does it disregard the existence of multiple, competing identities. Rather, it implies that identity – despite its multifaceted nature - is considered the variable that affects the dependent variable. Moreover, it is important to stress that state identity is basically a reification; it is the representatives of the states - its politicians and officials - who are endowed with a certain identity. Although the state (or, more specifically, its behaviour) is the unit of analysis, its presumed identity is merely the identity of the collective of its representatives. In sum, when speaking of Brazilian or Argentinian identity, one ought to bear in mind that there is no such thing as *the* identity, and that state identity is a reification. Nonetheless, by analysing the behaviour of states we can perceive the underlying identities shaping this behaviour, which is eventually carried out by ‘the state’. Thus, by unpacking identities that are dominant within foreign policy formation, we can deduct certain patterns that provide the context for the analysis of foreign policy. To sketch the context that is crucial to *Verstehen*, a literature review of Argentine and Brazilian political identity is provided as a starting point of the study.

For this study, this means that the research question should be approached with a method that allows for the interpretation of the relation between identity, interest and behaviour. Hereto, a discourse analysis will be employed. Although rooted in linguistics, discourse analysis has progressively expanded its research area, extending its focus from the syntactic to the content level (see Gee 2014). As a result, discourse analysis, as Barnett (2008, 166-67) states, has been a central asset in the constructivist research agenda, partly because it shares the constructivist commitment to socially constructed nature of the world (Milliken 1999, 229). Moreover, discourse analysis is one of the most straight-forward methods to apply *Verstehen* to IR, a discipline where classic fieldwork is often beyond reach. It is therefore not surprising that, parallel to the ascendance of constructivism in IR, discourse analysis has risen in recent years in

this very same field (see, for example, Carta and Morin 2014; Epstein 2008; Holzscheiter 2014; Makarychev 2014; Schoenberger-Orgad 2011; Teti 2012; Yongtao 2010).

To employ a discourse analysis, a wide range of data is available: speeches, declarations and interviews issued by the governments under study. In the course of the Crimea crisis, both governments issued a number of statements that communicate their stance on the issue. These discourse are carried out by representatives of the governments: presidents, (foreign) ministers, and UN ambassadors. These data are available on the official websites of the presidency, government or foreign office. Since these statements are official and deliberately issued by the Argentine and Brazilian administrations, they constitute the primary data that will be analysed. Their primacy is derived from the fact that the administrations choose to communicate their stances, and are thus officially part of their foreign policy. To a lesser extent, data will be drawn from statements and interviews as published in newspapers. Subsequently, these data are secondary since the media, and not the governments themselves, choose to publish them. These data thus constitute a sort of officious foreign policy.

The period of the collected data starts at the outset of the Ukrainian crisis to the aftermath of the UN vote. On February 18, the political crisis in Ukraine – unchained when Yanukovich announced to withdraw from the EU association agreement – escalated into riots. This moment is a logical moment because the crisis became so tense that it became impossible to refrain from comments. March 27 is the date of the vote on UN resolution 68/262 on the integrity of Ukraine, but the discussion lingered on in the aftermath, the weeks and months following the vote. This aftermath is set to end on July 17, de date of the downing of flight MH17, which formed a new critical juncture. This incident hardened the position of the West against Russia, and created a new dynamic within the conflict, and is therefore perceived to be ending the aftermath of the Crimea referendum. These statements offer abundant information on how these governments perceive the developments in Ukraine and provides insights about how identity shapes their interests. Here, the empathic nature of *Verstehen* reappears: the notion that action should be understood from within.

The analysis is two-fold: first, the more general nature of Argentine and Brazilian identity is examined through a literature review. This review shows how the identification of grandeur in both cases urges them to pursue an autonomous foreign policy. The second part of this analysis will consist of a discourse analysis to understand the position of these countries in the specific case of the Crimea crisis. This analysis shows the resistance of these countries to follow a bipolar logic in the conflict, which compromises their search for autonomy, which in turn, as is the argument, is rooted in identity.

Brazilian Identity in Foreign Policy

Brazil clearly illustrates the axiom that identity shapes foreign policy. Since the establishment of the Brazilian Republic, foreign policy reflected Brazil's ambivalence regarding its identity. The question at heart of this ambivalence is whether Brazil is a Western, First World country or a non-Western, Third World country¹⁰. Oliver Stuenkel (2011) extensively researched Brazilian self-identification, concluding that Brazilians' identifications vary from "Western" to "partly Western" to "non-Western". According to Stuenkel (2011, 179), its relations with the West is crucial in understanding Brazil's identity. In this complex relationship, two opposed tendencies are at work. At the one hand, Brazil tends to criticise and distance itself from the West. On the other hand, Brazil tries to emulate the West (Stuenkel 2011, 180). Brazil's relationship with the West, Stuenkel's (2011, 189) finds, has been marked by a "mixture of attraction and aversion".

This love-hate relationship with the West in general and the US in particular marks the two different currents that shaped Brazilian foreign policy. The non-Western, Third World current is more nationalist and developmentalist and stresses the intertwined principles of autonomy and universalism. Autonomy facilitates universalism, which is defined as "the willingness to maintain relations with all countries, regardless of location, regime type, economic concerns, as well as independence from global powers" (Gomes Saraiva 2011, 53). This position is rooted in the Brazilian conviction of their destiny as a world power, instead of just another Western country. Brazil is meant to flourish, at equal footing with the US in the hemisphere. Illustrative is the continuous objective to obtain a permanent seat in the UNSC, which has been pursued

¹⁰ In 2015 the term Third World is indeed somewhat of an anachronism; it was adequate throughout most of the 20th century however to describe what is now considered the Global South.

since the times of the League of Nations and subsequently since the establishment of the UN. As a former foreign minister put it: “no country can escape its destiny and, for good or ill, Brazil is condemned to grandeur (Gomes Saraiva 2011, 55). This grandeur urges Brazil to follow an autonomous courses which confirms the status the country envisages for itself.

As said, multiple identities can coexist. In the Brazilian case, the self-identification of a First World country leads to a different policy prescription. The course favoured by this more Western-oriented current is defined as pragmatic institutionalist. This minority current counters the autonomist current by claiming that autonomy is precisely obtained through integration within the liberal institutional framework (Vistentini 2014, 62). This current was dominant in the 1990s when Brazil sought global insertion through the adherence to international regimes, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Instead of universalism and its tolerance of ‘alternative’ forms of government, this current advocates a more vocal support for democracy and human rights, and envisages a liberal order based on “shared sovereignty” (Gomes Saraiva 2011, 57). These two mentalities, rooted in either aversion or attraction of the West, have shaped Brazilian foreign policy.

In these relations, the stance towards the US is a point of reference. The institutionalists support full alignment with the hemispheric hegemon, whereas the universalists call to diversify Brazilian foreign policy. Over the last decades, Brazil alternated several times between these two positions. In the early 1950s, Brazil’s strong identification with Western values and anticommunism was coupled with full alignment with the US. From the Kubitschek administration (1956-1960) onwards, Brazil searched for more autonomy and broadened its political alliances. Under the so-called Independent Foreign Policy, Brazil re-established relations with the Soviet-Union, deepened economic ties with China, and resisted the US Cuba policy (Hirst 2006, 6-7; Moniz Bandeira 2006, 15-16). Even conservative president Quadros decorated Che Guevara with the prestigious Cruzeiro do Sul Order, as to show off Brazil’s independent foreign policy (Fausto 1999, 262). The military coup of 1964 brought alignment with Washington back to centre stage, and in the decades to come the pendulum swung every now and then from one end to another (Fausto 1999, 285; Hirst 2006 7-11; Moniz Bandeira 2006,

16-21). The centrality of US relations in Brazilian foreign policy leads Pecequillo (2010, 136) to distinguish between “Americanists” and “non-americanists”.

Since the Lula governments (2003-2010), Brazil’s renewed confidence resulted in a more assertive foreign policy (Visentini 2014, 66). First of all, by joining the BRICS, which finally elevated the country to its long desired status as a global player. Moreover, Brazil increasingly presents itself as a leader of the South, expanding relations in other continents, primarily in Africa. In general, Brazil broadened its political alliances, which echoes the universalist tradition (Visentini 2014). In the post-Cold War era, universalism has been rebranded as the endeavour for multipolarity¹¹. Celso Amorim, Lula’s foreign minister, voiced Brazil’s desire to “increase, if only by a margin, the degree of multipolarity in the world” (Hurrell 2008, cited in Stuenkel 2011, 180). Brazilian officials showcase national identity “precisely through their unwillingness to position themselves either as fully integrated or completely detached from the Western World Order” (Stuenkel 2011, 180). Autonomy is thus the interest derived from identity, and figures as a prominent objective of foreign policy.

Argentine Identity in Foreign Policy

Argentina’s political identity is quite puzzling. The country brands itself as a Western and Christian nation (Sánchez and Zapata 2014, 103). But, whereas Argentina has always strongly identified with Europe, the same cannot be said with regard to the US (Escudé 1997; Malamud 2001, 90). Relations with the US were, as Escudé (1997, 1) signals, “less than friendly and [...] usually rather tense”. This complicated relationship stems from, *inter alia*, Argentina’s neutrality in both World Wars, its refusal to sign international regimes and its close ties with ‘rogue states’ as Iraq and Libya. The ‘carnal relations’ President Carlos Menem (1989-1999) maintained with the US formed the exception that proves the rule. After Menem, Argentina left the full alignment behind and returned to the traditional autonomist foreign policy (Russell and Takotlian 2015, 136).

¹¹ This essay uses both the terms multipolarity and multipolarism, with a simple but important distinction. Multipolarity is the status describing a multipolar world; multipolarism is a position favouring such a world. Multilateralism, in turn, is the practice of multipolarity.

The strained relations with the hemispheric hegemon marked Argentine foreign policy. Anti-Americanism is not a sentiment restricted to the ruling elites: a majority of Argentines has a negative opinion of the US. These attitudes are exceptional in the region: in Venezuela, where US bashing has become almost a national sport, less than 15 per cent of the population holds a negative opinion on the US. Only Middle Eastern countries and Pakistan show similar figures (Chiozza 2007, 96). This national sentiment manifested itself during the Summit of the Americas in Argentina in 2005, where president Bush was received with mass protests (Keohane and Katzenstein 2007, 276).

Nonetheless, anti-Americanism is an artefact, rather than the essence, of Argentine identity. Many observers conclude that Argentina suffers from chronic overconfidence and self-importance, based on Argentina's foregone heydays (Malamud 2011, 100). Argentina was one of the biggest economies until World War II, but never adjusted its political ambitions to its new place in the world order (Escudé 1997, 1-2). Accordingly, Argentina still aspires to be the regional hegemon (Eyre and Suchman 1996, 98). A striking illustration is Argentina's consistent opposition to the Brazilian candidacy to a permanent seat in the UN Security Council (UNSC), believing itself to be the rightful Latin American candidate (Malamud 2011, 93). It is perhaps this eagerness for a *Platz an der Sonne* that mostly determines Argentine identity and, consequently, its stance vis-à-vis the US, which it has vainly challenged for hemispheric hegemony (Escudé 1997, 3).

This drive for grandeur – “a self-importance rooted in a glorious past rather than any promising future”, Malamud (2011, 100) sneers - has been coupled with a particular obsession with autonomy, which is practised precisely by the kind of policies that riled the US (Escudé 1997, 122-123). Poor relations were thus effect, rather than the cause, of Argentina's autonomous foreign policy. In Peronism, the dominant political ideology in Argentina since World War II, this stance is particularly present: during the Cold War, Perón claimed a “Third Position” aimed to transcend ideological bipolarity, espousing both anti-imperialism and anticommunism (Sánchez and Zapata 2014, 103). This is not to say that Argentine autonomism was unique; it was of course the cornerstone of the Non-Aligned Movement, of which Argentina was a prominent member. Autonomism *cum* overconfidence however endowed Argentina with what

Escudé (1997, 1) called a unique record in Latin America. Argentine identity is, like the Brazilian, based on grandeur. In both cases, this identity is demonstrated by an autonomous foreign policy. To put it more bluntly, these countries consider themselves too important to follow world powers, and pursue an autonomous course to showcase this importance.

Brazilian Discourses on the Crimea Crisis

This section applies the constructivist approach to the discourse analysis. First the Brazilian, and then the Argentine discourses are analysed to understand their surprising positions on Ukrainian question. Brazil has been very careful in speaking out from the very beginning of the crisis. When riots broke out in Kiev, the foreign ministry declared to follow disquietly “the deterioration of the political and institutional framework in Ukraine, and [Brazil] laments profoundly the deaths occurred in Kiev”. It called upon to all parties involved to dialogue, stressing that “the political crisis in Ukraine needs to be solved by the Ukrainians themselves, in pacific manner with respect for institutions and human rights” (Ministério de Relações Exteriores 2014a, translation MNS).

Thereafter, Brazil remained silent during the Russian invasion of Crimea and the referendum of March 16, a position which was criticised by the Ukrainian embassy in Brazil (Embaixado da Ucrânia no Brasil 2014). When the UN resolution was put forward on March 27, UN ambassador Patriota initiated his voting statement by stressing the important relationship with Ukraine. “Our concern reflects our close bilateral ties with Ukraine, which in 2009 were elevated to the level of a strategic partnership. Together Brazil and Ukraine are developing high-technology projects, including in the field of space technology. Brazil is also proud to be host to one of the largest communities of people of Ukrainian descent outside Europe” (United Nations 2014a, 7). One might expect that Patriota would advance by announcing a vote in favour of the resolution, especially when he continued as follows: “Brazil has consistently upheld that the Charter of the United Nations must be respected under all circumstances. That position reflects our unflinching defence of an international system based on cooperative multilateralism and respect for international law” (ibid.). Nonetheless, Brazil concludes that “[i]n this situation, it is of the utmost importance that all stakeholders exercise maximum restraint” (ibid.).

This neutral position was criticised within Brazil, both in parliament and in the media. Faced with these critiques, then foreign minister Figueiredo put the government's position in perspective: "We voted like all of Mercosul and the BRICS, except for Russia, which voted against. We cannot turn back to a Cold War logic, of sanctions against sanctions. We need to resolve this through dialogue"¹² (translation MNS). One week ahead of the vote, Figueiredo visited his German counterpart Steinmeier, and announced the Brazilian position: "I agree with Steinmeier when he said that we need to overcome the logic of the Cold War, that we had a zero sum game and a growing spiral of measures. We see a growing spiral of sanctions and countersanctions"¹³ (translation MNS). Later, at the BRICS summit in July, president Rousseff reiterated the Brazilian aversion against Western sanctions: "We [the BRICS] agree that, in these and other cases, the constructive and cohesive involvement of the international community is essential, refraining from unilateral actions, which serve the convenience of specific countries, but compromise negotiated solutions and the interests of the great majority" (Ministério de Relações Exteriores 2014b, translation MNS).

When analysing the Brazilian statements on Ukraine, one interesting observation regards the discrepancy between the adherence to international law on the one hand, and the lack of criticism of Russian intervention on the other. If one adds up the special relationship with Ukraine, one might expect Brazil to speak out in defence of its strategic partner. But Brazil seems to be bothered by the way this conflict is portrayed, which apparently does not constitute 'co-operative multilateralism'. Accordingly, Brazil does not want to be forced to pick sides. It is likely the country does not agree per se with Russian annexation, but uneasy with the bipolar setting, Brazil simply does not want to join the West in a one-sided condemnation of Russian involvement. The Brazilian government does not believe that unilateral sanctions are in any way conducive to a sustainable solution.

¹² Marina Gonçalves, "Figueiredo rejeita críticas sobre posição do Brasil em relação à Ucrânia," *O Globo* <http://oglobo.globo.com/mundo/figueiredo-rejeita-criticas-sobre-posicao-do-brasil-em-relacao-ucrania-12016705> (Accessed May 16, 2015)

¹³ Fernando Caulyt, "Em Berlim, Figueiredo reforça neutralidade brasileira sobre Crimeia," *Deutsche Welle* <http://www.dw.de/em-berlim-figueiredo-refor%C3%A7a-neutralidade-brasileira-sobre-crimeia/a-17513404> (Accessed May 16, 2015)

Moreover, bearing Brazilian identity in mind, the unwillingness to come clean runs deeper. Brazil repeatedly rejected the return to a Cold War logic. Brazil is opposed to a bipolar logic because this would necessarily reduce the country to an a subordinated ally of one of the great powers. Brazil instead prefers a multipolar order that is more compatible with its self-identification of an autonomous country. Brazil does not want to be forced to pick sides, it seeks to follow an autonomous course that transcends the bipolar logic that dominated the Cold War and now seems to be defining the conflict in Ukraine. The discourses of the Brazilian government echo the tradition of autonomy and universalism, which in turn induce Brazil to maintain a neutral position and abstain from choosing sides in the Crimea conflict.

Argentine Discourses on the Crimea Crisis

Argentina has been more outspoken than Brazil with regard to Crimea. Moreover, whereas Brazilian president Rousseff mostly delegated the matter to her foreign minister, Argentine president Kirchner was very vocal herself on the issue. Two weeks before the vote, Kirchner visited her French par Hollande and commented in a press conference:

It is true what mister president [Hollande] signals with respect to territorial integrity, but we also call upon the great powers that when we speak of territorial integrity it is applicable to all. Because my country suffers from territorial encroachment, by the United Kingdom, of the Malvinas [Falklands] islands, and nonetheless, the great powers, fundamentally the United Kingdom and the United States, have pronounced themselves in favour of the referendum that the Kelpers [Falklanders] hold few days ago and which lacks any validity, because well, if the Crimea referendum lacks validity, at few kilometres from Russia, then a overseas colony at over 13.000 kilometres can have much less validity. Something that is fundamental to preserve the peace in the world, something that is fundamental for the respect for international law is not to have a double standard in the hour of taking decisions.[...] Therefore, we support the territorial integrity, therefore we voted how we voted in the Security Council, but we demand also that all are coherent and do the exact same thing (Casa Rosada 2014a, translation MNS).

President Kirchner is crystal clear in her comments. Firstly, she accuses the West of hypocrisy, although one could argue this is instrumental to advance her Falklands agenda. Argentina never misses a chance to reiterate its claims on the islands, and has found again an occasion to re-vindicate its claim. But whether or not one considers her criticism sincere or justified, there is more in her speech. Kirchner also refers to the vote in the UNSC of March 15, which called upon Crimea to not hold the referendum (United Nations Security Council 2014). Although it was vetoed by Russia, Argentina had voted in favour. Now, Kirchner accuses some countries – the West - of lack of coherence, since they imposed sanctions on Russia on March 17, despite the passage of the UNSC that called to “refrain from unilateral actions” (ibid., 1). Kirchner was apparently that disturbed, that she instructed her UN ambassador to abstain in the General Assembly on March 27. UN Ambassador Perceval repeated Kirchner’s criticism and added:

Argentina does not believe in adopting a confrontational stance that is a throwback to previous eras in which the international community was divided into separate and opposed blocs, thus preventing them from building a common future. We intend for our decisions not to fall back into the concept of a world divided by ideological barriers, a world where the principal victims were the peoples of Latin America, Africa and Asia. We believe that those situations cannot be resolved through unilateral acts of any kind, especially by actors with great influence who should, in fact, be relying on constructive diplomacy.[...] Accordingly, we reject initiatives that seek to isolate one of the parties or impose unilateral economic sanctions that undermine the conditions that could lead to a dialogue that has become very urgent (United Nations 2014b, 20).

Considering Perceval’s speech, Argentina’s opposition to sanctions (the confrontational stance) is rooted in the resistance to a return to a Cold War logic. Few days later, cabinet chief Capitanich recalled the diverging votes of Argentina in the UNSC and the General Assembly and elaborated on Argentina’s stance:

The former resolution reaffirmed the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence of Ukraine, but weeks later there was a very similar text introduced in the General Assembly, but the context had substantially changed. Various international actors made declarations, formulated threats, signed political and

commercial treaties, decreed unilateral economic sanctions, intervening in internal affairs of Ukraine.[...] The latter proposed resolution project in the General Assembly of the United Nations on March 27 did not seek a message to end the escalation of violence. There existed a biased reading of the conflict, pretending a revitalisation of a division of the international community based precisely on influence blocks, which is precisely the characterization of alignments typical of the Cold War (Casa Rosada 2014b, translation MNS).

Argentina thus firmly opposes sanctions and other forms of interference that had place between March 15 and March 27, leading Argentina to switch to abstention. Argentina clearly states to agree with the text of the resolutions, but abstained in the last one because of disrupting behaviour of some states – probably the West. Moreover, in this manner, Argentina felt that a Cold War-like bipolar dynamic was created, which triggered Argentina into taking a position of neutrality. In this sense, Argentina’s autonomist tradition of non-alignment appears to the forefront. Argentina’s tendency to showcase its autonomy is reflected in another governmental statement. The Casa Rosada, the governmental palace, communicated that president Putin had called his Argentine counterpart to thank her for her position:

The president of the Russian Federation called the head of state, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, today to express the importance of the Argentine position to be included in the debate on the question of Crimea, the double standard of various countries in relation to the principles of the UN (Casa Rosada 2014c, translation MNS).

The message seems to be that Argentina is not willing to go along with the isolation of Putin, and the subsequent bipolarisation of this conflict, as demonstrated by the high-level contacts. The initial support for the UNSC resolution is illustrative: it was willing to speak out in favour of Ukrainian integrity until the conflict was ‘bipolarised’, which was considered a threat to Argentine autonomy.

Four weeks later, Kirchner confirmed her vision of a multipolar world, as opposed to bipolar one: “it is necessary to look at all parts of the world, we have a multipolar world, there are many more protagonists than when the Berlin Wall fell, when some believed it was the end of history” (Casa

Rosada 2014d, translation MNS). She continued by stressing the necessity to “not create the binary logic of friend and foe, which tensed the history and was tragic in our continent” (ibid.). The advocacy of multipolarity is apparently fuelled by the fear of the return to the Cold War, which condemned Latin America to the whims of the US and the Soviet Union. Argentina is determined to avoid such a logic, which would compromise their ability to pursue an autonomous foreign policy.

In sum, apart from the continuous references to the Malvinas, Argentina has stressed its rejection of sanctions and other forms of interference and opposed the bipolar logic that reminds of the Cold War. Argentina is not willing to follow this logic and, like Brazil, wishes to transcend this bipolar logic. Although the style is fairly different, Argentina and Brazil essentially advance the same arguments which are primarily rooted in anti-bipolarism and consequently, a desire for autonomy in foreign policy. This might contravene Machiavellian rationality to accumulate power through powerful friends. Nonetheless, it is in line with *wertrational* pursuit of interests – *in casu* autonomy – based on identity.

A discourse analysis of both Argentina and Brazil’s statements on the Crimea crisis offers an alternative understanding of their foreign policies. This analysis attempted to show how national identity shapes foreign policy: self-perception of greatness needs to be coupled with an autonomous foreign policy, which leads Argentina and Brazil to rally against the tendency to create a bipolar logic which would relegate them again to the periphery of world politics. Neither Argentina or Brazil wished to abide with this logic and chose to abstain in the vote on the UN resolution. Not out of disagreement with the text, but with the context, which breathed an air of bipolar antagonism which, they seemed to fear, would compromise their autonomy.

This is not to say that anti-bipolarism is the only reason for Argentina and Brazil to abstain. Occasional factors are always at work: at the time of the vote, accusations of the NSA spying on president Rousseff severely strained bilateral relations, limiting the scope for Rousseff to back an US-led project (Stuenkel 2014, 2). Moreover, the sentiment that the West employs double standards, probably fostered the Argentine decision not to back the resolution. Many other arguments can be advanced - nonetheless, giving a complete and exhaustive understanding of all

the factors has never been the objective of this study. Rather, it investigated the motives emerges from Argentine and Brazilian discourses, which was the aversion against the bipolar frame in which the Crimea conflict was portrayed.

The Quest for Multipolarity

The rejection of the bipolar nature of the Crimean crisis is not limited to the specific case. Anti-bipolarism, like anti-unipolarism, is part of broad church of multipolarism - a frequent topic in the foreign policies of both Brasília and Buenos Aires. As for Argentina, President Kirchner has championed multipolarism throughout her presidency. In 2008, she asserted when she met with Russian president Medvedev: “We need to deepen our political articulation because we are both convinced of the necessity of more multipolarity” (Casa Rosada 2008). In the context of the Honduran coup in 2009, Kirchner declared: “A multilateral, multipolar, plural world, respectful of the rights of all nations and peoples. I feel that we are today fulfilling that mandate” [...] (ibid. 2009a, translation MNS). One year later, Kirchner said in an interview: “It seems to me that we are before an totally different historic moment at global scale, with new protagonists, with an scenery in which the multipolarity of which has been said so much becomes to obtain a much more concrete and less abstract shape” (ibid; 2010a, translation MNS).

In a similar fashion, then economy minister and the current vice-president Amado Boudou stated:

[...] a multipolar morphology [...] is an opportunity for the international community to face with distinct means a juncture that is not going to convert in bipolarity, in which the rest of the countries need to ally with one or the other, and this must converge towards a multipolarity where all actors are part of a new equilibrium, in which all countries have the possibility to prosper (Casa Rosada 2011a, translation MNS).

Later, meeting with then Venezuelan president Chávez in 2011, Kirchner said:

[...] we want to impose new paradigms, like growth with inclusion, without subordination to others, in a multipolar world, in a world that needs to respect the diversities and cultural, religious, and political pluralities, without losing identity (Casa Rosada 2011b, translation MNS).

More recently, after meeting with Putin last July, Kirchner commented on Argentina's position in the G20, where it was one of the few countries not to cold-shoulder Russia: "It is not a matter of winners or losers, simply that we firmly believe in multilateralism, in multipolarity [...]" (Casa Rosada 2014e, translation MNS). Two weeks later, at the Mercosur summit she claimed: "We should not be anxious, but contrarily, double our attempts to construct a more equitable, just and multipolar world order [...]" (Casa Rosada 2014f, translation MNS).

At a press conference with her Chinese counterpart, Kirchner stated:

[...] in the face of a bipolar world president Perón, from here, from this place, recondite of South America and almost all antipodes of the planet, another great leader, president Mao, posed a third position, which is not more or less than the right of every people and every society to establish its own forms of government, of growth and development without external interference [...]. [The world] is becoming multipolar [...]. (Casa Rosada 2014g, translation MNS)

Also this year, Kirchner made numerous references to the Argentine commitment to multipolarity. For example, at the Argentine-Chinese business forum, she said:

And this is what we pretend: to integrate in the world, but to integrate from our own interests, from our own model and to articulate with other countries that also have the same perception that the world can no longer be unipolar, like it was not bipolar and it exploited this bipolarism [sic]. All the countries in the world need to accustom to the multipolarity and the appearance of new actors. New actors that are modifying the international scene, in which we too feel protagonists of this new civilising stage which will demand much comprehension from all (Casa Rosada 2015a, translation MNS).

Last April, Kirchner reiterated her position, during an interview that covered 130 years of relations with Russia:

Moreover, I believe that we need to accept that a multipolar world of new actors has surged. What happens is that there was the perception when the Iron Curtain

fell, when the Berlin Wall fell, that history had come to an end. And well, history never ends, history always goes on and changes, and for the best! And it changes with new protagonists, new histories and new realities, and I believe that Russia is well, an unavoidable actor at global level, at world level, and I do not see why we could not have relations with them (Casa Rosada 2015b, translation MNS).

Kirchner systematically refers to the emergence of a multipolar world, and Argentina's support for such order. Argentina dismisses the unipolarity that followed the end of the Cold War, and feared the return of bipolarity in the Crimea crisis. The Kirchnerist foreign policy is clearly multipolarist, in the autonomist tradition that is rooted in the Argentine self-identification of a great, and thus autonomous, nation. The multipolarist discourses cited above are only an anthology. The list of references to Argentine adherence to multipolarity is long. Kirchner declared her support for a multipolar world at various regional and bioregional summits, as the OAS, Mercosur, Unasur, G77, the BRICS-Unasur Summit, the EU-Latin America Summit, the Africa-South America Summit and the Summit of South American-Arab countries, as well as at institutions like the IABD, the Clinton Global Initiative, and the Argentine Institute of Foreign Service (Casa Rosada 2009b; 2009c; 2009d; 2009e; 2009f; 2010b; 2010c; 2012; 2014h; 2014i; 2014j). Kirchner also expressed her multipolarist vision at more political platforms, as the São Paulo Forum, her party's youth organisation, and the rivalling Congress of Popular Radicalism, but also at less politicised venues as universities and libraries (ibid. 2009g; 2009h; 2010d; 2014k; 2015c). Lastly, she addressed multipolarity at economic fora, and at press conferences following bilateral meetings with Brazil, Qatar, Russia and Spain - even with the French economist Piketty (ibid. 2009i; 2009j; 2011c; 2011d; 2014l; 2015d; 2015e).

Also Brazilian president Rousseff almost ritually incorporates her promotion of multipolarity her discourses. Since she took office in 2011, she reiterated her multipolarist vision at press conferences following bilateral meetings with partners as diverse as Germany, Sweden, Uruguay, the EU, Nigeria, France, Russia, and China (Palácio do Planalto 2011a; 2011b; 2011c; 2011d; 2013a; 2013b; 2014a; 2015). Also, at various fora, summits, and business seminars as the Brazilian Congress, the Rio Branco Institute, Mercosul, the Woodrow Wilson Institute, the

World Social Forum, the Brazil-India Business Seminar, the Harvard Kennedy School of Governance, the CEO Summit of the Americas, the Clinton Global Initiative, and of course the BRICS, Rousseff expressed her commitment to a multipolar world order (ibid. 2011e; 2011f; 2011g; 2011h; 2012a; 2012b; 2012c; 2012d; 2012e; 2013c; 2013d; 2014b).

With regard to the latter, she claimed:

“In the countries called BRICS, we fight for a more just, more democratic new global economic and political multipolar order. In all global fora, we are in favour of multilateralism, of disarmament and of negotiated solutions to all threats to global peace” (Palácio do Planalto 2012a, translation MNS).

Likewise, at one BRICS summit she stated: “We are engaged in the creation of a multipolar institutional order, without hegemonic temptations or disputes for areas of influences” (Palácio do Planalto 2011i, translation MNS). At the BRICS summit last year, Rousseff stated:

In today’s meeting, we reiterated the commitment of the BRICS to transparent, democratic and efficacious multilateralism, which heads for a multipolar world. We note, however, that the principle institutions of global economic and political governance have lost representation and efficacy, that do not reflect the political and economic realities of today (Palácio do Planalto 2014b, translation MNS).

In a similar fashion, at a press conference with Venezuelan president Maduro:

Our countries are demonstrating this vocation to create a common future, that unites our entire region, that contributes to a multipolar and multilateral world, without spirit of confrontation, without hegemonic pretensions and without external interference (Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República 2013e, translation MNS).

Rousseff rejected bipolarity at a meeting with, ironically, then Ukrainian president Yanukovich:

On issues of peace and security, we [Ukraine and Brazil] agree that the current antique structures in a bipolar world lose their efficiency in this new multipolar world. Likewise, the United Nations lack reforms like, for example, the reform of the UN Security Council (Palácio do Planalto 2011j, translation MNS).

A similar statement was made at the Mercosul summit in 2011:

In the past we had a time, during the Cold War, in which there was bipolarity. The discussions were between two concepts of the world and the countries split accordingly. Afterwards there was a time in which the world seem to have accepted a sole mind-set and the proposal of unipolarity. We now live in another historical circumstance and it is very important that people understand, that this is multilateralism (Palácio do Planalto 2012g, translation MNS).

Again, at a press conference with then Egyptian president Morsi, Rousseff said:

We welcome with satisfaction the determination of your government to diversify the relations with developing countries. South-south dialogue and co-operation are indispensable in the process of the construction of a multipolar order, where justice, solidarity, social inclusion and respect for diverse visions of the world prevail (Palácio do Planalto 2013f, translation MNS).

Brazil's statements do not only express multipolarism, but also echo motives that drive this endeavour: the Brazilian destination of grandeur, which is confirmed by the unique role Brazil spells out for itself in this multipolar world:

At this very moment, we live in a world of transformation, in a multipolar world that is changing, that has changed. First from a bipolar situation to an almost unipolar hegemony, but today, one clearly perceives a multipolarisation. In this world, Brazil has a special, extremely complex, role (Palácio do Planalto 2012f, translation MNS).

Then foreign minister Patriota highlighted this Brazilian exceptionalism, stating:

The role of promotor of a multipolar cooperative order falls down on Brazil at this moment. What I see is that Brazil is uniquely well positioned for the multipolarity of cooperation in which the interaction with the primary poles does not represent neglect or disrespect for the minor actors in the international scene (Palácio do Planalto 2012h, translation MNS).

These remarks clarify the connection between identity and multipolarism. Brazil, like Argentina, does not want to conform to a world which is dominated by the US, or the US and Russia. Convinced of its 'special role' and 'unique position', a country like Brazil will not acquiesce in a role in the shadow of world powers. Doomed to grandeur, both Brazil and Argentina will not abide by playing second fiddle, but will assert an autonomous foreign policy that suits their standing. Multipolarity has become a key word in this endeavour, and the continuous promotion of a multipolar world is to pave the way for their autonomy. Identities are the basis of interests, and Brazilian and Argentine identity urge for autonomy, for which multipolarity offers a fertile ground.

In this manner, the investigation of identity as denominator of foreign policy offers an alternative perspective on interests. Shifting from material to ideational interests, a constructivist approach uncovers the rationality behind the unexpected behaviour of Argentina and Brazil in the case of the Crimea crisis. The constructivist focus on ideas, and more specifically the Wendtian emphasis on identity as applied in this case, explains the ineptitude of the major theories to explain the Argentine and Brazilian position in the Crimea crisis. This case illustrates the role of identity in the formation of interests, which is neglected by mainstream IR. Instead of assuming exogenous interest, the exploration of endogenous interests offers complementary insight beyond the realm of mainstream IR.

Conclusions

This essay addressed the position of Argentina and Brazil in the Crimea crisis. Contrary to most expectations, these countries chose to abstain from voting in the resolution that rejected the Russian annexation of Crimea. These expectations are founded in mainstream IR theories, which would predict these countries to support the resolution, either because they champion international law, or because they boldly side with the partners they share most interests with. The problem at the heart with these theories is that they assume state interests as fixed and given. The constructivist approach applied here departs from that assumption of exogenous interests and examined endogenous factors to explain the positions of Argentina and Brazil.

The notion that interests are also endogenous, and, more specifically, based on identity, provided

a point of departure for this query. Brazil and Argentina consider themselves as major players, and showcase their identity through an autonomous foreign policy. This autonomy is expressed by the quest for multipolarity, and in the specific case of the Crimea crisis, by means of anti-bipolarism. Apparently bothered by the dynamic of the conflict, they abstained from voting to demonstrate their unwillingness to simply take sides in what increasingly has become another proxy conflict between Russia and the West. The dismissal of bipolarity, and the quest for multipolarity, is not limited to the Crimea crisis, but is a constant feature in the foreign policies of Brasília and Buenos Aires.

Some lessons can be drawn from this tentative conclusion. The US and its allies need to recognise that self-declared major third countries do not automatically align with their cause, even if they essentially agree. The way this cause is projected, and the manner in which the problem and its solutions are addressed, do also count. If the West wants the rest on board, it will have to employ a more constructive and less polarising tone. To frame a conflict antagonistically, pressuring third countries to merely follow the West, might work for some pro-Western countries, but not for countries like Brazil and Argentina who are anxious to be drawn in one camp or another. Ironically, one thing is clear: the overarching strategy of the West behind the UN resolution – to isolate Russia - has backfired at the US and its allies.

Bibliography

- Adler, Emanuel. 1997. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* (3): 319-363.
- Astrada, Marvin and Félix Martín. 2013. *Russia and Latin America: From Nation-State to Society of States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barnett, Michael. 2008. "Social Constructivism." In *The Globalization of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. New York: Oxford University Press, 160-173.
- Carta, Caterina and Jean-Frédéric Morin. 2014. *EU Foreign Policy Through the Lens of Discourse Analysis*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2008. "Firma de acuerdos entre Argentina y Rusia." December 10. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/actividad-oficial/9-noticias/20329-blank-15574807> (Accessed June 8, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009a. "La Presidenta regresó de la misión en defensa de la democracia y el multilateralismo." July 6. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/actividad-oficial/9-noticias/21188-blank-42325064> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009b. "II Cumbre de Presidentes de América del Sur y los Países Arabes." March 31. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/20759-blank-75403471> (Accessed June 8, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009c. "Palabras de la Presidenta en El Salvador." July 6. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/21189-blank-73689366> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009d. "Intervención de la presidenta Crista Fernández en la V Reunión anual de la Clinton Global Initiative, en Nueva York." September 23. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/21404-blank-29186166> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009e. "Exposición de la Presidenta en la Cumbre ASA, Venezuela." September 27. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/21418-blank-19286707> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009f. "Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación en el acto de egresados del Instituto del Servicio Exterior de la Nación." October 26. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/21528-blank-4095043> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009g. “La Presidenta expuso ante la Universidad de La Habana.” January 20. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/actividad-oficial/9-noticias/20452-blank-26448112> (Accessed June 8, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009h. “Palabras de la Presidenta en la Biblioteca Nacional.” February 27. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/20607-blank-76148661> (Accessed June 8, 2015)

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009i. “Conferencia de prensa de la Presidenta Cristina Fernández y de su par español, José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero.” February 9. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/20511-blank-39251126> (Accessed June 8, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2009j. “Declaraciones de la Presidenta en Doha.” April 1. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/20765-blank-91848590> (Accessed June 8, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2010a. “La clave nuestra como región está en la unidad política y económica, afirmó Cristina Fernández en el ciclo Presidentes de Latinoamérica.” February 15. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/actividad-oficial/9-noticias/21919-blank-45584544> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2010b. “Clausura de la Cumbre Unión Europea, Latinoamérica y el Caribe.” May 18. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/22206-blank-61135208> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2010c. “Palabras de la Presidenta en Naciones Unidas al asumir la presidencia del G77.” September 28. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/22668-blank-10770233> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2010d. “Palabras de la Presidenta a representantes del Foro Social de San Pablo.” August 19. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/22535-blank-76426413> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2011a. “Anuncio del superávit fiscal: Conferencia de prensa del ministro de Economía y el secretario de Hacienda.” May 19. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/23259-blank-31476505> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2011b. “Firma de convenios comerciales entre Argentina y Venezuela: Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación.” December 1. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/25577-firma-de-convenios->

comerciales-entre-argentina-y-venezuela-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion
(Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2011c. “Conferencia de Prensa de los cancilleres de Argentina y Brasil, en Casa Rosada.” January 10.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/22978-blank-79498830>
(Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2011d. “18-1-2011 Palabras de la Presidenta seminario oportunidades de negocios en Qatar.” January 18.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/23001-blank-75454424> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2012. “La Jefa de Estado visitó la sede del BID en Washington.” September 26. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/actividad-oficial/9-noticias/26106-la-jefa-de-estado-visito-la-sede-del-bid-en-washington>
(Accessed June 7, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación Argentina. 2014a. “Audiencia privada entre presidentes de la Argentina y Francia: Palabras de Cristina Fernández.” March 19.
<http://www.presidencia.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/27326-audiencia-privada-entre-presidentes-de-la-argentina-y-francia-palabras-de-cristina-fernandez> (Accessed December 31, 2014).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación Argentina. 2014b. “Conferencia de prensa del jefe de gabinete de ministros, Jorge Capitanich, en la casa de gobierno.” March 31.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/27363-conferencia-de-prensa-del-jefe-de-gabinete-en-casa-rosada-23616511> (Accessed May 17, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación Argentina. 2014c. “El presidente Vladimir Putin llamó a Cristina Fernández de Kirchner.” March 25.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/actividad-oficial/9-noticias/27344-el-presidente-putin-llamo-a-la-presidenta-cristina-fernandez-de-kirchner> (Accessed May 17, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación Argentina. 2014d. “La Jefa de Estado resaltó el carácter de ‘aliados estratégicos’ que comparten Argentina y Rusia en ‘un mundo multipolar’.” April 23. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/eventos-destacados/28623-la-jefa-de-estado-resalto-el-caracter-de-aliados-estrategicos-que-comparten-argentina-y-rusia-en-un-mundo-multipolar-la-jefa-de-estado-resalto-el-caracter-de-aliados-estrategicos-que-comparten-argentina-y-rusia-en-un-mundo-multipolar> (Accessed May 17, 2015).

Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014e. “Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación, Cristina Fernández, luego de reunión bilateral con el Presidente de Rusia, Vladimir Putin.” July 12. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27697-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion-cristina-fernandez-luego-de-reunion-bilateral-con-el-presidente-de-rusia-vladimir-putin> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014f. “Palabras de la Presidenta al arribar a Caracas para participar de la Cumbre del Mercosur.” July 29.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27757-palabras-de-la-presidenta-al-arribar-a-caracas-para-participar-de-la-cumbre-del-mercosur> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014g. “Cena en honor del presidente de la República Popular China: Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación.” July 18.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27729-cena-en-honor-del-presidente-de-la-republica-popular-china-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014h. “Cumbre de países del BRICS y Unasur en Brasilia: Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación.” July 16.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27716-cumbre-de-paises-del-brics-y-unasur-en-brasilia-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014i. “Traspaso de la presidencia pro tempore del Mercosur: Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación.” July 29.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27764-traspaso-de-la-presidencia-pro-tempore-del-mercosur-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014j. “La Presidenta participó de la reunión de Jefas y Jefes de Estado de la Unasur.” December 5. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/slider-principal/28171-la-presidenta-participo-de-la-reunion-de-jefas-y-jefes-de-estado-de-la-unasur> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014k. “Saludo a los jóvenes militantes en los patios internos de Casa de Gobierno: Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación.” July 31.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27775-saludo-a-los-jovenes-militantes-en-los-patios-internos-de-casa-de-gobierno-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2014l. “Discurso de la Presidenta Cristina Fernández, en cena de agasajo por la visita del Presidente de Rusia Vladimir Putin.” July 13.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/27700-discurso-de-la-presidenta-cristina-fernandez-en-cena-de-agasajo-por-la-visita-del-presidente-de-rusia-vladimir-putin> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2015a. “Discurso de la Presidenta en la clausura del Foro Empresarial Argentino Chino.” February 4.
<http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/28351-discurso-de-la-presidenta-en-la-clausura-del-foro-empresarial-argentino-chino> (Accessed June 7, 2015).

- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2015b. "Entrevista del canal RT a Cristina Fernández de Kirchner: Declaraciones de la Presidenta de la Nación." April 23. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/conferencias/28626-entrevista-del-canal-rt-a-cristina-fernandez-de-kirchner-declaraciones-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2015c. "Acto de cierre del Congreso Nacional del Radicalismo Popular: Palabras de la Presidenta de la Nación." April 16. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/28583-acto-de-cierre-del-congreso-nacional-del-radicalismo-popular-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2015d. "Palabras de la Presidenta en al clausura del Foro Empresarial Argentino- Ruso, en Moscú." April 22. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/informacion/discursos/28605-palabras-de-la-presidenta-en-al-clausura-del-foro-empresarial-argentino-ruso-en-moscu> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- Casa Rosada: Presidencia de la Nación. 2015e. "La Presidenta recibió al economista francés Thomas Piketty." January 17. <http://www.casarosada.gob.ar/slider-principal/28298-la-presidenta-recibio-al-economista-frances-thomas-piketty> (Accessed June 7, 2015).
- CIA Factbook. 2014a. "The World Factbook South America: Argentina." June 23. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ar.html> (Accessed January 28, 2015).
- CIA Factbook. 2014b. "The World Factbook South America: Brazil." June 23. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/br.html> (Accessed January 28, 2015).
- Chiozza, Giacomo. 2007. "Disaggregating Anti-Americanism: An Analysis of Individual Attitudes Towards the United States." In *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, eds. Peter Joachim Katzenstein and Robert Ewan Keohane. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 93-126.
- De Zwart, Frank. 2002. "Administrative Practice and Rational Inquiry in Postmodern Public Administration Theory." *Administration & Society* 34 (November): 482-498.
- Dunne, Tim and Brian C. Schmidt. 2008. "Realism." In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. New York: Oxford University Press, 90-106.
- Dunne, Tim. 2008. "Liberalism." In *The Globalization of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. New York: Oxford University Press, 108-122.
- Escudé, Carlos. 1997. *Foreign Policy Theory in Menem's Argentina*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

- Etzioni, Amitai. 1988. "Normative-Affective Factors: Towards a New Decision-Making Model." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 9: 125-150.
- Embaixado da Ucrânia no Brasil. 2014. "Embaixador pede apoio do Brasil." March 9. <http://brazil.mfa.gov.ua/pt/press-center/publications/2069-embaixador-pede-apoio-do-brasil--ucrania> (Accessed 8 May 2015).
- Epstein, Charlotte. 2008. *The Power of Words in International Relations: Birth of an Anti-Whaling Discourse*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Eyre, Dana P. and Mark C. Suchman. 1996. "Status, Norms, and the Proliferation of Conventional Weapons: An Institutional Theory Approach". In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. Peter Joachim Katzenstein. New York: Colombia University Press, 79-113.
- Finnemore, Martha. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1989. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Gardini, Gian Luca. 2012. *Latin America in the 21st Century: Nations, Regionalism, Globalization*. London: Zed Books.
- Gee, James Paul. 2014. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Goldstein, Judith and Robert Keohane. 1993. *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gomes Saraiva, Miriam. 2011. "Brazilian Foreign Policy: Causal Beliefs in Formulation and Pragmatism in Practice." In *Latin American Foreign Policies: Between Ideology and Pragmatism*, eds. Gian Luca Gardini and Peter Lambert. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 53-66.
- Hirst, Mônica. 2005. *The United States and Brazil: A Long Road of Unmet Expectations*. New York: Routledge.
- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith. 1990. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holzschleiter, Anna. 2014. "Between Communicative Interaction and Structures of Signification: Discourse Analysis in International Relations". *International Studies Perspective* 15 (May): 142-162.

- Hurd, Ian. 2008. "Constructivism." In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, eds. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidel. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 298-316.
- Hurrell, Andrew (2008). "Lula's Brazil: A Rising Power, But Going Where?" *Current History* 107(706): 51-57.
- Jackson, Robert and Georg Sorensen. 2006. "Social Constructivism." In *Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kalberg, Stephan. 1980. "Max Weber's Types of Rationality: Cornerstones for the Analysis of Rationalization Processes in History." *The American Journal of Sociology* 85 (March): 1145-1179.
- Katzenstein, Peter Joachim. 1996a. *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter Joachim. 1996b. "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security." In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1-27.
- Katzenstein, Peter Joachim and Robert Ewan Keohane. *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Keohane, Robert Ewan and Peter Joachim Katzenstein. 2007. "The Political Consequences of Anti-Americanism." In *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, eds. Peter Joachim Katzenstein and Robert Ewan Keohane. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 273-305.
- Krasner, Stephan. 1993. "Westphalia and All That." In *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*, eds. Judith Goldstein and Robert Keohane. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 235-264.
- Lamy, Steven L. 2008. "Contemporary Mainstream Approaches: Neo-realism and Neo-liberalism." In *The Globalization of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. New York: Oxford University Press, 124-141.
- Malamud, Andrés. 2011. "Argentine Foreign Policy Under the Kirchners: Ideological, Pragmatic or Simply Peronist?" In *Latin American Foreign Policies: Between Ideology and Pragmatism*, eds. Gian Luca Gardini and Peter Lambert. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 35-54.
- Makarychev, Andrey. 2014. *Russia and the EU in a Multipolar World: Discourses, Identities, Norms*. Stuttgart: Ibidem.
- Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods." *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (June): 225-254.

- Ministério de Relações Exteriores. 2014a. “Situação na Ucrânia.” February 19.
http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2388:situacao-na-ucrania&catid=42:notas&Itemid=280&lang=pt-BR (Accessed 16 May 2015).
- Ministério de Relações Exteriores. 2014b. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante abertura da Sessão Plenária da VI Cúpula do Brics - Fortaleza, 15 de julho de 2014.” July 15.
http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5884:discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-abertura-da-sessao-plenaria-da-vi-cupula-do-brics-fortaleza-15-de-julho-de-2014&catid=197&lang=pt-BR&Itemid=448 (Accessed May 16, 2015).
- Moniz Bandeira, Luiz Alberto. 2006. “Brazil as a Regional Power and its Relations with the United States.” *Latin American Perspective* 148 (May): 12-27.
- Monserrat Filho, José. 2005. “A Better Model of Cooperation? The Brazilian–Ukrainian Agreement on Launching Cyclone-4 from Alcântara.” *Space Policy* 21 (February): 65-73.
- Monserrat Filho, José. 2010. “Regulation of Space Activities in Brazil.” In *National Regulations of Space Activities* ed. Ram Jakhu. London: Springer, 61-80.
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011a. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante almoço oferecido ao presidente da Alemanha, Christian Wulff.” May 5. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discorso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-almoco-oferecido-ao-presidente-da-alemanha-christian-wulff> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011b. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante almoço oferecido ao primeiro-ministro da Suécia, Fredrik Reinfeldt.” May 17. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discorso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-almoco-oferecido-ao-primeiro-ministro-da-suecia-fredrik-reinfeldt> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011c. “Declaração à imprensa da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, em conjunto com o Presidente da República do Uruguai, José Mujica.” May 30. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/declaracao-a-imprensa-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-em-conjunto-com-o-presidente-da-republica-oriental-do-uruguai-jose-mujica> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011d. “Declaração à imprensa da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, após cerimônia de assinatura de atos.” October 4.
<http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/declaracao-a-imprensa-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-apos->

cerimonia-de-assinatura-de-atos-bruxelas-belgica (Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011e. “Speech delivered by the President of the Republic of Brazil, Dilma Rousseff, before the National Congress during the Constitutional Oath Ceremony - English version”. January 1.

<http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/speech-delivered-by-the-president-of-the-republic-of-brazil-dilma-rousseff-before-the-national-congress-during-the-constitutional-oath-ceremony> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011f. “Declaração à imprensa concedida pela Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, após 3ª Cúpula dos BRICS.” April 11.

<http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/declaracao-a-imprensa-concedida-pela-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-apos-3a-cupula-dos-brics> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011g. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante cerimônia de formatura da Turma 2009-2011 do Instituto Rio Branco.” April 20. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discorso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-na-cerimonia-de-formatura-da-turma-2009-2011-do-instituto-rio-branco>

(Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011h. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, na primeira sessão da 41ª Cúpula de Presidentes dos Estados Partes do Mercosul e Estados Associados”. June 29. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discorso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-na-primeira-sessao-da-41a-cupula-de-presidentes-dos-estados-partes-do-mercosul-e-estados-associados> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011i. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante jantar por ocasião da entrega do Prêmio por Serviço Público, oferecido pelo Instituto Woodrow Wilson.” September 20.

<http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discorso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-jantar-por-ocasio-da-entrega-do-premio-por-servico-publico-oferecido-pelo-instituto-woodrow-wilson-nova-iorque-eua> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2011j. “Declaração à imprensa da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, após cerimônia de assinatura de atos.” October 25.

<http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/declaracao-a-imprensa-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-apos-cerimonia-de-assinatura-de-atos-brasil-2011> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012a. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante o Fórum Social Mundial – Diálogos entre Sociedade Civil e

- Governo.” January 26. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-o-forum-social-mundial-2013-dialogos-entre-sociedade-civil-e-governo> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012b. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, na cerimônia de encerramento do Seminário Empresarial Brasil-Índia: uma nova fronteira para oportunidade de negócios”. March 20. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-na-cerimonia-de-encerramento-do-seminario-empresarial-brasil-india-uma-nova-fronteira-para-oportunidade-de-negocios-nova-delhi-india> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012c. “Palestra proferida pela Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, na Harvard Kennedy School of Government”. April 10. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/palestra-proferida-pela-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-na-harvard-kennedy-school-of-government-2> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012d. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, no Forum CEO das Américas”. April 14. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-no-forum-ceo-das-americas-cartagena-das-indias-colombia> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012e. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante Seminário Empresarial: Desafios e Oportunidades de uma Parceria Estratégica.” December 12. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-seminario-empresarial-desafios-e-oportunidades-de-uma-parceria-estrategica-paris-franca> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012f. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, na cerimônia de formatura da Turma de 2010-2012 do Instituto Rio Branco.” April 20. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-na-cerimonia-de-formatura-da-turma-de-2010-2012-do-instituto-rio-branco-brasilia-df-25min07s> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012g. “Entrevista coletiva concedida pela Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, na Conferência das Nações Unidas sobre Desenvolvimento Sustentável (Rio+20) - Rio de Janeiro/RJ.” June 22. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/entrevistas/entrevistas/entrevista-coletiva-concedida-pela-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-na-conferencia-das-nacoes-unidas-sobre-desenvolvimento-sustentavel-rio-20> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2012h. “Brasil vai adotar posição ambiciosa na Rio+20, diz Patriota.” June 12. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/excluir-historico-nao-sera-migrado/brasil-vai-adotar-posicao-ambiciosa-na-rio-20-diz-patriota> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2013a. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, após cerimônia de assinatura de atos.” February 23. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-apos-cerimonia-de-assinatura-de-atos-abuja-nigeria> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2013b. “Brinde da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante almoço em homenagem ao presidente da República francesa, François Hollande, e senhora Valérie Trierweiler - Brasília/DF.” December 12. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/brinde-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-almoco-em-homenagem-ao-presidente-da-republica-francesa-francois-hollande-e-senhora-valerie-trierweiler> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2013c. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante cerimônia de formatura da turma 2011/2013 do Instituto Rio Branco”. June 17. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-cerimonia-de-formatura-da-turma-2011-2013-do-instituto-rio-branco-e-de-condecoracao-da-ordem-de-rio-branco> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2013d. Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante encontro da Clinton Global Initiative (SGI) - Rio de Janeiro/RJ. December 9. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-encontro-da-clinton-global-initiative-sgi> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2013e. “Declaração à imprensa da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, após encontro bilateral com o Presidente da República da Venezuela, Nicolás Maduro.” May 9. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/declaracao-a-imprensa-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-apos-encontro-bilateral-com-o-presidente-da-republica-da-venezuela-nicolas-maduro> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2013f. “Brinde da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante almoço em homenagem ao Presidente do Egito, Mohamed Morsi”. May 8. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/brinde-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-almoco-em-homenagem-ao-presidente-do-egito-mohamed-morsi> (Accessed June 6, 2015).

- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2014a. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante almoço em homenagem ao Presidente da Rússia, Vladimir Putin.” July 14. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-almoco-em-homenagem-ao-presidente-da-russia-vladimir-putin> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2014b. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante abertura da Sessão Plenária da VI Cúpula do Brics - Fortaleza/CE.” July 15. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-abertura-da-sessao-plenaria-da-vi-cupula-do-brics-fortaleza-ce> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Palácio do Planalto: Presidência da República. 2015. “Discurso da Presidenta da República, Dilma Rousseff, durante almoço em homenagem ao Primeiro-Ministro da República Popular da China, Li Keqiang e senhora Cheng Hong - Palácio Itamaraty”. May 19. <http://www2.planalto.gov.br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/discursos-da-presidenta/discurso-da-presidenta-da-republica-dilma-rousseff-durante-almoco-em-homenagem-ao-primeiro-ministro-da-republica-popular-da-china-li-keqiang-e-senhora-cheng-hong-palacio-itamaraty> (Accessed June 6, 2015).
- Pecequillo, Cristina Soreanu. 2010. “A New Strategic Dialogue: Brazil-US Relations in Lula’s Presidency (2003-2010)”. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 53 (December): 132-150.
- Pinkerton, Alisdair and Matt Benwell. 2014. “Rethinking Popular Geopolitics in the Falklands/Malvinas Sovereignty Dispute: Creative Diplomacy and Citizen Statecraft.” *Political Geography* 38 (January): 12-22.
- Price, Richard and Christian Reus-Smit. 1998. “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism.” *European Journal of International Relations* 4 (September): 259-294.
- Reuters. 2014. “World leaders on lunch break at G20.” November 14. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LA-keQDAV68>. (Accessed January 29, 2015)
- Ruggie, John Gerard. 1998. “What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge.” *International Organization* 52 (4): 855-885.
- Russell, Roberto and Juan Gabriel Tokatlian. 2015. “Argentina’s Foreign Policy.” In *Routledge Handbook of Latin America in the World*, eds. Jorge I. Domínguez and Ana Covarrubias. New York: Routledge, 127-138.
- Sánchez, Leandro Enríquez and Victoria Zapata. 2014. “Una visión postestructuralista de la política exterior peronista. Las fuentes internas de su identidad.” *Confines de Relaciones Internacionales y Ciencia Política* 10 (20): 91-116.

- Schoenberger-Orgad, Michèle. 2011. "NATO's Strategic Communication as International Public Relations: The PR practitioner and the Challenge of Culture in the Case of Kosovo." *Public Relations Review* 37 (November): 376-383.
- Smith, Steve and Patricia Owens. "Alternative Approaches to International Theory." In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. New York: Oxford University Press, 174-191.
- Stuenkel, Oliver. 2011. "Identity and the Concept of the West: the Case of Brazil and India." *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 54 (1): 178-195.
- Stuenkel, Oliver. 2014. "Why Brazil Has Not Criticized Russia over Crimea." May 27 http://peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/65655a04cd21b64dbcc9c8a823a8e736.pdf (Accessed May 8, 2015).
- Teti, Andrea. 2012. "The EU's First Response to the 'Arab Spring': A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Partnership for Democracy and Shared Prosperity." *Mediterranean Politics* 17 (November): 266-284.
- United Nations. 2014a. "Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 27 March 2014". March 27. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/68/262 (Accessed May 16, 2015).
- United Nations. 2014b. "General Assembly Sixty-eighth Session: 80th Plenary Meeting". 27 March. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/68/PV.80 (Accessed May 16, 2015).
- United Nations Security Council. 2014. "Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America: draft resolution". March 15. http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_2014_189.pdf (Accessed May 17, 2015).
- Visentini, Paolo. 2014. "Brazil: From 'Sleeping Giant' to Emerging Power." In *Brazil Under the Workers' Party: Continuity and Change From Lula to Dilma*, eds. Fábio de Castro, Kees Koonings and Marianne Wiesebron. London, Palgrave Macmillan: 63-75.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Weber, Max. 1968 [1921]. *Economy and Society*, eds. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. New York: Bedminster.

- Weber, Max. 1972 [1920]. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie, Vol. 1*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: the Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organisation* 46 (2): 391-425.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1995. "Constructing International Politics." *International Security* 20: 71-81.
- Yongtao, Liu. 2010. "Discourse, Meanings and IR Studies: Taking the Rhetoric of 'Axis of Evil' As a Case". *Confines de Relaciones Internacionales y Ciencia Política* 6 (11): 85-107.