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Abstract

The IBSA (The India-Brazil-South Africa) alliance was initiated to be the symbolic representation of a new world order led by three prominent and emerging nations of the Global South, namely: India, Brazil and South Africa. An alliance such as IBSA that connects these three geopolitically strategic nations and provides a platform for them to share their economic skills, exchange information, develop resources and collaborate on political agendas has profound implications both for the participating states as well as the rest of the world. Furthermore, as a key institution of the International System, IBSA's formation, functioning and performance are determining factors of the potential of Global South to South Cooperation.

The shifting Global Political Economy dynamics of the 21st century necessitate a more focused understanding of the politics and economics of the countries of the Global South. This thesis aims to expand on the current academic knowledge of IBSA and to contribute to the debate regarding the scope and potential of international institutions, particularly of those institutions that are focused on the Global South. In order to facilitate the same, this thesis conducts first, an analysis of foundational international relations concepts aimed at developing a theoretical model explaining the origins, formations and functioning of the IBSA alliance from an international affairs perspective. Followed by, an analysis of the foreign policy convergence of these three countries, aimed at understanding the combined potential of the IBSA states in achieving development through mutual cooperation, facilitating regional leadership, reforming international institutions and reshaping global norms.
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Introduction

I. The Potential of Global South to South Cooperation

In 2013, the United Nations Development Programme released a Human Development Report that acclaimed the tremendous "shift in global dynamics, driven by the fast rising new powers of the developing world". The report recognized India, Brazil and South Africa as 3 of the top 40 countries that had met unexpected and unprecedented standards of human development and economic growth. India was recognized for entrepreneurial creativity and innovation in social policy, Brazil was appreciated for raising living standards and improving poverty alleviation programs while South Africa was commended for developing as “a leading world actor on the world stage”. The UNDP report further predicted that the economic activities and development programs of the so-called “Global South”, led by these three countries, would surpass the traditional economic powers of the world, namely: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom and the United States.

The 21st century has witnessed a global shift in the balance of power from the traditional economies of the North to the developing nations of the South. The UNDP World report claims

---


that “The world is witnessing an epochal “global rebalancing” pioneered by countries of the South.” In the recent years, these countries have managed to increase economic productivity by developing their industries, attracting foreign investments, harnessing their human capital, introducing social developmental policies and by strengthening bilateral relations with countries of the Global South. Testifying to this is the United Nations Development Program that reports that, “By 2020, the combined output of the three leading South economies—China, India, Brazil—will surpass the aggregate production of the United States, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Italy and Canada.” The report also notes that “Developing countries nearly doubled their share of world merchandise trade from 25 percent to 47 percent between 1980 and 2010. Trade within the South was the biggest factor in that expansion, climbing from less than 10 percent to more than 25 percent of all world trade in the past 30 years, while trade between developed countries fell from 46 percent to less than 30 percent. (The report also adds that) trade between countries in the South will overtake that between developed nations. Increasing openness to trade correlates with rising human development achievement in most developing countries.”


5 The term "countries of the South" here is used as a reference to the countries of the Global South that have been recognized by the United Nations Development Program for their rapid economic growth and political power in the 21st century. The term comprises of countries like India, Brazil, South Africa and China.


7 Ibid.
The United Nations Development Program attributes the transformation of the Global South to three key aspects of development politics which include: the role of a proactive developmental state that develops private and public policies, the ability of countries of the South to integrate into the global market and the efficiency of social policy innovations of the countries that complement the economic growth and development of the South.\(^8\)

India, Brazil and South Africa are three of the world’s fastest developing countries and the leading pioneers of South to South cooperation. India is rising as a global power. India’s abundant supply of natural resources and its geostrategic location complemented the extensive economic liberalization reforms undertaken in 1991 under Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, enabling India to accelerate its economic development to unprecedented levels of growth and development. According to data published by the World Bank, India's "recent growth and development has been one of the most significant achievements of our times”\(^9\). From leading an agricultural revolution to sending a spacecraft to Mars, India has efficiently harnessed the potential of its abundant resources and human capital to accelerate its economic growth and development. Similarly rich in resources and geopolitically strategic is South Africa. South Africa has played a crucial role in the development of Africa as well as the rest of the world\(^10\). Pretoria has already emerged as a superpower in the continent of Africa, often (claiming to)

\(^{\text{8 Ibid.}}\)


represent the needs of the continent in international forums and organizations. The abundance of natural resources, mineral reserves of gold, ferrochrome, platinum, vanadium etc., along with manpower in the country is capable of accelerating South Africa’s economy and eventually its global prominence. Similarly, Brazil’s economic progress leading to the year 2004 has been remarkable. According to information published by the World Bank, Brazil has achieved poverty alleviation of 29 million people while reducing the inequality by a Gini coefficient of 6.6 percentage.\(^{11}\) As per information published by the Economy Watch in 2015, India has a 7.016\% GDP share of world total. Similarly Brazil's total share in GDP is 2.812\% and South Africa's share amounts to 0.637\%.\(^{12}\) India, Brazil and South Africa are increasingly developing as the new “engines of growth” in the 21st century.\(^{13}\)

Along with undertaking measures to achieve unprecedented economic growth and development, India, Brazil and South Africa have also effectively wielded diplomatic power at the global front. India being the world’s biggest democracy has been able to secure unique and politically significant deals with the world’s still dominant superpower, the United States. The Indo-US (India–United States Civil Nuclear Agreement) Nuclear deal is one such unique deal that secures American civilian nuclear cooperation for India. India is the only country that the United States has extended such an accommodation to, given its strong nuclear nonproliferation stance. India

\(^{11}\) The World Bank. Country Data- Brazil


has also managed to secure the support of four of the five UN permanent Security Council members namely France, Russia, The United Kingdom and The United States, in its bid for permanent membership at the UN Security council. India has made a systematic effort to extend its influence over the globe through the Ministries of International Affairs and the ICCR (Indian Council for Cultural Relations) offices that seek to promote Indian tourism, culture, food and lifestyle (such as healthy living and yoga) across the world.

Similar to progress in India, in the recent years especially under President Lula da Silva’s reign (2002-2010), Brazil has been strengthening its economic and diplomatic standing in the international arena. Under Silva, Brazil undertook an intensive foreign policy project that was aimed at strengthening its diplomatic relations, particularly within South America. Brazil is a member of various regional cooperation institutions including the Bank of the South, the South American Community of Nations and the South American Defense Council. Brazil has also publically supported reforming the United Nations Security Council, pressing for an increase in the number of permanent states at the Council.

Despite being a young democracy, South Africa has made radical improvements and changes in its political and social policies, pursuing the dream of the ‘Rainbow Nation’. South Africa has internationally set an example for nonproliferation of nuclear weapons by voluntarily dismantling its nuclear weapon capabilities. Furthermore, in the African continent, South Africa has prioritized diplomatic and economic relations with the African continent, claiming to represent the pan-African voice of the African continents at international forums such as BRICS (Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa association).

The past few years has witnessed the powers of the Global South emerging in international affairs. India, Brazil and South Africa have engaged in various diplomatic projects that have
successfully launched their soft power diplomacy at the global front.

The multipolar world of the 21st century is increasingly shifting its axis towards the countries of the Global South.\textsuperscript{14} South to South cooperation has managed to secure a significant portion of the international market by harnessing the power of natural resources and the abundance of human capital. At the rate of its current growth, the emerging markets of the developing “third world” countries, have the potential to surpass the traditional markets of the North. India, Brazil and South Africa are the pioneers of this new global political and economic order. With their growing diplomatic power and economic strength, India, Brazil and South Africa aspire to be the architects of a new world order that prevails on the developing markets and growing political prominence of the countries of the South.

IBSA (The India-Brazil-South Africa alliance) is intended to be the symbolic representation of a new world order led by India, Brazil and South Africa. An alliance such as IBSA that connects these three prominent emerging nations and provides a platform for them to share economic skills as well as develop political agendas, has profound implications both for the participating states as well as the rest of the world. These shifting Global Political Economy dynamics necessitate a more focused understanding of the politics and economics of the countries of the Global South. An important aspect of such a study is an analysis of the kind of transnational and multilateral alliances and partnerships that the countries of the Global South form, to benefit from promoting self-reliance, strengthening mutual capacity, sharing resources and technological

\textsuperscript{14} Harris, Jerry. "Emerging Third World Powers: China, India and Brazil." \textit{Race & Class} \textbf{46}, no. 3 (2005): 7-27
innovations, developing communication channels and increasing their collective participation in international affairs.
II. Conception and Formation of IBSA

"What is the use of being invited for dessert at the banquet of the powerful? We do not want to participate only to eat the dessert; we want to eat the main course, dessert and then coffee"

- Lula da Silva (Group of Eight Summit, Evian, France). 15

During the Group of Eight Summit (G8) in France in 2003, President Lula felt that Brazil (along with India and South Africa) were “merely symbolic” observers at the G8 Summit. Following the Summit, “only three days later, India’s Minister of External Affairs Yashwant Sinha, Brazil’s foreign Minister Celso Amorim, and South Africa’s Minister of International Relations and Cooperation Nkosazana Dlamini Zuma met in Brasilia in what they called a “pioneer meeting” and formalized the IBSA Dialogue Forum through the adoption of the “Brasilia Declaration” on 6, June, 2003 16. The IBSA Dialogue Forum, or commonly referred to as “IBSA” (an abbreviation referring to the first letter of the states composing the alliance), was launched as an international platform that would initiate, facilitate and develop dialogue based discussions among the self-declared leaders of the Global South, in order to counter the marginalization of developing nations.

The IBSA alliance was a first of its kind, unique alliance formed by the South, of the South and


for the South. The alliance was formed with "the aim of examining themes of the international agenda and those of mutual interest". Internationally, the alliance sought to reform the existing structure of major international institutions by attempting to make it more representative and inclusive, especially for the countries of the Global South. Domestically, the alliance sought to aid the participating states in pursuing urgent priorities such as poverty, hunger, social equity, education, environment protection and food security through collective cooperation and mutual assistance. The economic, political and social needs of the developing countries were a key foundational agenda of the tripartite partnership, as the IBSA alliance sought to pursue policies, programs and initiatives “in different international forums, to make the diverse processes of globalization inclusive, integrative, humane, and equitable”\(^{18}\), to negotiate the “reversal of protectionist policies and trade-distorting practices through the Doha Development Program”\(^{19}\) and to cooperate towards “towards making the international financial architecture responsive to development”\(^{20}\). IBSA aimed to achieve its developmental agendas by holding political consultations, exchanging information on areas of cooperation, coordinating foreign positions, conducting summits and developing dialogue through the Trilateral Joint Commission.\(^{21}\)

India, Brazil and South Africa understand themselves to be democratic, multicultural and pluralistic developing countries that share similar values such as democracy, human rights and


\(^{18}\) Ibid.

\(^{19}\) Ibid.

\(^{20}\) Ibid.

\(^{21}\) Ibid.
the rule of law and that lay claim to a similar status as "middle powers" in global politics. The IBSA alliance was formed to establish a partnership between like-minded countries of the Global South. The objective of the alliance was to increase cooperation on matters of mutual interest which included political, social and cultural concerns. An international dialogue forum was established through IBSA to develop discussion and facilitate cooperation among the countries of the Global South while unifying and reinforcing the needs of the Global South at the global front.

IBSA claims to be an important model of transforming global politics. The alliance is a first-of-its-kind international institution that has been formed by three strategically integral countries of the Global South in order to counter marginalization at the global front. IBSA is a marker of global politics that necessitated an alliance among the countries of the Global South given the shift in global politics and economics towards these countries. IBSA aspires to be regarded as the precedent archetype of a South to South dialogue forum that is based on shared interest and goals. “Its (IBSA’s) creation recognized the necessity of a process of dialogue among developing nations and countries of the South to counter their marginalization.”22 As Foreign Secretary Shri Shashank noted at the IBSA Dialogue Forum meeting in 2004, "The idea of IBSA had emerged out of a general feeling about the absence of an effective forum for South-South cooperation", "This partnership is an example of the innovative globalization where the three countries, despite the vast geographical distance between them, come together in a quest for greater autonomy. It has a vast potential for shaping the debate on global issues and influence its course so that

---

globalization becomes a positive force for the benefit of the developing countries". 23

As an international tripartite partnership, IBSA aims to represent the strength of cooperation as exercised by three of the world's strongest democracies with rapidly growing economies. As an international institution, it aims to increase intra-IBSA cooperation, promote dialogue between IBSA countries, share resources and technological capabilities and to unify to influence international decisions on significant political and social issues.

At the heart of the IBSA alliance was the need of the countries of the South to be represented internationally, to have the needs of the developing countries addressed, to increase cooperation among the countries of the South and to collectively pursue a new Global order. 24

IBSA’s growing prominence has raised various debates in the international sphere and in the academia regarding the organization’s purpose, performance, durability and efficiency. There are several international relations approaches that could be applied to ascertain the formation of this unique alliance of (some of the most prominent) countries of the Global South. While liberals would focus on the democratic framework of the IBSA alliance, the constructivist approach of international relations would be centered on the shared principles and ideals of the participatory


countries. Similarly, while Marxist theories could be used to interpret the formation of IBSA as a proletariat response to the Western bourgeoisie control of the production system, realist theories could be deployed to understand the formation of IBSA as a counterweight to the current global distribution of power.

Most of the current scholarly literature focuses on the efficiency of IBSA as an international organization²⁵, the probability of an IBSA-BRICS coalition²⁶ or the compatibility of the three partner countries.²⁷ The current literature lacks a strong theoretical framework that situates IBSA in the Global Political Economy dynamics and outlines the political and economic circumstances that necessitated an alliance such as IBSA by these three countries.


III. STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

**III. i Academic Contribution and Significance:** This dissertation aims to contribute to scholarship pertaining to IBSA by developing a theoretical model to facilitate an understanding of IBSA, the political determinants and motivation behind the formation of the alliance, its framework and the impact that it has on the Global Political Economy. This dissertation identifies a key institution of the International System and provides an understanding of its formation, functioning and potential. Secondly, by evaluating global trends and inter-state relationship, it analyzes the potential of South to South Cooperation in terms of the extent to which IBSA has managed to counter the marginalization of the countries in the South or managed to secure more negotiation powers at the global front.

**III. ii Objectives:** The first main objective of this dissertation is to develop a theory rooted framework that analyzes the political and philosophical foundations of the IBSA alliance by situating it in International Relations and Global Political Economy dynamics. The theoretical framework attempts to frame an understanding of the political or economic determinants behind the IBSA alliance, ascertain the rationale behind creating an IBSA alliance separate from BRICS, analyze the impact that the IBSA alliance has had on the alliance partners as well as the rest of the world and to initiate academic discourse regarding IBSA’s influence on the creation of a new world order centered on the Global South. The second objective is to form an analysis of the foreign policies of the IBSA countries, to understand how the IBSA alliance has facilitated the realization of these foreign policy objectives as well as to analyze the impact that IBSA has had on influencing Global Politics and Economics.
**III.iii The methodology** of the thesis is centered around the following objectives: to develop a theoretical framework that situates IBSA in the Global Political Economy, to facilitate an understanding of the creation and functioning of IBSA, to form an analysis of the foreign policies of the partner countries, to ascertain the rationale behind operating independent of BRICS and to understand the impact that IBSA has had on influencing global politics and economics.

The methodology used is divided into:

i) **Theoretical Analysis:** The methodology for the development of the theoretical framework relies on an analysis of prominent International Relations theories and Global Political Economy theories that are relevant to the study of IBSA. Theories analyzed for the purpose of this study include Marxism, Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism. The choice of theories are based on the prominence of the theories in international political literature as well as the particular relevance to IBSA for the purpose of this study.

ii) **Qualitative analysis:** Personal Interviews with diplomats, country officials, scholars and members of prominent Think Tanks associated with IBSA are conducted to understand the creation and functioning of IBSA as well as to analyze the political and economic aspects of the foreign policy of India, Brazil and South Africa that facilitated such an alliance.

iii) **Quantitative data analysis:** Official reports and data published by IBSA (meeting reports, summit reviews and commissioned reports) along with data and reports as published by the United Nations, World Bank and International Trade Center are used to analyze the extent to which IBSA has achieved its officially states goals regarding the effectiveness of social development projects, the volume of economic trade, and impact that it has had on initiating or influencing global political and economic policies.
III. Chapters: This paper is divided into two chapters. The first chapter titled “The Development of a Theoretical Framework of IBSA” attempts to theoretically explain the formation of the IBSA alliance and the Global Political Economy dynamics that necessitated such an alliance. This chapter contains the literature review and theoretical framework that situates IBSA within current Global Political Economy dynamics. The second chapter titled “Impact on the Global Political Economy” develops a critical analysis of IBSA’s role and contribution to the Global Political Economy based on an analysis of the foreign policy and foreign policy objectives of IBSA countries as well as a comparative analysis of IBSA’s actual execution of stated objectives against the officially stated goals, in order to gain a systematic perspective on its impact on the Global Political Economy and the creation of a new world order.

III. v Limitations: This thesis does not seek to provide a comprehensive understanding behind the formation of IBSA. There are various other theoretical and non-theoretical approaches that could be adopted to study the formation of IBSA and the unique South to South cooperation facilitated by the IBSA formation. For the purpose of this project, the dissertation is limited to analyzing the foundations of the IBSA alliance based on certain international relations theories that are best suited for the purpose of this study. In terms of the foreign policy objectives of IBSA countries, there are again, various theoretical frameworks assessing the impact of both international and domestic factors that impact the foreign policy of the countries. This dissertation is limited to analyzing and expanding on foreign policies that are most relevant for the study of the IBSA alliance. Compared to other international institutions, there is very little information that exist on IBSA both in academia as well as through information generated by
IBSA and IBSA states. This dissertation is therefore developed within the limited information available and seeks to expand on the same.
CHAPTER 1: DEVELOPING A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF IBSA

From the League of Nations to the European Union, states have formed alliances with one another through international institutions. States join international organizations to achieve political and economic objectives at the global front that cannot be achieved by states independently. State membership at international organizations have increased in the recent years due to the process of globalization that has bound states together through issues of common concern. In *Ruling the World: Power Politics and the Rise of Supranational Institutions*, author Gruber Lloyd notes that “At first, this trend toward supranational governance was primarily a regional phenomenon, in recent years, however, the trend has begun to encompass a number of global regimes as well”.28 Membership of states at international institutions is also driven by domestic social, political or economic concerns and objectives. International organizations provide a common platform for states to come together and facilitates interstate dialogue and cooperation. International organizations also create international norms and principles that govern interstate relations.

Why do states form alliances or partnerships through international organizations? The formation of international organizations and the membership of states at these organizations can be explained by various international relations theories that provide a framework for analyzing and understanding state behavior and interstate relations. These theories also provide a conceptual understanding of the domestic social, political and economic factors that influence state behavior and state membership in these organizations. The formation and establishment of international

---

organizations and state membership at these organizations are deeply rooted in social, political or economic objectives that the state seeks to achieve through alliances and partnerships.

The formation and establishment of the IBSA alliance by India, Brazil and South Africa can be understood by developing a theoretical framework that uses major Global Political Economy theories and international relations theories that explain the philosophical foundations behind the creation of IBSA. The development of a theoretical framework has several advantages which are critical to understanding the IBSA alliance. The development of a theoretical framework allows to form an understanding of global politics that necessitated an IBSA alliance. It situates IBSA, its formation and mechanics at the center of Global Political Economy framework which is increasingly tilting towards the political economies of the countries of the Global South. The development of a theoretical framework also facilitates an analytical understanding of the relationship between the countries of the Global South based on the power struggles between the Global South and the North. Furthermore, the theoretical framework aids in generating theory-rooted explanations of the mechanism and officially stated goals of IBSA. In the subsequent section, different international relations theories are applied to understand some or all of the determinants behind the formation and functioning of the IBSA alliance.

1.1 Structural Realism

Realism views the international system to be in a state of anarchy where there is widespread political disorder given the absence of a single authority that can command obedience from all other actors. Realism views individual states as rational actors that aim primarily to guarantee
their survival and “maximize their benefits while minimizing their cost of operations”\textsuperscript{29} in the anarchic system. Power and security are considered to be the most fundamental goals of states in a system of anarchy.\textsuperscript{30}

Classical realism was founded on the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes's \textit{Leviathan} (1651) that understands society to be in a state of war where men live in anarchy and are motivated by competition, egoism and the pursuit of honor or glory.\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Leviathan} is based on the idea that men in their natural behavior are cruel, selfish and self-seeking and therefore, in order to establish civil peace and unity in the society, the presence of a \textit{Leviathan} (great power) is necessary. The establishment of a common power is therefore considered necessary to ensure harmony in the society. \textit{Leviathan} lays down one of the founding principles of classical realism which is centered on the concept of an anarchic society that requires the establishment of a regulatory authority. \textsuperscript{32} Leviathan established that “international anarchy is the principal force guiding the motives and actions of states”. \textsuperscript{33}


Structural realism as proposed by Kenneth Waltz in his book, *The Theory of International Relations* (1979) focuses less on the actions of individual actors and more on the anarchic system of the international society. Structural realism “sets aside the features of international relations that depend on the character of the actors or the nature of their interaction in order to highlight the constraining impact of the structure of the international system”.\(^{34}\)

What does a structural theory mean for the agency of individual states in the system? In the *Theory of International Politics*, Kenneth Waltz asserts that in the “self-help” anarchic system, individual states will strive to ensure a balance of power to counter the hegemonic state. According to his theory of the balance of power, states will attempt to counter hegemony either through internal mechanisms such as increasing the economic or military capabilities of the state or through external mechanisms such as forming alliances with other states.\(^{35}\) Similarly, in "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation", Grieco argues that "states in an anarchy fear for their survival as individual actors".\(^{36}\) Structural realism views states as striving to fend for themselves in a state of anarchy.\(^{37}\) The main objective of states therefore, is to attempt to strike a balance in the international system by either reducing the risk posed by stronger states or by increasing the

---


strength of the individual state.\textsuperscript{38}

What does this then mean for international organizations? According to critics, Waltz’ strong emphasis on self-help and distrust in International Relations fails to explain the formation and maintenance of any meaningful structures of cooperation at the international level. However, advocates of Structural Realism's disagree who do not view a contradiction in the coexistence of alliances and treaties within their framework. Structural realism views international organizations as political apparatuses which can be used by states to achieve these objectives of gaining power, increasing economic benefits and maintaining political security under the pretext of extending cooperation.\textsuperscript{39} International organizations are viewed less as independent actors and more as tools in the power struggles of States.

Structural Realism explains the motivations that both small and big states have in forming and joining international organizations. Since Realism focuses on the power struggle and survival of states in the society, the rationale behind small states (such as India, Brazil and South Africa) forming international organizations can be understood as an attempt on their part to pool state sovereignties together in a united organization (such as the IBSA alliance) that aids in balancing the power struggle between small states and big states. Small states have the incentive to form international institutions to avoid being politically and economically swallowed up by big states—they serve as a protective shield against the bullying tendencies of Great Powers. In his book \textit{The

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 38

Tragedy of Great Power Politics, John J. Mearsheimer asserts that the anarchic international system facilitates an environment in which relatively powerful states are incentivized to establish themselves as regional hegemons given the absence of a singular power figure in the international system. 40 Big and relatively more powerful states are also consequently driven to join international organizations to counterbalance the unification of small states. Although a big state has the ability to consolidate power independently, power cannot be yielded unilaterally. By joining multilateral organizations, big states have the ability to legitimize their authority while yielding power over the international system by counterbalancing the joint sovereignty of small states. As Grieco argues, "states worry that today's friend may be tomorrow’s enemy in war, and fear that achievements of joint gains that advantage a friend in the present might produce a more dangerous potential foe in the future. As a result, states must give serious attention to the gains of partners".41 Realism emphasizes that conflict and cooperation is a method of ensuring survival in an anarchic international system. A classic example of this is provided by Mearsheimer: "great powers sometimes find institutions - especially alliances- useful for maintaining or even increasing their share of world power. For example, it was more efficient for the United States and its allies to balance against the Soviets through NATO than through a less formal and more ad hoc alliance".42

---


Alternatively, realism and the theory of balance of power also potentially helps us explain the economic rationale behind the formation of IBSA. The current Global Political Economy is heavily concentrated in the hands of a few countries of the West. This concentration of global power pressures the less well established or “developing” countries to form alliances to counterbalance the concentration of power. One of IBSA’s officially stated goals and founding principle is embedded in this power struggle between states. IBSA’s “creation recognized the necessity of a process of dialogue among developing nations and countries of the Global South to counter their marginalization”.\textsuperscript{43} The profile of IBSA’s alliance partners illustrate Waltz’s theory of regional hegemony and counter marginalization. India, Brazil and South Africa not only aim to (or have already) established themselves as regional hegemons in their respective geopolitical regions but also aim at counterbalancing the growing hegemony of the West. Through IBSA, these countries have a strategic, political and economic advantage in their respective regions and have the advantage of a joint union that significantly increases their ability to counterbalance traditional hegemons. Thomas Pederson describes this practice as the development of a "co-operative hegemony" where regional hegemons balance power by establishing cooperative institutions for power sharing.\textsuperscript{44}

\textbf{1.2 Liberalism}

The philosophical tradition of liberalism originated from the European Enlightenment. The European enlightenment and the ‘new age of reason’ sought to move beyond the chaos of war


and irresponsible governance by developing liberal political fundamentals that concentrated on developing the domestic state rather than at engaging in war abroad. Classic liberalism as proposed by Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill asserted the importance of a social contract between state and society that operated on the values of individual free will, a free market and laissez faire governance. Classic liberalism emerged as a critique of mercantilism and asserted the need to strive for overall increase in the level of wealth and welfare through unfettered commerce.

The 18th and 19th century witnessed the development of two main philosophies of liberalism. During this time, the French Revolution and the First World War popularized the concepts of national self-determination and the practice of sovereignty. Liberalism in the 21st century is influenced by two significant movements of the 20th century namely: the spread of democracy post-cold war and the globalization of the modern world.

International liberalism draws its influence from the liberal peace model as proposed by Immanuel Kant in *The Perpetual Peace*. Kantian liberalism is based on the principle of democratic governments in an international society and claims that democracies with responsible governments are more inclined and incentivized to maintain peaceful relations with other states. Democracies are prone to engage in peaceful negotiations in order to prevent incurring the expenses of war. The peace model relies on mutual cooperation, international trade, diplomacy

---


46 Ibid., 26

and peaceful resolution among states and believes that democracies do not operate solely on power politics but uphold peaceful norms and regulations that reduce the likelihood of war by encouraging nations to maintain peace. Kant believes that democracies share mutually agreed upon principles that foster greater understanding and peace among them. “In the wake of increasing culture and humankind’s gradually coming within reach of an agreement regarding their principles, they lead to mutual understanding and agreement to peace”

Kant also states that democracies form alliances and partake in negotiations to avoid incurring the cost of war. Along with the importance of democratic principles, Kantian liberalism asserts that international institutions (both political and economic) bind nations together, peacefully resolve conflicts, create the norms that regulate international relations and maintain the incentive for peaceful and cooperative existence through mutual cooperation.

The fundamental principles of Liberalism aim to promote democracy, free trade and capital markets along with strengthening peaceful relations among countries. Liberalism is founded on the principles of human rights, the rule of law and democracy. It aims to promote global economic integration and to maintain peaceful relations within and among nations.

How does a liberal approach then explain the functioning or formation or the membership of states of international organizations? The liberal approach of international institutions focuses on

---


the principles of interdependence and peaceful coexistence. Liberals believe that international organizations especially, when democratic, can contribute to dispute settlement, ensure peace and stability, and uphold international agreements, and influence norms and identity creation among states. Keohane and Martin argue that liberal institutions provide valuable information regarding gains from cooperation that benefit all member parties, reduce the likelihood of cheating among member parties, settle conflicts, facilitate cooperation and promote exchange and cooperation. A classic example of a successful liberal institution is the European Union which is a democratically elected body that enforces common regulations, promotes free trade, encourages cooperation and acts as a unifying inter-governmental body.

Referencing Duffield on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO, world's most potent military alliance between self-declared liberal states), Keohane and Martin also argue that institutions lead to more security and stability. John Duffield uses the case study example of NATO to demonstrate how liberal institutions led to stability, cooperation and security. "NATO made an independent contribution to the "Long Peace" in Europe by drawing boundaries, demonstrating U.S. commitments and making them credible, and facilitating the augmentation of NATO allies' military capabilities", furthermore, "stable norms and rules of NATO led to stability in levels of conventional forces within the regime".
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Liberal theorists argue that liberal institutions build trust and reduce rivalry among member countries. In “Committed to peace: Liberal institutions and the termination of rivalry”, authors Brandon et al argue that institutions increase cooperation and reduce rivalry. “Using a Cox proportional hazard model and Thompson's data on rivalries, it is shown that change towards democracy, as well as the joint effect of democracy and economic development increase the likelihood of rivalry termination. Also, joint membership in international organizations with mechanisms for dispute settlement reduces the duration of rivalry”.

In *Ruling the world: Power politics and the rise of supranational institutions*, Lloyd Gruber notes the benefits that arise for countries from membership in institutions. Gruber argues that by acting as a mediator and facilitator, international institutions lay down the grounds of fair play and encourage cooperation. Taking the example of a particular case which requires the compliance of large number of diverse actors for the purpose of realization of collective gains, Gruber notes that "in "noisy " environments like these, international institutions can play a useful role in formalizing the initial terms of cooperation, monitoring subsequent behavior and efficiently transmitting informing about each party's past and present record of compliance”.

Liberalism also believes in the economic gains that accrue to countries through mutual cooperation and interdependence through the practice of “commercial liberalism”. “Commercial
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liberal theory posits that changes in the structure of the domestic and global economy alter the costs and benefits of transnational economic exchange, thus creating pressure on domestic governments to facilitate or block such exchanges through appropriate foreign economic and security policies”. Liberalism believes that economic interdependence can foster security and stability. "A simple starting point is that the collateral damage of war disrupts economic activity: the more vulnerable and extensive such activity, the greater the cost. A more sophisticated cost-benefit calculation would take into account the potential economic costs and benefits of war". The concept of "commercial liberalism" also complements the "democratic peace theory" that liberalism ascribes to "Democratic peace" is established and maintained by countries that are economically interdependent and cannot afford the cost of war.

Classical Liberalist theory focusing on North-South relations in particular, believe that the countries of the Global South have the ability to match the economic growth of the countries in the North through trade liberalization, advanced technologies and export markets. Interventionist liberalism (a field of liberalism that argues in favor of state intervention for the promotion of liberal objectives) theories argue that both countries in the North and South can profit from a mutually benefitting agreements. More powerful and relatively well established countries can assist countries of the Global South by providing international assistance, removing trade barriers and investing in foreign assets, while simultaneously benefiting from the deal because of
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a mutual interdependence that fosters a symbiotic relationship. Both fields of liberalism ultimately believe in the establishment of “democratic peace” through cooperation fostered by economic interdependence.

How does a Liberalist perspective view the formation of the IBSA alliance? IBSA claims to be founded on the liberal values of democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights. “The principles, norms and values underpinning the IBSA Dialogue Forum are participatory democracy, respect for human rights, the Rule of Law and the strengthening of multilateralism.” Faced with the economic superiority of the West, IBSA can be understood as a strategy by three leading emerging powers that are seeking to benefit from trade flows in the context of an expanding globalized economy. IBSA has heavily invested in strengthening mutual free trade by lowering inter-IBSA trade barriers, attempting to harmonize trade standards, and by establishing trade cooperation regulations and agreements. Furthermore, liberalism can also be used to ascertain the rationale behind creating an alliance separate from BRICS. IBSA claims to be an alliance of democratic countries that are concerned with promoting and upholding democratic principles. While BRICS mainly focuses on economic issues, IBSA is a more liberal institution that is based on democratic principles and is concerned with the promotion of democracy, establishment of the rule of law, equitable development and sustainable development. The Dialogue Forum of IBSA allows states to discuss matters related to human
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60 The extent to which IBSA has been successful in doing so, is evaluated in the next chapter.
rights and climate change that are not accommodated in BRICS. IBSA could be understood as an extension of the liberal political and economic framework of IBSA states.

1.3 Marxist approaches to international relations

Karl Marx’s theory regarding the conditions and chances for the self-emancipation of the working class from the destructive capitalist system in early 19th century Europe, is crucial for analyzing international relations. “Classical Marxism, mainly formed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, was greatly influenced by the emergence of capitalism, an economic system based on competition and on the notions of Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Ricardo and classical Marxists share three fundamental assumptions: (1) the expansion of capitalism (production and trade) occurs "under the stimulus of a homogeneous world market"; (2) governments initially realize the interests of the ruling class; and (3) borders are unimportant because of the assumption that competitive trade is not only transboundary but also universal”.

Marxist approaches to international relations are rooted in Karl Marx's philosophy of class struggles and are based on the fundamental difference and subsequent conflict between two distinctive classes in the society: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Marx defined class on the basis of ownership of property and believed that an individual’s' position in class hierarchy and structure was determined by their position and role in the production process. Since society was characterized by a fundamental difference in class, classes with similar economic interest were motivated to make conscious efforts to advance their mutual
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interest and to promote a similar political interest and ideological consciousness.

In Marxism, the distribution of political power in the society is determined by the control yielded over the production system. The bourgeoisie's control of the production system consolidates political power into their hands, enabling them to exploit the proletariat. Marx also predicts a proletariat revolution as the widening gap between the bourgeois and the proletariat, increases the exploitation of the proletariat class and ruptures the existing social system, leading to a revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeois.\textsuperscript{62}

Both Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin believed that capitalism would cause its own inevitable downfall. Marx argues that capitalism would fail for economic reasons and would come to an end following a proletariat revolution. Lenin on the other hand believed that capitalism would push countries to behave as "competing mercantilist nation states driven by economic necessity". "In summary, Lenin argued that the inherent contradiction of capitalism is that it develops the world and plants the political seeds of its own destruction as it diffuses technology, industry, and military power. It creates foreign competitors with lower wages and standards of living who can outcompete the previously dominant economy on the battlefield of world markets. Intensification of economic and political competition between declining and rising capitalist powers leads to economic conflicts, imperial rivalries, and eventually war.\textsuperscript{63}"


The "world system" proposed by Wallerstein is also situated at the heart of a class conflict. Wallerstein believes the international system to be a scaled-up class struggle between two classes, the bourgeoisie that controls the production system and the proletariat class that supplies labor in exchange for wages. The International system is understood as predominantly capitalist and therefore perceived as inherently exploitative. The Marxist theory of International relations also understands issues of inequality of income, wealth distribution and development as a result of class exploitation in the International system. In fact, Wallerstein asserts that there is no such thing as a “third world” but just one world defined by economic relationships between the accumulators of capital and those that produce labor. For example: Wallerstein would define the United States as a core country that has a dominant capitalist framework and engages in the economic exploitation of the peripheral countries by extracting labor and resources from these countries at unfair prices. Countries like India and Brazil would be termed as "semi-peripheral" countries that have emerging markets and growing technological capabilities but continue to share characteristics of peripheral countries. South American Latin countries would fall under the category of peripheral countries that have low technical skills and are characterized by low levels of industrialization. These peripheral countries are dependent on the core countries in a vicious cycle of economic exploitation.64

As Buecker puts it, “Most Marxists agree that capitalism is the source of international behavior and that its expansion forces core states to create tremendous military power, in order to suppress the uprisings of peripheral states, which try to liberate themselves from such dominant core countries arid the prevailing capitalist system. The fact that many of the "non state actors"

come from the financial arena shows the predominance of economic factors in international society”.

The Dependency School which is closely associated with Marxism, expands on this system of underdevelopment of the countries of the Global South and holds the hegemonic center, namely, the United States responsible for the exploitation and systematic underdevelopment of the third world countries. The Dependency theory asserts that the hegemon power feeds on the exploitation of the peripheral countries and the only solution for third world countries is to "delink from the world economy". In *Globalization and Its Discontents*, Joseph Stiglitz, who was once the chief economist at the World Bank (1997) argues that the international financial institutions such as the IMF are incapable of developing the economic markets of emerging nations. He claims that the 'Washington Consensus Policy' is flawed and structurally catastrophic for developing economies. Stiglitz asserts that international financial institutions which operate in isolation need to be regulated with a system of checks and balance that prevents their ability to unilaterally impose economic decisions on developing countries, compromising their economic (and often political) sovereignties.

More moderate dependency theorists claim that capitalism does not benefit the rich and poor countries equally and the pragmatic solution for these countries would be to reduce their
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dependency on the center and to develop autonomously. The dependencia theory in the case of developed countries was explored by Raul Prebish using the context of Latin America. He introduced the term "core" and "periphery" to describe the international economy. “The former is composed of fully developed industrialized countries” that are the beneficiaries of the conditions of trade, and the latter contains the less developed countries that can only change their destiny by industrializing”. Prebish argues that less developed countries that are currently in a position of disadvantage, from which they will strive to escape. A classic example of dependency has been explored in the context of Latin America by author Ronaldo Munck.

Munck analyzes the 2001-2002 collapse of the Argentinian economy and the rise of the workers party candidate Lula da Silva in Brazil to assert the need to find an alternative political economy approach to neoliberalism. He claims that neoliberalism and the idea of a necessary neoliberalist economy has caused Latin America to be plagued by dependency on the West which in turn, has fostered the vicious cycle of perpetual dependency and economic degradation in Latin America.

How do Marxists analyze state membership in international institutions? International institutions therefore, are viewed as political products of the class struggle between states. Interdependence is not regarded as prudent under the Marxist ideology as the international

---
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system is understood as inherently capitalist and exploitative. "The position of states within the capitalist world-economy also determines their relations with one another. Strong states seek to dominate weak states in order to keep the economic channels of the weak states open, pressuring them, sometimes through military force, to conform to the preferences of the strong states. Strong states relate to each other as competitors because their firms compete with one another; this competition among strong states sometimes erupts into war, but these states also cooperate to maintain the world-economy. This competition creates a rough balance of power among the strong states". 72

Marxism regards international institutional alliance as an essential tool to counter balance the global division of labor. Under the Marxist theory, the need for international institutions arise from the unbalanced division of labor, which can be balanced or limited to an extent through the use of international institutions that set the norms for global trade and operations. "According to Marx, universal peace can only be realized when states disappear in the international structure. When a large majority of the world's societies participate in global solidarity and joint action, a world socialist society can come into being". 73

Marxists understand the international system as an exploitative capitalist structure consisting of a developed core that feeds on an underdeveloped periphery and therefore, does not believe in interdependence but advocates for multilevel governance that counters the hegemonic


exploitation of the core. "Marxist analysis points to the urgent need for new systems of multilevel governance in the global economy to identify, manage and steer" our contemporary problems of capital concentration (North-South partition) and increased interdependence that may lead to a financial crisis with serious consequences for the political and economic system.  

Through a Marxist perspective, the formation of IBSA can be understood as an attempt to bridge the unequal development gap between the countries of the Global South and the North. Since the IBSA countries are major constituents of the proletariat class that predominantly provide labor in exchange for wages, the formation of IBSA can be understood as a Marxist struggle to counterbalance the bourgeois class who are the primary owners of production. One of IBSA’s most important and most achieved agenda is inter-IBSA trade. The initial trade target amount of US$ 25 billion for 2015 was predicted to be well achieved and surpassed by 2013 itself, given the trade figure of $23 billion as of 2013.  

"The IBSA economic partnership is strengthened by the drafting of various IBSA agreements that seek to minimize trade and customs procedures while increasing intra-IBSA investment and development. IBSA’s emphasis on strengthening trade networks among participating countries is a clear indication of the Global South’s attempt to achieve economic development and progress independent of the hegemonic system. Neo Marxist dependency theories can be employed to understand IBSA as an attempt of the Southern
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states to escape the exploitative system of capitalism as imposed by the West and their allies through the creation and establishment of independent, autonomous and efficient trade links that reduce their dependency on the West.

1. 4 A Constructivist Approach of International Relations

The Constructivist approach of International Relations views states as dynamic and constantly changing. Constructivism moves away from a purely materialistic, realist concentration and focuses on the social dimensions of international relations which constitutes of shared beliefs, principles, norms and values. Identity (as created or shared) is at the heart of this approach.

Constructivism emerged during the 1980s when critics of rationalist theorists challenged the fixed and objective concepts that were used to explain state sovereignty and politics. Some of the earliest constructivist thinkers attempted to explain world order and politics on the basis of notions, ideas and institutions.\(^76\) According to constructivists, “the end of the Cold War showed that the world of international relations is not fixed like the natural world, a world which exists independently of human actions and cognition (including here the social phenomena of language and communication). The international system, usually described as being anarchical because it lacks a central government, is still a system whose rules are made and reproduced by human practices. Only these intersubjective rules, and not some unchangeable truths deduced from human nature or from international anarchy, give meaning to international practices”.\(^77\)
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\(^77\) Guzzini, Stefano. "A reconstruction of constructivism in international relations." *European*
The term “Constructivism” was first coined by Onuf Kratochwil in *World of our Making* in 1989. Alexander Wendt later developed the theory of constructivism for international relations in his article “Anarchy is what states make of it” published in 1992. Wendt argues that international politics is constructed on the basis of constructed and shared intersubjective ideas that states reinforce through intersubjective practice. Wendt further explains the socially constructed nature of international relations and argues that intersubjective norms and ideals drive state behavior more than material interests, emphasizing on the importance of identities. Friedrich Kratochwil further developed the theory of constructivism by situating state action at the center of intersubjective state relations. Kratochwil asserted that international politics was to be understood as meaningful actions rather than as instrumental behavior. “In all politics, domestic and international, actors reproduce or alter systems through their actions. Any given international system does not exist because of immutable structures, but rather the very structures are dependent for their reproduction on the practices of the actors. Fundamental change of the international system occurs when actors, through their practices, change the rules and norms constitutive of international interaction.”
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The theory of constructivism focuses on the density of states in an international system more than the power struggles of states. It asserts the idea of "co-constitution of states" which believes that states in a system of anarchy are constantly influenced by each other's actions and that states influence norms that govern international order which, in turn, further govern the behavior of states in a cyclical process of mutual influence. Realist interests of the state in terms of power, military strength and trade are believed to be social constructs that have evolved over time through historical interaction, state relations and social behavior. Therefore, the focus according to constructivism should be less on “fixed” practices and more on analyzing the norms and social changes that influence the behavior of states.

In terms of world affairs, constructivists believe in the importance of both material and economic power. Constructivism places a special focus on the power of social practices and understand state interests to be a manifestation of the state’s attempt at identity construction. "The power of social practices lies in their capacity to reproduce the intersubjective meanings that constitute social structures and actors alike." Taking the example of the United States involvement in Vietnam, "The U.S. military intervention in Vietnam was consistent with a number of U.S. identities: great power, imperialist, enemy, ally, and so on. Others observing the United States not only inferred U.S. identity from its actions in Vietnam, but also reproduced the intersubjective web of meaning about what precisely constituted that identity. To the extent, for
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example, that a group of countries attributed an imperialist identity to the United States, the meaning of being an imperialist state was reproduced by the U.S. military intervention. In this way, social practices not only reproduce actors through identity, but also reproduce an intersubjective social structure through social practice”. 83

Constructivist believe that social change in world politics is both possible and difficult to attain. Constructivists argue that power can be manifested in the manner in which a state reproduces this power through identity construction. When a state engage in such power production, it makes it difficult for alternative actors with alternative identities and practices to produce such power and to implement change. But constructivists argue that such a change is nonetheless possible at least theoretically. 84

What roles do international institutions then play in the Global Political Economy for constructivists? Seen through the Constructivist lens, international institutions can be understood as the institutional exemplifications of the principles and norms that govern state behavior and the international society. Constructivism asserts the principles and norms that govern state behavior and international relations are both “intersubjective” and “institutionalized”.

“Intersubjective” refers to the concept of ideas being shared among people or states and “institutionalization” of ideas refers to the process of practicing these beliefs and constructing
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identities based on these beliefs. Constructivism focuses on social norms and principles as the decisive factor behind the actions of states— including actions comprising of cooperation and alliance building.

International politics and the establishment of international institutions are understood to be manifestations of these constructed state norms and principles. Constructivists believe that cooperation is possible among states but offer a different perspective from what neoliberalism does. "A constructivist approach might begin by investigating how states understand their interests within a particular issue area. The distribution of identities and interests of the Relevant states would then help account for whether cooperation is possible". Constructivists argue that membership in international institutions and the survival of institutions is determined by the kind of perception that states have about each other. “Constructivist hypothesis would be that if the identities being reproduced by the social practices constituting that institution have gone beyond the strategic game-playing self-regarding units posited by neoliberals, and have developed an understanding of each other as partners in some common enterprise, then the institution will persist, even if apparent underlying power and interests have shifted”

How does Constructivism explain the formation of IBSA? The formation of a dialogue based IBSA alliance based predominantly on the shared ideals and principles of democracy and multi
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pluralism can be understood by employing constructivist theories. The basis of IBSA’s formation was founded on “shared” principles and “like-mindedness”. “The IBSA Dialogue Forum brings together three large pluralistic, multicultural and multiracial societies from three continents as a purely South-South grouping of like-minded countries”.88 The constructivist approach can also be used to understand the manner in which India, Brazil and South Africa are attempting to change the existing political norms of global governance through the formation of the IBSA alliance. India, Brazil and South Africa share similar political ideologies, social norms and economic status. The shift in global economics towards the Global South has necessitated the creation of a shared identity and voice for the South which is achieved through the creation of IBSA.

CHAPTER 2: IBSA AND THE IMPACT ON THE GLOBAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

The theoretical framework in the previous chapter seeks to explain the rationale behind creating the IBSA alliance on the basis of four key International Relations theories. The second section develops a critical analysis of IBSA’s role and contribution to the Global Political Economy, which is crucial to understanding its significance as a relevant international organization or a tripartite partnership of the Global South. Such an analysis also provides insight into the capabilities and limitations of emerging powers in reshaping the Global Political Economy and the potential of Global South to South cooperation.

The second section analyzes the manner in which IBSA embodies the foreign policy objectives of the participating states and therefore, implicitly, seeks to answer a critical question regarding IBSA’s influence on the Global Political Economy: Has IBSA contributed to creating or reshaping a new world order centered on the Global South? In order to analyze IBSA’s influence on the Global Political Economy, this section begins with a brief analysis of the foreign policies of the IBSA states along with a subsequent analysis of the extent to which the IBSA alliance has facilitated the realization of these foreign policy objectives.

The next sub section identifies converging foreign policy objectives of the participating countries and compares IBSA’s actual execution of stated objectives against the officially stated goals in order to gain a systematic perspective on its impact on the Global Political Economy and the creation of a new world order. The subsequent section includes a brief, historical background of foreign policy trends of the IBSA states and then proceeds to situate IBSA within these foreign policy trends and objectives.

2. 1 FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES OF IBSA STATES
India

After India gained its independence from the British Empire in 1947, India's foreign policy was characterized by policies centered around protecting India’s sovereignty, autonomy and increasing economic development. The aftermath of the Cold War witnessed the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement, of which Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru was a key player along with the President of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser and President of Yugoslavia, Josip Tito. Nehru's idealistic and anti-colonial outlook asserted a neutral, non-alignment foreign policy approach that preserved national sovereignty and prevented a neo-imperial intervention of previously colonized countries. By refusing to align with either of the major superpower blocs (USA or USSR), India and the other Asian countries sought to establish "peaceful coexistence" through a policy of mutual noninterference. 89 This historical non alignment set the foundation for Indian foreign policy for decades to come.

The Non Aligned policy was revised in 1977 under Prime Minister Morarji Desai who "reiterated his commitment to "proper nonalignment," that is, nonalignment "with no suspicion of any alliance with anyone"." 90 Desai revised the policy of nonalignment in an attempt to forge better relations with the United States, Russia, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal (Desai feared that the Indira Gandhi administration had poorly managed foreign relations and deteriorated relations


with neighboring countries as well as the United States). Desai claimed that the principle of non-alignment was a "national article of faith" and continued to pursue non-alignment and the non-interference foreign policy. The Non-Aligned policy under Desai was modified from international abstention to forging peaceful relations with all countries.

India has always had a strong, realist foreign policy approach that has been consistent through changing administrations, although economic and political policies have been modified and tailored to meet the requirements of the Global Political Economy. Economic development has been a consistent foreign policy objective albeit the framework of achieving the same has changed from a protectionist policy under Nehru to a realist framework under Gandhi and ultimately to a more liberal approach at fostering multiculturalism today.

Under Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, India adopted a protectionist economic policy aimed at fostering self-reliance and development. In 1980, Indira Gandhi adopted a zero-sum realist policy both domestically and internationally aimed at increasing India’s regional power and security. Under the administration of her successor (and son) Rajiv Gandhi (1984-1989), the Nehruvian dream of an economically competent welfare state of India was carried forward as Gandhi initiated reform measures aimed at liberalizing trade, increasing foreign direct investment and reducing the fiscal deficit. Prime Minister P.V Narasimha Rao (1991-1996) initiated a "Look East" policy in an attempt to expand trading markets to the emerging

91 Ibid., 217

92 Ibid., 218

economies of the East and to counter the growing regional influence of China. 94

Economic liberalization and the privatization of the economy was continued under the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) administration that succeeded the Janata Dal cabinet. The BJP adopted an exceptionally strong realist foreign policy framework, particularly in terms of the Nuclear Non Proliferation treaty that India refused to sign while maintaining that it would reserve its nuclear weapons capabilities for peaceful purposes and territorial protection. 95

Currently, under Prime Minister Narendra Modi, in office since 2014, and the External Affairs Ministry (under the guidance of External Affairs Minister, Sushma Swaraj), India has embarked on an outward focused, international multilateral foreign policy that seeks to strengthen bilateral relations with key strategic players of the Global Political Economy such as the United States of America and China during his first administrative year.96 Modi's foreign policy also places a special emphasis on enhancing regional ties with South Asian neighbors like Pakistan and Bangladesh, engaging in bilateral talks with PM Sheikh Hasina and Pakistani PM Nawaz Sharif at various occasions during his tenure.97
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Modi’s foreign policy doctrine comprises of five key elements "(1) the idea that a strong, self-reliant and confident India will pursue the path of ‘enlightened national interest’, (2) India will help build and strengthen a peaceful, stable, democratic and economically linked neighborhood, (3) An emphasis on soft power expressed through trade, tradition, talent, tourism and technology, (4) multi-track alignment with all great powers, and (5) the willingness to raise issues of concern at a bilateral level (such as with Pakistan vis-à-vis the export of terrorism into Indian Territory)". 

Modi's political endeavors are understood to be an attempt at fostering India's economic ties both regionally and globally. From establishing the New Silk Road (with China to investing in a direct oil pipeline from Iran, Modi's' foreign policy is viewed as a geo-economic strategy aimed at economic progress. 

Political Non Alignment and economic development have been key features of Indian foreign policy since independence. In the 21st century, India continues these foreign policy objectives, albeit in ways that are tailored to the requirements of the 21st century Global Political Economy. The Non Alignment foreign policy of India now seeks to make independent and autonomous decisions at the international arena without foreign intervention or influence. It is understood as the ability to develop India's strategic capabilities to secure national interests and to work towards a more balanced and equitable international order that allows India to grow and develop. 

The Non Alignment principle is particularly relevant today given India's dramatic
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economic growth and growing political influence. Given the dynamic nature of the Global Political Economy including the rise of China as an economic superpower and the decreasing hegemonic control of the United States, it has become more important, than ever before for India to maintain its political autonomy while pursuing its economic development agenda. Rapid economic globalization also necessitates Indian participation and cooperation abroad through multilateral economic and political engagement albeit without compromising on state autonomy or sovereignty.

The principle of Non alignment allows India to maintain state autonomy and sovereignty while maintaining international engagement. “Nonalignment will no longer be limited to avoiding becoming a frontline state in a conflict between two powers. It will instead require a very skillful management of complicated coalitions and opportunities—in environments that may be inherently unstable and volatile rather than structurally settled. This also provides India with rich opportunities, especially if it can leverage into the international domain some of its domestically acquired skills in coalition management and complex negotiation”.

Complex multilateralism requires India to develop a foreign policy that allows India to gain the fruits of cooperation while being grounded in protected state sovereignty, autonomy and independence.

The IBSA alliance enables India to engage internationally while maintain its Non-Aligned political stance. Politically, the IBSA alliance provides India with a Non-Alignment framework that allows it to develop internationally while maintaining domestic sovereignty. IBSA and its democratic framework also allows India to sustain and bolster the image of the “largest

\[101\] Ibid., 9

\[102\] Ibid., 9
democracy of the world”. Economically, the IBSA alliance is a continuation of India’s comprehensive efforts at seeking economic competitiveness internationally while consequently increasing India’s potential to grow as a regional and global superpower. Through IBSA, India is able to maintain its stance on Non Alignment vis-à-vis Western States or China while engaging in global, multilateral alliances for the benefit of the Indian economy.

Brazil

Brazil was a Portuguese colony from the 16th to the 19th century. In 1822, Brazil declared independence and established a constitutional monarchy led by Emperor Pedro I. In 1889, Pedro II was replaced by a Republican military coup which was headed by General Deodoro da Fonseca, under whom Brazil was a constitutional democracy up until 1930.

During the Pre-World War II era in the “ideological climate that discredited liberal and democratic institutions”\textsuperscript{103}, Brazil followed a "developmentalism (or desenvolvimentismo” model aimed at import substitution and industrialization to increase the domestic production of the state.\textsuperscript{104} The independent foreign policy or the “Political Externa Independent” initiated by President Janio Quadros (1961) and continued by his successor João Goulart (1961-1964) also sought to pursue development (through expanded trade and import substitution industrialization) independent from the US-USSR power blocs (while simultaneously expanding trade relations

\textsuperscript{103} Loureiro, Maria Rita. "Economist in the Brazilian government: from developmentalist state to neoliberal policies." \textit{Economist in the Americas} (2009)., 102

with Eastern countries). Brazil’s pre-war foreign policy reflected Brazil’s attempt at delinking from the economic system in an attempt to prevent imperialistic dependency.

However Brazil soon realized that the self-sufficient developmentalism model was inefficient as, in 1961, the Quadros administration facilitated economic expansion while attempting the first ever break from automatic alignment with the United States. From 1961 to 1964, the Quadros administration pursued a nationalistic, independent foreign policy which did not lead to economic self-sufficiency. In the aftermath of the same. The 1964 Brazilian coup d'état established a military regime in Brazil from 1964-85. Rapid leftist economic developments were undertaken during this period which initially led to an increase in the economic growth of the country but eventually resulted in massive inequality and national debts. Brazil witnessed a democratization period during 1985 Fernando Collor de Mello was elected as President and a neo liberal economic framework was adopted. In 1990, Brazil opened up to international trade and adopted a floating exchange rate. The hyperinflation of the military decades and the continuing gross inequality culminated in the election of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva in 2002.

Global politics such as the Second World War followed by the Cold War have been crucial in shaping Brazilian foreign policy which has reflected internal crisis as well as external politics. Through unsuccessful previous attempts at fostering independence and self-sufficiency, Brazilian foreign policy has evolved to be multilateral and liberal. The end of the Cold War and the rise of other key players such as the newly developing countries like India, South Africa, Egypt and Mexico at the international arena prompted a multilateral foreign policy outlook of Brazil, which
has been continued till date.105

President Lula da Silva (2003-2010) expanded bilateral and multilateral relations with countries. Lula believed that it was important to establish and maintain ties with countries of all regions, even those that did not share common views or were in close proximity geographically. Lula believed that "politics of isolation" did not lead to peace and stability.106 Lula’s foreign policy was characterized by multilateralism targeting both the developing states of Africa and Asia while focusing specially on improving ties with regional neighbors in South America.107 Dilma Rousseff’s administration (2011-2016) continued and expanded the strong Brazilian presence in the African continent, initiated under Lula. Foreign policy under Rousseff was characterized by an increase in the efforts aimed at developing bilateral relations with countries of the South, in an attempt to foster South to South relations as well as an increase in Brazil’s role as a regional actor. Additionally, the Rousseff administration was a strong advocate for “global governance reforms”.108 The Rousseff administration pursued the Lula policy of "advocating for reform of global governance institutions and the revision of Global norms"109 while simultaneously pursuing regional integration in Latin America. The creation of the UNASUR (Union of South American Nations), and the expansion of the MERCOSUL (Mercado
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Comum do Sul) are indicators of Brazil's foreign policy commitment to regional integration. Economic liberalization and integration into the Global Political Economy have been key features of Brazilian foreign policy since these reforms were first initiated in the early 1980s. Brazil has consistently pursued economic integration and development while being cautious so as to not compromise on its state autonomy, particularly seeking to prevent over reliance on the United States (while not compromising existing relations with Washington D.C.). As embodied in President Ernesto Geisel's foreign policy of (1974-1979) “responsible pragmatism”, Brazil has sought trade liberalization both at the domestic and international front while engaging in bilateral relations with developing states so as to prevent unitary dependence on any one country. In the past few decades, notions of multilateralism and the need for revised Global governance reform as propagated by Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff have been key extensions of Brazil’s “responsible pragmatism” foreign policy.

The IBSA alliance for Brazil is an expansion of the “responsible pragmatism” foreign policy proposed by President Ernesto Geisel. This foreign policy has two key dimensions. The economic dimension focuses on responsible multilateralism that prevents dependency. The political dimension of the foreign policy focuses on normative engagement to influence Global governance wherein both “normative debates” (regarding changing global norms and values) and
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“conceptual initiatives” (such as the IBSA alliance) are diplomatically pursued to increase international participation and Global influence.\textsuperscript{112}

IBSA fits the Brazilian move from regional to global economics and international diplomacy.\textsuperscript{113} Brazilian foreign policy has chosen to contribute in “normative and conceptual terms” to bridge the unequal economic and diplomatic gap as a part of its "Responsibility while protecting" initiative.\textsuperscript{114} In this regard, IBSA allows Brazil to pursue more equal Global representation, while simultaneously working on issues of Global concern albeit without direct intervention or the use of force. As an emerging power, Brazil has attempted to increase its diplomatic engagement through the normative approach of development aid, peacekeeping missions and the nuclear policy.\textsuperscript{115}

Through the IBSA alliance Brazil has the ability to pursue economic and political ties with emerging markets such as Africa and India while simultaneously maintaining and not risking its economic ties with super powers such as the United States of America. Politically, IBSA also creates the economic opportunity for Brazil to assume the role of a (self-declared) regional leader, by initiating and facilitating inter-continental economic partnership in Latin America with the rest of the world though IBSA as led by Brazil, that would facilitate the development of Latin American countries and their subsequent recognition of Brazil’s role in the region.


\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 42
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South Africa

From 1948 to 1994, South Africa was plagued by Apartheid, a political and social system that segregated society on the basis of race as Whites and non-Whites. Non-Whites, and particularly the native black population, were denied basic rights and economically oppressed under the system. Apartheid was internationally criticized and South Africa was internationally isolated till Apartheid ended in 1994.

Post-apartheid, South Africa’s foreign policy has been focused on reintegrating into the international order and has been characterized, at least initially, by strong advocacy and promotion of democracy and human rights. Nelson Mandela (1994-1999) set the precedent for a foreign policy that focused on adopting and promoting a democratic framework,\(^{116}\) establishing strong regional ties with African neighboring countries,\(^{117}\) and developing a vibrant economy that catered to poverty alleviation and income inequality reduction.\(^{118}\) Mandela's foreign policy was heavily centered on human rights and the promotion of civil liberties and democratization.\(^{119}\) Regionalism and internationalism were key features of South Africa's foreign policy that was initiated under Mandela. "There was a strongly held belief that South Africa could not remain an 'island of prosperity in a sea of poverty'"\(^{120}\) and therefore, efforts were made to increase regional


\(^{117}\) Ibid., 90
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cooperation and development. The main aim of foreign policy under Mandela was reorientation into the international political system.

Multilateralism was continued under the neoliberal economic policy initiated under Thabo Mbeki (1999-2008), along with strengthening South Africa’s regional role and initiating changes in the global order. South Africa’s foreign policy under Mbeki “began to distance the organization (ANC) from its commitment to socialist ideas and moved to articulate policy programmes which converged with the post-Cold War neo-liberal international system. This involved recognition, at least in theory, of uni polarity, globalization, and the importance of geo-economics, the general marginalization of Africa and its decidedly peripheral status in the Global economy”. Under Mbeki’s administration, South Africa actively pursued the reformation of international institutions along with stronger bilateral ties with countries of the Global South, while establishing itself as a key player in Africa's regional development. Mbeki's foreign policy sought to strengthen regional ties under the "African renaissance" dream and to extend multilateral relations through trade with countries. The 'African Renaissance' policy was manifested in a twofold policy. The first, focused on strengthening Africa’s regional agenda and
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the second included developing South Africa as an internationally competent country both economically and politically. Mbeki adopted a new liberal economic policy on foreign investment and market operations. Mbeki’s foreign policy asserted that the South African identity was one of a “developing state, committed to eliminating ‘Global apartheid’ in both the economic and political terrains”. Mbeki’s “African Renaissance” was to pursue an African identity while initiating reforms in the existing Global institutions. It was under this agenda, that Mbeki established NEPAD (New Partnership for African Development) that would allow African countries to undertake a modern reconstruction program and gain from benefits of large scale, mutual cooperation. Furthermore, the South African Development Community (SADC) was established to monitor and mediate democracy and human rights to prevent conflict and preserve stability in the region.

South Africa under Mbeki often played the role of regional mediator in African conflicts. Foreign policy under Mbeki sought to maintain regional peace and to promote regional stability. At several occasions, South Africa stepped in as the regional mediator: Mbeki pursued the Mozambican opposition party to rejoin elections in 1994, resolved a political crisis in Lesotho, and
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and pursued the rebel movements in Democratic Republic of Congo to sign a ceasefire along with intervening in the Kenyan election crisis of 2007.\textsuperscript{131}

The transition from Mbeki to Kgalema Motlanthe was characterized by "continuity not change".\textsuperscript{132} Motlanthe made efforts to continue regional trade and cooperation through the common Market for East and Southern Africa (COMESA). In terms of multilateral trade, Motlanthe affirmed commitment to trade relations with India and Brazil while extending South Africa’s relations with China. Regional mediation was also pursued as a policy agenda as Motlanthe encouraged political dialogue in Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Somalia.\textsuperscript{133} "During the transition from Mbeki to Zuma, there was continuity in policy on paper but detours in practice".\textsuperscript{134} Although Jacob Zuma assured continuity in foreign policy, there were notable discrepancies in assured foreign policy and the actual execution of the same. South Africa’s decision to abstain from condemning Syria's excesses in the United Nations General Assembly and the decision to not support the condemnation of human rights violation charges against the Bashar al- Assad regime, were two of such major discrepancies noted. Mbeki’s ambitious international agendas under Zuma’s cabinet, were reoriented towards "modest" regionalism\textsuperscript{135}
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South Africa’s foreign policy post-Apartheid has focused on two key issues: the need to integrate into the international society and to gain benefits of the international system while simultaneously maintaining its African identity, political sovereignty and autonomy. The IBSA alliance allows South Africa to effectively pursue both these foreign policy objectives. Firstly, it allows South Africa to join a South to South multilateral alliance and to gain the economic benefits of the international market. IBSA enables South Africa to form strategic partnerships with emerging markets such as Brazil and India and to develop its own market potential through mutual cooperation and partnership. Secondly, the alliance enables South Africa to counter what it sees as the neo colonial international order and to gain political legitimacy. For South Africa, the IBSA alliance is both a political statement against the neo colonial order and an economic alliance that weakens the influence of the neo colonial order and enables South Africa to break the chains of dependency.

Under IBSA, South Africa not only gains from multilateral cooperation but also has the ability to pursue its normative policies of democracy, human rights and sustainable development (which continue to be an important function of South African foreign policy from Mandela and Mbeki and then to Zuma) unlike other international institutions such as the BRICS where South Africa is restricted to economic development. At IBSA, South Africa has the opportunity to address key issues of Global concern such as human rights and democracy. IBSA through its Dialogue Forum and Working Groups, caters to the important normative functions of South African foreign policy.

2.2 IBSA AND THE MANIFESTATION OF CONVERGENT FOREIGN
POLICY OBJECTIVES

Foreign policy analysis of India, Brazil and South Africa reveal similarities and convergences in the political and economic objectives of the three IBSA countries in setting up and maintaining the alliance. IBSA as an institution therefore was established to converge and coordinate the foreign policy objectives of the IBSA states while simultaneously providing a platform for mutual development through cooperation on matters of political and economic interest. The IBSA model (at least in theory) provides the mechanism for these three countries to achieve their key, convergent foreign policy objectives of Emerging as a regional leader in the respective regions, Achieving development through cooperation and reforming International Institutions as well as the Creation of a new world order focused on the Global South.\textsuperscript{136}

The extent to which IBSA has actually manage to coordinate and achieve these foreign policy objectives is a crucial indicator of the continued relevance of the IBSA alliance both as an international organization and a tripartite partnership of the Global South.

The following section analyses the extent to which the IBSA alliance has been successful at achieving the three convergent foreign policy objectives of IBSA states, which are: emerging as a regional leader in the respective regions, achieving development through cooperation and the creation of a new world order focused on the Global South. In each subsection, the actual level

\textsuperscript{136} The three key convergent foreign policy objectives are based on convergence as observed in consistent trends and similar foreign policy objectives of all the individual three IBSA countries in the preceding foreign policy analysis section. Secondly, the three broad, convergent policies have also been discussed at various IBSA summits and meetings as noted in the subsequent section. Thirdly, interviews conducted with diplomats from IBSA and IBSA countries also confirm these three broad policies as foreign policy objectives of the IBSA countries as noted in the subsequent section.
of achievement of IBSA states will be compared to the officially stated goals and objectives. This section seeks to analyze the extent of IBSA achievement by comparing actual level of achievement to officially stated goals and objectives.

2.2 I Emerging as a regional leader:

2.2 I A. IBSA’s role in regional leadership:

“India, Brazil and South Africa are three strategically located countries in continents of great, unharnessed potential. One of the more implicit undertakings of IBSA is to help the IBSA countries unleash their potential as regional leaders. Such an undertaking could help these countries in their pursuit of a new Global order”.137

In the seventh Trilateral Commission Meeting of IBSA, attended by The Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of India, S M Krishna, the Minister of External Relations of the Federative Republic of Brazil, Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, and the Minister of International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa, Ambassador Maite Nkoana-Mashabane in New Delhi in 2011, the ministers asserted the mutual need for reforming the United Nations Security Council to make it more inclusive of "representation of developing countries”138. Reforming the UN Security Council and the inclusion of India, Brazil and South Africa as permanent members of the Security Council was proposed on the grounds of increasing the
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representation of the three respective continents. “Towards this end, the representation of developing countries from Africa, Asia and Latin America is essential. Such reform in the United Nations Security Council is of utmost importance to reflect contemporary geopolitical realities and to enhance its representativeness, effectiveness and legitimacy”. 139

The IBSA countries have implicitly assumed and claimed the responsibility of representing South Asia, Latin America and Africa. IBSA claims to be representative of the voices of countries of the Global South particularly in high profile international meetings such as the G8 and G20 summits. For instance, a South African diplomat of IBSA asserted that through IBSA, South Africa strives to represent the voice of Africa in international institutions. “IBSA is focused on promoting issues of common agenda and issues pertaining to the imbalanced Global system where Global institutions are more focused towards the North and biased towards the Global South. In critical international institutions like the United Nations Security Council, Bretton Woods and IMF, there are continuing and often contested issues of lack of voting rights and representation of developing South countries. Decisions made in these forums are detrimental towards countries that are not adequately represented. IBSA therefore represents not only South Africa but also the whole continent as they bring along continental agendas representing Africa as a whole consensus”. 140

Similarly, a senior Brazilian official stated that “IBSA is more than a partnership between India,

139 IBSA TRILATERAL. INDIA-BRAZIL-SOUTH AFRICA DIALOGUE FORUM. 7th Trilateral Commission Meeting Ministerial Communique, New Delhi, 2011., 1

140 South African IBSA, Diplomat. "The significance of the "IBSA" India, Brazil, South Africa alliance on the Global Political Economy". Personal interview by author. January 10, 2017
Brazil and South Africa. IBSA strives to keep the demands of the developing countries on the table at international meetings. IBSA is an umbrella institution for the development agendas of developing states.”  

2.2 I B. IBSA’s role in regional representation

But to what extent have the IBSA countries emerged as regional leaders representing the needs of their respective regions? This part of the analysis will draw upon the theoretical and conceptual framework dealing with regional powers as outlined by Daniel Flemes in *Regional leadership in the Global system: ideas, interests and strategies of regional powers*.

According to Flemes, two of the main determining factors for classifying a country as a "regional leader" include the self-declared regional leader's ability to aid development or provide collective goods in the region and the acceptance of leadership by co-regional follower countries. Under this framework, "the status of a regional power is a social category that seems to depend upon the recognition of this status and the corresponding power hierarchy by other states. Nevertheless, the inclusion in this social category also presupposes the corresponding material resources.”

The development of India, Brazil and South Africa as regional leaders can be measured on the
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basis of two basic criteria: a) to what extent has IBSA contributed to regional development or promoted regional cooperation? b) To what extent has IBSA received recognition or acceptance from other countries for its role as a regional leader? To be a successful regional leader, IBSA countries not only have to use the IBSA platform for the benefit of the countries of the regions they claim to be representing, but also need to receive the recognition and approval of the countries in the region to validate their positions as regional leaders.

In this regard, IBSA states have made comprehensive efforts at increasing regional and multilateral cooperation through the IBSA platform. In the 3rd IBSA Trilateral Ministerial Commission Meeting Communiqué, IBSA partners extended their support for the implementation of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) as well as towards the South American Community of Nations which was recognized for establishing and extending political and economic links in South America.\(^{144}\) Through IBSA, economic cooperation was enhanced through the development of transshipment facilities, connecting not only the IBSA countries but also regional players in the respective continents. A shipping pathway was established between MERCOSUL (comprising Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela), SACU (comprising Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, and Swaziland) and India.\(^{145}\) Furthermore, preferential trade agreements were implemented among India, SACU and MERCOSUL to enhance the market links between these three blocks and to further the South to

\(^{144}\) IBSA TRILATERAL. INDIA-BRAZIL-SOUTH AFRICA DIALOGUE FORUM. 3rd IBSA Trilateral Ministerial Commission Meeting Communiqué. Rio De Janeiro , 2006., 5

\(^{145}\) Ibid., 16
South cooperation agenda.\textsuperscript{146}

IBSA states have also made an effort to extend their financial and technical assistance to regional actors while incorporating the needs and objectives of regional actors in the IBSA agenda. IBSA states have worked to establish multilateral, inter-continental links. For instance: along with committing to share “developmental experience” with NEPAD to further the objectives of the African Union, the IBSA countries also agreed to “consider partnership with the Pan-African Infrastructure Development Programme's projects”.\textsuperscript{147} In terms of regional development and leadership initiative, the IBSA fund was used to contribute significantly to the agricultural development in Guinea Bissau.\textsuperscript{148} IBSA also extended its support for the work of the UN Peacebuilding Commission in Guinea Bissau.\textsuperscript{149} An important observation regarding the operation and distribution of funds under the IBSA Fund, as noted by Vieira, Marco is that the development assistance provided by the IBSA Fund does not come with terms and conditions that traditional donors such as the IMF and the World Bank are known to have imposed on donor countries. "Unlike traditional Western donors, the IBSA partners often engage as development partners, facilitators and enablers rather than ‘teachers’ of best behavior”.\textsuperscript{150} Through the non-
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interventionist distribution of Funds, IBSA lives up to its core value of facilitating development through cooperation in developing countries.

Regional blocs headed by Brazil and South Africa such as the MERCOSUR and SACU have been well factored into the functioning of IBSA established Working Groups. IBSA has also made an attempt to develop and strengthen these regional ties through bilateral trade and information exchange. Given these various regional development agendas and achievements, IBSA seems to have made satisfactory attempts at accommodating the regional economic needs of Latin America and African countries along with occasionally extending its political solidarity to the region.\(^{151}\)

However, the inter-continental cooperation seems to have had less of an impact in influencing India’s regional ties with its neighbors, which for the most part seems to be completely absent under the IBSA framework. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), comprising of Afghanistan, India, Bhutan, Pakistan, Nepal, the Maldives, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka were not included in any of the major trilateral meetings or IBSA Working Groups. India’s regional trade in South Asia is much undeveloped and accounts for a meagre sum of India’s total trade value. At 0.15% of India’s export share percentage with Afghanistan, 1.78% with Bangladesh, 0.05% with Bhutan, 0.04% with Maldives, 0.95% with Nepal, 0.65% with Pakistan and 1.41% with Sri Lanka, the total trade with the SAARC together accounts for barely

5% of India’s total share of trade (As of total trade value in 2013).\textsuperscript{152} Furthermore, India was the only South Asian representative for intercontinental trading groups formed under IBSA. The lack of successful integration of other South Asian players in the intercontinental trade groups or agreements is a clear indicator of India’s validation (or rather the lack of it) as a regional leader in South Asia.

\textbf{2.2 I C. Gaining regional recognition for regional leadership efforts}

On the issue of regional assistance for their efforts, IBSA countries are yet to receive substantial cooperation and reciprocal support from their regional neighbors in their role as regional leaders. The lack of recognition of IBSA countries as regional leader has been referred to by Vieira and Alden as the “paradox of leadership”\textsuperscript{153}, which in essence means that while IBSA countries have been recognized and encouraged by Western Powers to assume more regional leadership (a conclusion that is drawn from the fact that IBSA countries have been invited to be part of important multilateral talks at the G8 and the World Economic forum), their role as regional leaders remain unrecognized and their potential remains unharnessed. “IBSA state's capacity to act effectively as managers within their respective regions remain only partially subscribed to and, in some spheres actively disputed by neighboring states. The limited recognition of India, Brazil and South Africa as regional leaders by states that make up their regions put a significant break on the fulfilment of their own aspirations, individually and through IBSA, as well as

\textsuperscript{152} "India Exports by Country and Region." India | Export to all country | 2013 | WITS | Data. Accessed April 01, 2017.

contradicting internationally held expectations as to their states.

Therefore, in terms of emerging as regional leaders, India seems to have fallen behind on satisfactorily accommodating the needs and objectives of the region through the IBSA alliance. Furthermore, all three IBSA states are yet to receive the support and cooperation of their regional partners. Although IBSA has been used to accommodate pan-continental needs, it has not managed to gain pan-continental support (or legitimacy) for its efforts.

2.2 Achieving Development through cooperation

The IBSA alliance is said to be centered on development through cooperation; development under IBSA is defined as initiating projects aimed at attaining the Millennium Development Goals with reducing poverty and hunger, increasing sustainability, creating jobs and making effective use of technology as top priorities, with poverty and inequality being two of the most pressing national concerns in all three countries. As of 2011, in India, 273 million (29.8% of the population) people were living below the poverty line (less than $1.90 a day), with a Gini index of 35 (Gini index of 0 represents perfect equality, while an index of 100 implies perfect inequality). In Brazil as of 2011, 11.1% of the population was living below the poverty line,
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with a Gini index of 53.1\textsuperscript{157}. In South Africa, as of 2010, 53.8\% of the population was living below poverty line with a country GINI index of 63.4 as of 2011\textsuperscript{158}

As PM of India, Manmohan Singh stated in his opening statement at the Plenary Session of the IBSA Summit in 2011, the IBSA alliance is “underpinned by three pillars - political consultation and coordination; multi-sectoral trilateral cooperation; and execution of development projects in third needy countries”.\textsuperscript{159}

Development centered cooperation was conceived to be at the heart of this unique tripartite partnership. There are two broad frameworks under which IBSA pursues its agenda of development through cooperation. Firstly, IBSA has established Joint Working Groups and People-to-People forums (along with the IBSA Fund that falls under this category) that serve as organizational branches focused on development in key areas of mutual concern. Secondly, IBSA pursues development through inter-IBSA trade. This subsection analyzes IBSA’s achievements and efficiencies in both the two major organizational frameworks aimed at development i.e.: the Joint Working Groups (along with the Forums and the IBSA Fund) and secondly, the inter-IBSA trade.


To provide a brief overview of the organizational structure of IBSA, it revolves around fourteen established Joint Working Groups, six 'People-to-People Forum', and annual 'Focal Points', Regular Trilateral Commission's, IBSA Summits, IBSA Fund, IBSA Business Forums and Other meeting arrangements. The Joint Working Groups focuses on fourteen main areas of cooperation between IBSA countries which include: Transport; Health; Education; Defense; Science & Technology; Trade & Investment; Culture; Agriculture; Energy; Public Administration and Governance, Revenue Administration, Human Settlement, Environment and Social Development.

The ‘People to People’ forums are aimed at expanding government efforts to people at the 'grass root levels'. The six main areas of cooperation of the People-to-People Forums include Parliamentary Forum, Women's Forum, Academic Forum, Local Governance Forum, Business Forum, and Editors' Forum. The annual Focal points are precedents to the Trilateral Commissions that facilitate meetings between delegates from the three countries. Furthermore, the IBSA fund (based on contribution by all three countries) is responsible for facilitating cooperation between the IBSA countries by establishing a mechanism through which development projects of the IBSA states are financed.\(^{160}\)

2.2 II A. Development through cooperation: An assessment based on IBSA’s Joint Working Groups and Forums

IBSA has taken pride in its multi-faceted approach to development. As Prime Minister

Manmohan Singh stated at the Plenary Session of the IBSA Summit in South Africa, “The IBSA framework is unique because it goes beyond just government-to-government interaction. It touches the lives of our people by facilitating dialogue among civil society and other important sections of society”. ¹⁶¹ The IBSA forum and the multiple Working Groups has been used as a platform for the participating states to share information on development for the benefit of the IBSA states as well as for other developing countries. A senior Indian diplomat who previously worked with IBSA stated that “The IBSA cooperation extends its economic and social developments for the benefit of other developing states. The trilateral commission, the IBSA Working Groups and people to people forums are essential components of the IBSA alliance that aid in development and facilitate a participatory environment at the grass root level”. ¹⁶²

Have the Working Groups and Forums been able to contribute to cooperation led development?

A study conducted by Oliver Stuenkel including interviews conducted with public officials associated with IBSA Working Groups discovered that there are various bureaucratic discrepancies and delays associated with the Working Groups.¹⁶³ There is a lack of a clear framework for the Working Groups as well as an absence of incentives for the Working Groups to coordinate and cooperate. There are also no efficiently established lines of communication within the Working Groups across the three countries, which lead to delays in sending and


¹⁶² Senior Indian, Diplomat. "The significance of the "IBSA" India, Brazil, South Africa alliance on the Global Political Economy". Skype interview by author. September 20, 2016.

receiving important information. High levels of corruption in the three countries and the lack of professionalism are two organizational obstacles towards facilitating effective cooperation. Geographical distance and the large time gap further hinder easy communication.\textsuperscript{164} The efficiency of the Working Groups are also challenged by the geographical distance and language barriers that exist among them. Furthermore the lack of available budgetary funds that stem from the lack of interest of foreign ministers or cabinets in charge, lead to structural inefficiencies and delays in implementation.\textsuperscript{165}

Despite organizational inefficiencies, the success of IBSA Working Groups should not be limited to material results alone. One of the main objectives behind establishing joint Working Groups was to facilitate mutual learning from the experiences of IBSA states. Therefore, it is important to analyze the efficiency of the Working Group on the basis of its contribution to facilitating dialogue and encouraging research. In this regard, it is important to note that despite organizational obstacles that delay efficient results, the Joint Working Groups facilitate dialogue. Joint Working Groups and subsequent summits and meetings held under these Working Groups provide a platform for IBSA states to engage in dialogue and aid states in finding common grounds for cooperation and collaboration among three countries that are geographically


separated and cannot afford the luxury of regional cooperation with each other. Furthermore, the transnational links built through the working groups increase the socialization between the IBSA countries. The capacity building initiatives and knowledge sharing programs facilitated by the working groups allow the countries of the South to learn and replicate models from the South (This is particularly important as the countries of the South share more historical, geographical and economic similarities and therefore models produced by the South are more beneficial for the countries of the South compared to models borrowed from the North)  

As proposed in the Brasilia declaration, the IBSA states have made attempts at reaffirming "their commitment to the promotion of peace, security, human rights, and sustainable social and economic development in the world". The Dialogue Forum has been instrumental in initiating discussions and drafting resolutions on issues of climate change and global warming. Furthermore, the Dialogue Forum has also been used tackle issues related to Human Rights and fundamental freedom along with reaffirming the peaceful use and application of nuclear weapons in states (despite divergent nuclear weapon policies).

Most importantly, the IBSA Development Fund set up under this framework, has also been hailed a success despite a meagre contribution amount of $1 million by member states. Through the IBSA Fund, three projects including waste management in Haiti, small scale agricultural
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development in Guinea Bissau and health care clinic in Cape Verde have been completed along with four other projects that are nearing completion: HIV testing counselling center in Burundi, sports center in Palestine, a school in Gaza and an undertaking in Laos.  

The Working Group have initiated dialogue among states and the IBSA fund has been used effectively to counter developmental concerns. However there are several organizational inefficiencies that reduce the potential of these groups.

2.2 II B. Development through cooperation: An assessment based on inter-IBSA trade

Another crucial element of the IBSA cooperation is the intra IBSA trade. Intra IBSA trade has been boosted by the various multilateral agreements undertaken by IBSA. The IBSA Action Plan on Trade Facilitation for Standards and Technical Regulations and Conformity Assessment was signed on the 1st IBSA Summit. Trilateral Free Trade Agreements were also established to increase regional cooperation. Under the Trade and Investment Joint Working Group, IBSA has managed to establish trade standardization procedures through Bureau of Indian standards (BIS), South African Bureau of standards (SABS) and the Brazilian Association of Technical Norms (ABNT) agencies. Furthermore, a Business Forum (attended by business delegations from leading corporations of the respective states) was established to promote convergence and
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cooperation in key economic sectors.\textsuperscript{173}

Regarding the efficiency of these efforts, studies conducted on Intra-IBSA trade, have concluded that the establishment of the IBSA forum has contributed to a "healthy rate of growth" of intra-IBSA trade.\textsuperscript{174} According to information published by the International Trade center on bilateral trade statistics, both the total import and export value of trade (for all trade products) among IBSA countries have increased from 2003 to 2013 (a decade after the establishment of IBSA)

\textbf{In terms of imports:} Indian imports from Brazil was at $312 million\textsuperscript{175} in 2003 and $3,831 million in 2013, witnessing an 1128% increase in import value. Indian imports from South Africa witnessed a 278% increase in trade value from $1,945 million in 2003 to $7,351 million in 2013 (Figure 1). Similarly for the case of Brazil, Brazilian imports from India grew by 1211% in 2013 (from $485 million to $6,357 million) and imports from South Africa grew by 255% (from $202 million in 2003 to $719 million in 2013) (Figure 2). For South Africa, imports from India grew by 1193% (from $416 million in 2003 to $5,377 million in 2013) and imports from Brazil grew by 126% (from $712 million to $1,607 million) (Figure 3).

\textbf{In terms of exports:} Indian exports from Brazil grew by 1475% (from $388 million to $6111 million) and exports from South Africa grew by 1130% ($467 million to 5,742 million) (Figure

\begin{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{175} Figures have been rounded up and denominated in millions of US Dollars. Source: (ITC), International Trade Centre. "Trade statistics for international business development." Trade Map., Accessed March 12, 2017
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1). Brazilian exports from India grew by 466% (from $553 million to $3,130 million) and exports from South Africa grew by 150% (from $733 million to $1,836 million) (Figure 2). For South Africa, exports from India grew by 692% (from $380 million to $3,008 million) and exports from Brazil grew by 271% (from $177 million to $656 million) (Figure 3).176

"Taking both import and export figures into account, it would appear that intra-IBSA trade grew marginally faster in the decade following the establishment of the IBSA Forum than in the decade preceding it. Furthermore, growth in intra-IBSA trade has continued to outpace growth in total IBSA trade in the first decade of the IBSA Forum's existence. These facts would suggest that the IBSA Forum may indeed have had a positive effect in terms of promoting intra-IBSA trade".177

---
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![Bar chart showing trade value in millions of US$ for imports and exports between India and South Africa for the years 2003 and 2013.](image)

*Figure 1*

Brazilian Trade with India and South Africa
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*Figure 2*
Although IBSA has increased inter-IBSA trade, it has been less successful in their pursuit of trade independence and South-to-South cooperation, which has been one of the founding objectives of the IBSA states. Studies have concluded that IBSA trade flows with China have surpassed the level of intra-IBSA trade.  

To represent this statistically, out of India’s total trade import value the percentage of the total trade value with China at 11.08% was more than the combined share with Brazil (0.82%), South Africa (at 1.58%) and the United States (4.85%). Brazil too has the highest import share

---

percentage with China (15.57%). Interestingly, for Brazil the share percentage with the United States (15.14%) is almost equal to the trade percentage with China. Import value from India (2.65%) and South Africa (0.30%) barely accounts for 3 percentage of the total import trade value. This trend is consistent through all three IBSA countries as South African import percentage share from India accounted for 5.2% of its total import trade value and the percentage share from Brazil was at 1.55% while import share from the United States accounted for 6.35% and an enormous section of the trade percentage was with China at 15.47%

Similarly for exports, India's export percentage with the United States (12.46%) is higher than the export percentage with Chia (4.88%). Furthermore, Chinese export trade percentage is still higher than the percentage with Brazil (1.82%) and South Africa (1.71%) combined (Figure 4). Brazil's export with China (19.01%) and the United States (10.27%) is significantly higher than the export percentage with South Africa (0.76%) and India (1.29%) combined (Figure 5). South African export trade with China (12.67%) surpasses the trade percentage with the United States (7.24%), India (3.16%) and Brazil (0.69%) (Figure 6).\textsuperscript{179}

Therefore, although intra-IBSA trade flows suggest a shift away from traditional markets of the North, increasing trade flows with China indicate a shift to markets of the East. IBSA has not been entirely successful in fostering market independence by relying solely on South to South cooperation.\textsuperscript{180}
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Furthermore, in understanding the efficiency of IBSA trade, a study measuring Intra-IBSA trade and market access from the period of 2001-2011, identified several barriers both tariff and nontariff barriers that hindered the market accessibility. Most of IBSA trade continue to be conducted under the MFN basis of framework (Most Favored Nation Framework) despite initiatives aimed at trade liberalization.\textsuperscript{181} There continues to exist high tariff on key trade goods such as agricultural goods, prepared foodstuff, beverages, textiles and arms and ammunitions.\textsuperscript{182} Furthermore, wide disparities between the average minimum bound tariff rates and the average maximum bound tariff rates also hinder easy trade flows.\textsuperscript{183}

Regarding the efficiency of Preferential Trade Agreements, it is to be noted that the SACU-MERCOSUR Trade Agreement has not yet been ratified by the Department of Trade and Industry of South Africa. Furthermore, the existing agreement covers only a limited range of tariff lines out of the 7000 tariff lines that exist between South Africa and South America.\textsuperscript{184} The India-SACU Preferential Trade Agreement was initiated to boost current levels of trade in key areas such as pharmaceuticals, machinery and automobiles. Despite several bilateral meetings
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held in this regard, the Preferential Trade Agreement has not yet been signed. Only 63.2% of the
current tariff lines are accounted for in this agreement and even that figure has not been ratified
since the treaty is yet to be signed.\textsuperscript{185} A trilateral SACU-MERCOSUR-India is still being
discussed and is yet to be materialized or ratified by states.\textsuperscript{186}

Furthermore, there are several non-tariff barriers that restrict market access such as geographical
distance, limited shipping and air connections, frequent port delays, insufficient cooperation
along trade routes and an absence of cargo vessels dedicated to IBSA trade.\textsuperscript{187} There is a lack of
sufficient information regarding IBSA initiative and business opportunities provided under IBSA
which reduces the potential and incentive to conduct business.\textsuperscript{188} Import licensing and custom
regulations are said to be non-transparent and time consuming especially due to the lack of a
centralized and regulated system dealing with import regulations and tariff and custom duties.\textsuperscript{189}

\textbf{2.2 III The creation of a new world order focused on countries of the Global South}

The growing political significance and economic progress of the BRICS has provoked
skepticism regarding the relevance and scope of the IBSA alliance on impacting the Global
Political Economy. The presence of China and Russia in BRICS contributes in tipping the
political balance in favor of BRICS. Furthermore, BRICS has taken a more proactive initiative
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role in international affairs compared to IBSA. While BRICS has conducted 8 international
summits, IBSA has hosted only 5 in comparison. The latest BRICS summit was conducted
recently in October 2016 while the last IBSA was conducted 5 years ago in 2011. Apart from
conducting annual BRICS Summit meetings, leaders from participating countries of BRICS have
been regularly meeting and conducting talks over the BRICS agenda.
BRICS like IBSA, has also addresses political and economic issues related to existing trade
measures, climate concerns and developmental issues. BRICS through China has also extended
its agenda to cover political and security issues. In fact, IBSA and BRICS have several areas
of common concerns such as in issues relating to global governance, maritime trade concerns,
and reformation of trade systems (IBSA and BRICS however, completely differ on the issue of
the reformation of the United Nations Security Council). But in terms of areas of common
concern, BRICS seems to have overshadowed IBSA in practical observation.
In comparison to BRICS, IBSA seems to currently lack momentum and active international
participation. State leaders, politicians and diplomats have not been as engaged with IBSA as
they have been with BRICS lately. BRICS which started off as a geo-economic group has
gradually expanded its agenda to include geo-political issues while IBSA, on the other hand, was
initially thought of as a geo-political group had had less substantial standing politically and
economically.

---

190 Panda, Jagannath P. 2013. “China and IBSA: Possible BRICS overreach?”, *Strategic Analysis*
37 (3): 299-304., 299

191 Gupta, Surupa. "The significance of the "IBSA" India, Brazil, South Africa alliance on the
Global Political Economy." Skype interview by author. February 27, 2017.
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Is IBSA then still relevant as an international organization? The answer to the continued significance of IBSA (especially amidst the recent rise in prominence of BRICS) can be understood firstly, through IBSA’s influence in reforming international institutions and secondly, in changing Global norms for the benefit of countries of the South.  

2.2 III A IBSA’s role in Reforming International Institutions: A foundational agenda of the IBSA alliance has been to counter the imbalance of the Global Political Economy, which IBSA states have felt had largely disregarded the countries of the South. At a ministerial joint summit, IBSA diplomats expressed their grave concern over the need for reformation of the current framework of international institutions. “The current political economy is skewed towards established powers of the West. Developing countries like India, Brazil and South Africa are at a severe disadvantage at the international arena as we (IBSA states) are both underrepresented and unheard. There is a dire need to change for reformation of International Institutions that will aid in accommodating the interest of developing nations”. IBSA aims to reform international institutions to make them more inclusive of the developing countries. Two of the main international institutions which IBSA sought to reform are the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

193 Although there are several measures to gauge IBSA’s impact on creating a new world order, reforming international institutions and changing global norms have been two of the most discussed issues at IBSA meetings and summits (as discussed in the subsequent section).

194 Senior Indian, Diplomat. "The significance of the "IBSA" India, Brazil, South Africa alliance on the Global Political Economy". Skype interview by author. September 20, 2016
IBSA was founded for the purpose of reforming international institutions and for unifying the voices of the Global South at an international arena. As explained by a Brazilian Foreign Service Officer: “IBSA aims to change Global norms by continuously engaging with a common agenda. A common agenda, aimed at a common goal is very important for influencing Global dynamics through a common position. It is an exemplification of the voice of the Global South, by the Global South and for the Global South. IBSA focuses on "unifying and amplifying" the voices of the Global South. IBSA is based on three blocks, represented by individual countries. It is therefore, important to have a common approach (such as regarding the reformation of international institutions) so there is one voice, from every Southern continent, representing the needs of the continent”.  

IBSA countries have coordinated political efforts at initiating a reform of the current United Nations Security Council structure. This has been a priority that these states have pursued individually for years- a longstanding foreign policy objective. Brazil and India have also actively lobbied for a permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council. However, despite active lobbying and strong international support, India, Brazil and South Africa are yet to be given a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council, although both Brazil and India are quite hopeful of a positive reformation within the coming few years. IBSA managed to
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significantly contribute to the “Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters related to the Security Council” also known as the “Working Group” aimed at structural reform of the United Nations.\textsuperscript{197} A draft prepared by India, and co-sponsored by Brazil and South Africa pushed for “expansion in both permanent and non-permanent categories; greater representation of the developing countries and representation of the developed countries.”\textsuperscript{198} In doing so IBSA managed to initiate negotiation, unite the voices of developing countries, “reiterate inter-governmental negotiation” and “strengthen cooperation” at the United Nations.\textsuperscript{199} Unfortunately, IBSA is yet to achieve complete reformation of the United Nations Security Council or even a permanent seat at the UNSC.

IBSA participating countries have also sought to reform certain procedures of the World Trade Organization (WTO). In the Brazilian Declaration of 2003, IBSA countries decided to merge their cooperation towards securing negotiations and change at the Doha Round of WTO, particularly in terms of reforming protectionist policies.\textsuperscript{200} The Doha Round was aimed at reforming the international trading system by introducing lower tariff barriers along with revising existing trade rules. The Doha Development Agenda aimed at improving trading
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prospects, particularly for developing countries. India, Brazil and South Africa effectively collaborated and coordinated their positions on the need for immediate reform of the WTO and demanded to resume negotiations on the matter. This is exemplified by a statement by an IBSA Delegate: “India, Brazil and South Africa recalled the outcome of the G-20 High-Level Meeting held in Rio de Janeiro on 9 and 10 September 2006, and reiterated that they shall spare no effort to resume the negotiations sooner rather than later. On the road ahead, the progress achieved so far must be fully preserved. We cannot retreat. The level of ambition of the Doha Development Agenda must be maintained. The needs and aspirations of developing countries will only be met with an ambitious outcome to the Round that will reduce protectionism and end distortions.”

IBSA countries were successful in securing a "TRIPS Waiver" at the 2003 WTO General Council Decision in addition to drafting a "Ministerial Document" at the WTO Ministerial Conference in 2003. IBSA countries are also said to have been instrumental in implementing and continuing the success of the G20 cooperation.

The joint efforts of IBSA countries have played a crucial role in skewing negotiations in favor of developing countries. "As large emerging economies such as India and Brazil have assumed more prominent roles in the negotiations, the ability of traditional powers such as the US and the
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201 IBSA TRILATERAL. INDIA-BRAZIL-SOUTH AFRICA DIALOGUE FORUM, 1st IBSA Summit Declaration, Brasilia, 2006., 12


EU to dictate the agenda of these negotiations has diminished.\textsuperscript{204} In fact, IBSA is one of the important forums to actually rise the question for the various needs of the countries of the Global South.\textsuperscript{205}

IBSA states have been able to successfully coordinate their positions for the reformation of the WTO trade procedures and have been instrumental in initiating change in this regard. Through its diplomatic efforts and political unification, IBA has become pressure group for international reform and organizational reform\textsuperscript{206}

2.2 III B. IBSA’s role in Changing Global Norms: One of the most important goals of the IBSA Tripartite alliance has been to change Global norms in favor of developing countries- and to have the Global South put forward its own "Global norms"\textsuperscript{207} which is an important element of the IBSA alliance as well as international theories that govern the principles of IBSA. As explained in “"The constructivist turn in International Relations theory”, the term “global norms” have different connotations in various international relations theories. For instance: realism understands norms to be lacking of any "causal force".\textsuperscript{208} Liberals understand norms to be
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"superstructures built on material base" and understand norms to be regulatory factors. Conversely, according to neoliberal theories of International Relations, states are agents that create structures comprising of norms and institutions, on the other hand the constructivist approach to IR understands norms as "collective understandings that make behavioral claims on actors". Along with regulating behavior, norms are understood to be crucial in shaping identities and interests of actors. "Norms are no longer a superstructure on a material base; rather, they help to create and define that base. For constructivists, agents (states) and structures (Global norms) are interacting; they are mutually constituted".

At the heart of the IBSA tripartite alliance was the resonating desire to create a new world order. IBSA states pledged to be the architects of a new inclusive and representative world order that is inclusive of the needs of the developing countries. As expressed by an IBSA diplomat at a Joint Ministerial Summit in 2011, “the current international system has to be more reflective of the needs and priorities of developing countries. IBSA, as like-minded countries, will continue to strive to contribute to a new world order whose political, economic and financial architecture is more inclusive, representative and legitimate”.

To what extent then has IBSA been able to reform the Global Political Economy and managed to
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direct it towards a more “pro-South” approach?

To analyze this, IBSA has certainly increased the visibility and international participation of IBSA states themselves. The increased participation of IBSA states in international organizations is aimed at both reforming the current system as well as increasing the participation of IBSA states in major decision making bodies.\textsuperscript{213}

In support of evidence for IBSA’s increased international participation, it can be noted that the IBSA Forum has established a “Dialogue Forum” as a part of its forum delegations, to address key issues of Global concern including human rights, climate change, women's rights and terrorism and to serve as a platform for initiating and leading discussions and debates. According to information released by IBSA under the Dialogue Forum, IBSA states have successfully worked together towards finalizing climate change agreements under the Kyoto Protocol which is to be implemented for assessment and consequent implementation in the respective countries.\textsuperscript{214} IBSA states also been active advocates for sustainable development and have held commissions to reiterate their "political commitment” towards implementing sustainable development agendas in crucial sectors of economic operation. Furthermore, the IBSA countries also support and assist other developing countries in implementing sustainable development, both through financial aid and technical assistance.\textsuperscript{215}
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Similarly, IBSA leaders have used the IBSA platform to strongly advocate for the promotion of human rights and freedom. "The Leaders recognized that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing".\textsuperscript{216} For the promotion of human rights, they have worked towards providing technical assistance and information based on their previous experiences and technical capabilities.\textsuperscript{217} IBSA leaders have also initiated many comprehensive programs for the promotion of welfare and empowerment of women, children and people with disabilities. "The Leaders recognized with concern that the situation of women, children and Persons with disabilities have been negatively impacted by the world financial and economic crisis".\textsuperscript{218} Leaders use the IBSA Dialogue forum to discuss obstacles to equitable socio-economic development such as the lack of adequate health care services for women, gender gap in wage and employment, inadequate access to education\textsuperscript{219} and lack of sufficient data on disability issues.\textsuperscript{220} IBSA states have also maintained their constant support and assistance to UN Peacekeeping missions in abating terrorism globally.

But does international participation equate to the creation of a new world order or even at the least, reformation of the existing system?
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Although IBSA in and of itself may not have been successful in creating a new world order, it has managed to take the first step towards reformation of the existing system and it has done so in two significant ways. The IBSA tripartite alliance, through its Working Groups, trade alliances and political ties has strengthened South to South cooperation. Although it may not have been successful in fostering complete or even significant independence of traditional markets, it has significantly contributed to enhancing political and cultural links among the three prime countries of the Global South. Secondly, the unique IBSA dialogue forum has provided a very creative and efficient platform for countries to address matters of Global common concern such as human rights, terrorism, sustainable development and climate change. In addition to jointly working towards the reformation of international institutions, the IBSA alliance has managed to secure international recognition and acceptance for the countries of the South, and in doing so, it has taken the first main step towards tilting the Global Political Economy towards the South.

Approaching the working of the IBSA alliance, through a constructivist perspective, IBSA has managed to initiate changes in the global norms associated with countries of the South. Despite not being able to shift the focus of the Global Political Economy, towards the South, IBSA has managed to grab substantial attention of the world towards the countries of the South. By making an attempt to enhance regional cooperation and by coordinating efforts at international organizations, IBSA states have unified the voices of the Global South (albeit with occasional regional discrepancies) and strengthened their participation in international affairs. As Mehmet argues regarding the role of IBSA in integrating the Global South, “the establishment of the IBSA Dialogue Forum may be understood at best as a reflective grouping against the “Global apartheid” and a movement that seeks to create channels to make their voice heard. Therefore,
the IBSA is a product of constructivist perspective that locates the institutions at the very center of their understanding of international economy; however their central aim is not really to alter the constitutive and regulative norms of the international system as argued by various academics”.  

IBSA then is better understood as a project aimed at equity and representativeness, which is more of a normative project than a balance of power project aimed at transforming the international system. 

To understand IBSA’s influence on the Global Political Economy, it is important to understand the core, normative function of IBSA. Going back to its time of formation, the Global Political Economy at that period of IBSA favored multilateral engagement. There was a momentum in terms of how the Global architecture responded to initiatives that dealt with Global governance and multilateral alliances. It gave a sense of substance to South to South cooperation and in particular, gave substance to the identities and values that it represented. IBSA states represented a normative value and a normative set of value propositions that essentially made them very like-minded in Global architecture. From the formation to the functioning of IBSA, there are strong normative values and identities that guide the working of IBSA. The South to South cooperation agenda is based on the normative logic of sharing and partnership rather than imposing a top down, hard power economic logic. IBSA has made attempts at demystifying the
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Global South and attempts at shifting away from Global North practices of trading and development (as exemplified by the unique Dialogue Forum, Joint Working Groups and People to People Forums).  

IBSA has managed to initiate changes in the existing Global Political Economy by adopting strong normative stance against existing structures, institutions and procedures. By actively working with developing countries, IBSA has managed to draw a normative battle against traditional powers. By unifying the voices of the South and by coordinating positions, IBSA has strengthened its normative approach towards reformation of the existing world order.

3. CONCLUSION

“The significance of IBSA however transcends our bilateral ties. It symbolizes the desire of three great countries to overcome physical distances and pool their material and intellectual Resources for a common cause. IBSA is a strong moral force in today’s unsettled world”.

-Prime Minister of India Dr. Manmohan Singh

---


This particular quote perfectly sums up the essence of IBSA tripartite alliance. The IBSA alliance is a unique international alliance that embodies the core foreign policy objectives of India, Brazil and South Africa, while simultaneously expanding the paradigms of conventional understandings of international organizations.

IBSA alliance is a commentary on the norms, rules and functioning of the Global Political Economy that necessitated such an alliance. On one hand, IBSA attempts to represents the needs and objectives of the developing countries that have long been unaddressed and on the other hand, the unique IBSA alliance has taken the first steps towards transforming conventional understandings of international multilateral alliances and partnership.

IBSA provides an alternative model of international institutions. It is a special arrangement that is not just driven by geopolitical strategy but is based on shared principles of democracy, rule of law and social justice for the participating countries as well as for the Global South. IBSA surpasses a purely economic centric objective and strives for political unification at the Global front while expanding the social and cultural interstate relations of the participating countries. Unlike BRICS or other regional groupings, IBSA is more than an economic partnership. IBSA adopts a liberal, constructivist approach to its workings, which in essence means that along with exercising liberal values of democracy and free trade, IBSA is instrumental in influencing the construction of new Global norms. IBSA is therefore best understood through a liberal framework combined by a constructivist approach of international relations.

From an International Relations approach, IBSA is a unique international alliance that has in
many ways challenged the conventional understanding of international institutions. IBSA is neither exclusively political nor economic in its structure. IBSA does not even have a strict political or economic framework that guides the workings of the groups. Instead, the IBSA alliance is centered on liberal trade practices and constructivist shared values. IBSA does not seek to project hard power but instead seeks to extend the soft power influence of the IBSA states. Through the vast and diverse developmental programs and projects, IBSA adopts a wider, global agenda rather than a purely state centric approach at International Relations.

The foreign policy objectives of the IBSA states reflect the needs of an ever growing, dynamic Global South that is both strategic and crucial in its influence and impact on the Global Political Economy. IBSA has undertaken both coordination of convergent foreign policy objectives and unification of the voices of the Global South at the international arena. By attempting to reform key international institutions and by taking up initiatives of regional economic and political development, IBSA states have taken the first step towards securing political legitimacy and economic prosperity for the Global South, thus initiating a new normative order within a liberal, democratic framework of cooperation centered development, that enhances the potential of Global South to South cooperation.
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