

TEACHING AND RESEARCH ON FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF BRAZIL¹

Carlos Aurélio Pimenta de Faria²

The status enjoyed by the Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) as a sub-area of International Relations (IR), thought of as academic field, seems today, in the United States, no longer to be the object of so much controversy, as occurred in previous decades, when many expectations voiced by the original researchers of the sub-area (SMITH, 1986, reviewed these criticisms rightly) were frustrated. Today enthusiasm seems to prevail, among its supporters in academia, and it is visibly present in the work of Hudson (2005 and 2007). The revaluation of Foreign Policy Analysis was sanctioned in 2005 by launching a new journal devoted exclusively to the promotion of research in the sub-area, namely the *Foreign Policy Analysis*, published with the support of the ISA (International Studies Association). One will not find here an appraisal, albeit concise, of the sub-area evolution in the USA. To this end, the reader should refer to the work

¹ The research that led to this work had the financial support of CNPq and FAPEMIG, whom the author wishes to acknowledge. The author also wishes to thank Luísa Gonçalves de Medeiros and Wilson Mendonça Júnior, by competent and dedicated research assistance. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Third Meeting of the Association of International Relations (ABRI), São Paulo, USP, July 20th to 22th, 2011. The author appreciates the comments and suggestions by Dawisson Belém Lopes and Haroldo Ramanzini Júnior.

² Professor at the Postgraduate program in Social Sciences and International Relations of the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais (PUCMG, Brazil). (carlosf@pucminas.br)

listed in the footnote³. The purpose of this article is solely to analyze teaching and research on foreign policy in Brazil in the last two decades.

To this end, the paper is organized as follows. The first section discusses how the main narratives about the evolution of International Relations in Brazil, considered as an area of knowledge, depict the place that has been designed, in the same area, to the study of foreign policy. The second section is devoted to an assessment of the status of foreign policy in IR teaching in the country, both at undergraduate and *scripto sensu* graduate programs. There is also a mapping and characterization of theses and dissertations which had foreign policy as object. The third section assesses the space given to studies on foreign policy in three academic forums nationwide, namely: the meetings of ABRI (Brazilian Association of International Relations), the ABCP (Brazilian Association of Political Science) and ANPOCS (National Association of Graduate Programs and Research in Social Sciences). In the fourth section there is a mapping and characterization of the published articles on foreign policy between 1990 and 2010, in the following IR Brazilian journals: *Cena Internacional*, *Contexto Internacional*, *Política Externa* and *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*. At last, the fifth and final section seeks to assess briefly the importance that comparative studies have in the sub-area of foreign policy in the country. The final considerations make a general assessment of the empirical research presented in the previous sections.

But first, we must define “foreign policy”, distinguishing it from “international politics”. It is also necessary to characterize, albeit briefly, the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA), with its specific characteristics in relation to the mainstream of IR, while recognizing the profound pluralization of the field in recent decades, in theoretic, methodological and thematic terms.

There are almost innumerable definitions of “foreign policy” found in the literature. That proposed by Arenal (1994) seems to us sufficiently precise in its brevity and will be adopted in this work:

³ GERNER (1995); GROOM (2007); HILL & LIGHT (1986); HUDSON (2005 and 2007); HUDSON & VORE (1995); KAARBO (2003); KUBÁLKOVÁ (2001); LIGHT (1994); NEACK; HEY & HANEY (1995); RIPLEY (1993); ROSATI (2004); and SMITH (1986).

*"As **foreign policy** we must understand the study of how a State conducts its relations with other States, how it is projected to the outside, that is, the formulation, implementation and evaluation of foreign options from inside a State, under the perspective of the State"* (p.22).

The author proposes that the definition of "international politics" also seems relevant, namely:

*"The term **international politics** covers a wider reality than the foreign policy, since it refers not only to the action of a foreign State, but the set of interstate relations that constitute the system of States. Here the perspective is not a State, but this system as a whole".* (Ibid.).

The IR field was split in the 1950s, according Kubáľková (2001), into two sub-areas, namely: Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) and the study of International Politics (IP). The question that promoted such divorce was the treatment given to the State, previously conceived as a "black box" whose contents would be of interest only to political science. The foreign policy analysts started to dedicate themselves to the opening of this "box" in order to understand the international behavior of States, which were taken as units of analysis. For its part, IP focused on the interaction among States in the formation of a system, in order to decipher their attributes. As it is clear from the two definitions given above, the first sub-area (FPA) favors the parts for a possible understanding of the whole, while the second (IP) departs from the whole to reach, sometimes, the parts. "Since the FPA 'has moved into the box', scholars from each side saw little need of each other and the two subfields began to grow separately" (KUBÁĽKOVÁ, 2001: 15).

Even today such a dichotomous view of the area seems to prevail. As suggested by several authors, the "comparative studies of foreign policy (FP)", the "middle range theories" and "FP domestic sources" were for a long period the main approaches of the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis. For our interest in this work, the evolution of the subfield, which interspersed moments of optimism and euphoria with periods of low status, is less interesting than a characterization of FPA. This sub-area is characterized today by seeking to link the domestic and international arenas and the attempt to mobilize both levels

of individual analysis, the State and the international system, trying to integrate them into a coherent whole (GERNER, 1995). So Roseneau defined it as a “bridging discipline”, with “limitless boundaries” (GERNER, 1995). As it becomes evident, parsimony is not part of the vocabulary of the supporters of the FPA, which often contributed to the inferiority of the subfield within the academic context.

According to Hudson (2005), the FPA is characterized by its emphasis on “actor-specific focus”, since the sub-area is backed on the argument that “everything that happens between nations and across them is grounded in human decision makers, acting individually or in groups” (p.1). Also according to Hudson, in another study (2007), FPA's approach would have six major hallmarks, which are: (1) it views the explanation of the decision making process as **multifactorial**, with the aim to examine variables over a level of analysis, being, therefore, (2) **multilevel**. (3) The **multi- or interdisciplinarity**, since insights and theories from various fields such as psychology, sociology, organizational theory, anthropology and economics, among others, are useful in the task of the FP analyst to explain the decision process. The FPA would then be, among all IR subfields, the more radically (4) “**integrative**” theoretical enterprise in that it seeks to integrate *a variety of information across levels of analysis and spanning numerous disciplines of human knowledge* (2007: 6). (5) Emphasis on “**agent-oriented**” theories. The States would not be agents, for they are “abstractions and therefore have no agency”. (6) The theory of the FPA would also be “profoundly **actor-specific**” in its orientation, for the reasons given above.

The Post-Cold War FPA would have, still according to Hudson (2007), preserved their specific theoretical commitments that characterize the sub-area since its inception, the main ones being:

- *“a commitment to look below the nation-state level of analysis to actor-specific information.*
- *a commitment to build middle-range theory as the interface between actor-general theory and the complexity of the real world.*
- *a commitment to pursue multicausal explanations spanning multiple levels of analysis.*
- *a commitment to utilize theory and findings from across the spectrum of social science.*

- *a commitment to viewing the process of foreign policy decisionmaking as important as the output thereof*". (Hudson, 2007: 31)

Having done this very brief characterization of the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis, let us turn now to our appreciation of teaching and research on foreign policy in IR field in Brazil, following the structure presented above. Before, however, we anticipate, as we shall see in more detail at the end of the next section, that only part of the Brazilian academic production on foreign policy seems to fit this definition of the sub-area, its purposes, objects and methods.

1 - Brazil's foreign policy seen through the large syntheses of the International Relations field in the country

Remember, initially, that there are numerous works devoted to the study of evolution and characterization of IR field in Brazil⁴, which may reflect a need for (self) claim the area as a specific field of knowledge or, for many of the Brazilian internationalists, preferably an independent field. According to a more "benevolent" perspective, and certainly more accurate, it is possible to think the existence of this multiplicity of studies, perhaps unparalleled in Brazilian Social Sciences, as an expression of the very process of constitution of the field in the country, involving necessary activities like self-observation, self-reflection and self-description (CROSS;MENDONÇA, 2010). The present work is, too, part of this still ongoing process.

The IR area has, as it is known, a quite new constitution in the country, as evidenced by the expansion of undergraduate and graduate courses, which started in the mid-1990s and concentrated in the 2000s, and the creation of ABRI (Brazilian Association of International Relations) only in 2005, which held its first meeting in 2007.

The constitution of the area is, thus, late in Brazil, where the IR appeared in the academic, in close relationship with Political Science, as

⁴ See, among others: ALMEIDA (1993 and 1999a and b); CRUZ & MENDONÇA (2010); FONSECA JR (1989); HERZ (2002); HIRST (1992); LESSA (2005 and 2006); MIYAMOTO (1999 and 2003); SANTOS & FONSECA (2009); SANTOS (2005); and SARAIVA & CERVO (2005).

occurred in the U.S., as highlighted by several authors, although the roots of the field are “planted in diplomatic history, the Public International Law and the corresponding branch of Economy.” The IR gradually acquired its own identity and “its practitioners do not always recognize themselves as political scientists” (CROSS; MENDONÇA, 2010: 298).

It is not intended, in this section, to offer one more narrative, albeit synthetic, of the evolution of the field in Brazil. The goal, much simpler, is trying to determine how these great syntheses of the area in the country portray the meaning, relevance and development, in the field itself, of the study of foreign policy.

In its following sections, this work will be show the minority space occupied in recent years, in the academic realm of the IR of the country, by studies on foreign policy. However, a very different picture emerges from reading those works that sought to make an assessment of constitution of the field in Brazil, according to which, in past times, there was a predominance of studies on Brazilian foreign policy. Let us have a look at these works, following a chronological order:

“What marks, then, more generally, the ‘Brazilian way’ of thinking about international relations is the search of a specific understanding of the progress of foreign policy.”
(FONSECA JR., 1989:276)

“(...) the interest generated by new routes introduced in Brazilian foreign policy from the mid-70s in the academic world (...) was the main impetus for the development of IR area in the 70s. Nevertheless, the fact that this area focuses attention on the issue of State action itself leads to create a strong association between the development of the IR discipline and the study of Brazilian foreign policy.”
(HIRST, 1992: 66)

“From an examination of national production on the topics covered by the area of international relations (...) it is possible to reveal the dual character of the literature produced until the end of the 80s: the historical recovery and the prescription regarding the country’s foreign policy. The main theoretical and epistemological debates that marked the development of the area studies in Europe, the

United States and other centers hadn't reached the Brazilian researchers until recently. This picture begins to change in the 90s." (HERZ, 2002:8).

"Still in the 90s, most of the academic production deals with international insertion of Brazil, the formulation of its foreign policy and the relevant bilateral ties, particularly with the United States and Argentina. The thematic distribution of master's and doctoral theses in the 80s and 90s clearly demonstrates this fact (...) as well as publishing articles in journals. If we look at books publication, this reality is even more evident, since most of the national production refers to historical works on Brazilian foreign policy and international integration of the country" (HERZ, 2002:23).

In this sense, Paulo Roberto de Almeida highlighted, in the late 1990s, though recognizing the interdisciplinary character of the area also in Brazil, that, in the field of IR in the country, it would be possible to see "a certain *benign dictatorship* of the history of international relations over other social science disciplines (sociology or political science), and over the applied social sciences (law, business administration or economics)" (1999a: 119, emphasis in original). In another study from the same time, the author says:

"(...) more reflective elaborations about the international relations of Brazil derived mainly from Brazilianist academic papers, without relevant theoretical contributions by the Brazilian academy itself, despite the existence of some great thinkers in the areas of political science and law and 'Renouvinian' influenced researchers in the area of history (especially at the University of Brasilia). From the specific point of view of intellectual production in this area, we can say that it evolved from the purely historiographic school of the traditional era to the historical and sociological essayism of the transitional period and even to the more political markedly tone analysis of the recent phase." (ALMEIDA, 1999b:194)

In a study of the mid-1990s, Amado Luiz Cervo, affirming that the study of IR in the country was a "thought without theory" and based on the international debate, was careful to distinguish the analytical work of historians

from that of the political scientists by placing “spicing up” a debate that, in Brazil, remains strong until today. Another long quotation is in order here:

"The way historians do theory of international relations is quite distinct from the procedure of political scientists. The difference is the starting point: for the former, certain principles accepted as postulates which govern the deduction of knowledge: for the latter, the mass of accumulated knowledge by empirical research allowed the foundation of a reasoning process that is rather inductive. The theory of historians proved to be flexible and open to contributions from other social sciences and eventually freed the history from the nationalisms that pervaded the old diplomatic history. The theory of historians has another point of distinction with regard to that of their fellow scientists: it does not run after that secret, the key to the explanation of international relations". (CERVO, 1994: 13, emphasis in original).

We are not interested in reviving certain disputes, nor review them. The subsequent development of the historiography of Brazilian IR was synthesized by Lessa (2005), who ends his appraisal questioning the relevance of the judgment of Cervo (a “thought without theory”) for the characterization of more recent periods. Santos (2005), in turn, in an article of the same year, argues, in the opposite direction, the subfield of the history of IR in Brazil, in the two previous decades, had little repercussion of the theoretical and methodological debates. When referring to the great synthesis made in *História da Política Exterior do Brasil* by Cervo & Bueno, originally released in 1992 and reissued several times, perhaps still the most widely used textbook in undergraduate courses in the country, Santos states that (and also here there is no escape from a long quotation):

“(...) The authors, while making use of a methodology that favors multiple causes and the different analytical levels to understand the international insertion of Brazil and Brazilian foreign policy, identify State and nation and confuse the diplomatic discourse of Itamaraty with Brazil’s own foreign policy. Thus, the history of international relations of authors is not, in fact, situated in a framework of general history, as Renouvin would say, economic and

social history, history of ideas and institutions; on the other hand, the State is identified as a unitary nation, neither multi-faceted nor problematized. In several parts of the work the authors make reference to the Brazilian State conforming to the interests of the 'nation'" (SANTOS, 2005: 26).

Listing, in the early 1990s, the issues and problems that were previously overlooked or neglected by scholars of foreign policy of Brazil, Hirst (1992) mentioned, among others:

"With regard to the domestic universe, there are various dimensions to be deciphered and subsequently incorporated into the study of Brazilian foreign policy. The analysis of decision making based on its societal base (pressure groups, values of the ruling elite, historical traditions, etc.), the institutional origins of foreign policy, the construction of its speech, are little explored perspectives in this direction. An important explanation for this lack is the addiction to globalizing perspectives that rarely focus on the analysis of specific aspects such as those just mentioned. They work with the notion of the State as a unified actor, which exerts a very simplistic effect, both to grasp the bureaucratic relationships and to realize the perception of dynamics that are established between the State bureaucracy and the living interests of society." (HIRST, 1992: 68-69).

It is clear that, if this situation started to change from the 1990s onward, as noted by Herz (2002: 23), the 2000s witnessed a multiplication and diversification of the work of the sub-area, byproduct and at the same time feedback cause of the boom not only the IR area has lived in the country, but also the studies on foreign policy, as discussed in the subsequent sections of this work.

In our analysis of teaching and research on foreign policy developed in the last two decades, which follows, we have a double purpose: quantification and classification. The methods employed are presented below. It should, however, be said that the debate among historians and political scientists, which is obviously not regulated by the past x present dichotomy, will be faced in a very peculiar way. The works of the sub-area are classified into two

categories (Foreign Policy – FP and Foreign Policy Analysis – FPA), which, in turn, are subdivided as follows: (a) Brazilian foreign policy (BFP); (b) foreign policy of other countries (FPOC); (c) analysis of Brazilian foreign policy (ABFP); and (d) analysis of foreign policy of other countries (AFPOC).

If the FPA category was presented in greater detail in the introduction of this article, we will classify as FP studies those who embrace “globalizing perspectives”, according to Hirst (1992), dedicated to the study of the major guidelines of the country’s international insertion, on its more general aspects, with little concern for the domestic determinants of foreign policy and its decision-making process and that, and this point is central, face the State as a unitary actor. Note as well that this classification seems to innovate, for example, by giving a clearer sense of a category used by Herz (2002) in her survey and thematic classification of dissertations and theses in IR and papers in the area presented at ANPOCS during the 1980s and 1990s. This is because one of the categories adopted by the author is the “Brazilian Foreign Policy and International Relations of Brazil”, which was, incidentally, the majority among the other themes distinguished by the author, both in case of completion of work and in studies shown at ANPOCS. It should be noted, however, that our FP category should not be understood as synonymous of “IR of Brazil”, this last category that, in our judgment, would cover issues, problems and other actors beyond those involved in foreign policy, as defined in the introduction to this study.

It should be clear here that it is not intended, with this distinction between FP and FPA, to endorse any type dichotomy of traditional/modern or descriptive/analytical, although the present author considers it desirable to strengthen the Foreign Policy Analysis in the country, implying highlighting those “globalizing” trends aforementioned, which really seems to be already occurring, as discussed later. And also because it is recognized that, alongside the growing consolidation of Brazil’s international relations and the increasing politicization of its foreign policy, it seems reasonable to expect that the analytical tools typical of the FPA, as it focuses on the domestic determinants of foreign policy, become increasingly important for understanding the country’s international insertion. Note, however, that it is not unusual that the works that are more closely aligned with FPA, for focusing, sometimes excessively, on the domestic domain in its quest for understanding the

positioning of States at the international level, underestimate the systemic constraints that limit the autonomy of national decision makers, as indicated, for example, by Light (1994).

We also note that we recognize as problematic the inability of our classification of bringing to the fore, explicitly, the fundamental question of theory and method. However, we hope that what is lost in this sense is somehow compensated by the possibility, which such simplified option offer to us, of enlarging the scope of empirical research. Besides, of course, the possibility that it gives us to see to what extent the new generation of scholars of foreign policy is whether or not concentrated exclusively in the Brazilian experience, which is also a way to measure the maturity of not only the sub-area, but also IR in Brazil themselves.

2 - The foreign policy in the teaching of International Relations in Brazil

This section of the paper is divided into two parts. At first, we analyze the space of foreign policy in the teaching of undergraduate and *stricto sensu* graduate programs in International Relations in Brazil. In the second part, we make a mapping and classification of research on foreign policy in the theses and dissertations of IR graduate programs in the country and also in the works available at Capes Database of Thesis and Dissertations⁵, covering all areas of knowledge.

2.1-Foreign policy in undergraduate and graduate studies in International Relations

The place now occupied by foreign policy in the field of Brazilian International Relations can be glimpsed, initially, through the way the sub-area has been addressed in the teaching of IR in the country, in the areas of undergraduate and graduate.

Usually one takes the expansion of IR graduate programs in the country, a phenomenon that has accelerated in the 2000s, as an indicator of the

⁵ Capes (Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education) is an agency of the Brazilian federal government, under the Ministry of Education, responsible for promoting, regulating and evaluating graduation programs in Brazil.

consolidation of the field in Brazil. In 2011 there were in the country 102 IR undergraduate courses registered on the Ministry of Education, the vast majority of which at private educational institutions (only 11 of these courses were offered by public universities). Out of these 102 degrees, we had access to the curriculum of 87 courses, in which are offered in 172 disciplines devoted to foreign policy, including mandatory, the overwhelming majority, and optional (only 10 of them are optional, but we had no information on this issue on 15 of these subjects)⁶. Among these 172 subjects are included those with a more historical approach, as well as those who favor diplomacy. It should be noted that only one of these courses **does not** offer any discipline focused on foreign policy.

To get an idea of the diversity of approaches and views, it is enough to say that these 172 subjects engaged in foreign policy are offered under 50 different denominations, being “Brazilian Foreign Policy” (BFP) the most common (38 subjects have such denomination). Other names frequently are, in descending order: “BFP I” (14 subjects); “BFP II” (14); “History of BFP” (13) and “History of IR in Brazil” (9). Thirty-three (33) subjects have unique names that are not repeated in other IR courses, such as: “Issues of BFP”; “Economic Diplomacy in IR”; “BFP's Military Regime” and “Diplomatic Contemporary Issues.”

It is important to us here, however, to point out that seems correct to state that the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis still suffers, in Brazil, from an unsatisfactory a degree of institutionalization, at least when it comes to teaching. This is because, at undergraduate level, it is relatively rare to offer specific courses, distinct from the traditional discipline “Brazilian Foreign Policy” or “History of Brazilian Foreign Policy”, both of which typically have more of a historical approach, dividing the subject according to presidential mandates and with an emphasis on diplomacy, owing as well to the traditional isolation of the country's foreign policy and Itamaraty. These are subjects in which the view of the State as a unitary actor is predominant.

⁶ Sources: website of the Ministry of Education (MEC), www.e-mec.gov.br, accessed on May 18, 2011, websites of the institutions and mail exchange with the coordination of the courses.

Out of these 172 disciplines devoted to foreign policy at the undergraduate level, only 15 (or 24 if we include the 9 “Introduction to Foreign Policy” disciplines) seem more clearly connected to the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis, admittedly interdisciplinary, whose main goal is, as seen, to appraise the way the international position of States is produced from complex interactions between actors and institutions in domestic, state and non-state alike, taking into account their perception of the constraints and opportunities arising from the system internationally.

With regard to the graduate level, the outlook does not seem to be very different, even if, also in this context, the space devoted to foreign policy is significant. Out of the eleven IR graduate programs recognized by Capes⁷ (as of mid 2011), only 3 were offered by private institutions, with only 3 that offer Doctoral Degree. Seven of the eleven programs had research fields devoted to foreign policy. In these eleven programs were offered a total of 26 subjects in the area of foreign policy, being only 6 of them mandatory (only one of eleven programs **does not** offer any discipline in the area). Among these 26 subjects, however, only three were called “Foreign Policy Analysis”. When the syllabi of these 26 disciplines devoted to foreign policy are analyzed, what one finds is that, beyond 3 courses entitled Foreign Policy Analysis (all 3 electives), only 3 had other content that could be thought of as equivalent⁸. Put in another way, only 6 of these 26 subjects (23%) emphasized the actors, the concerns and methods favored by the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis.

Moreover, as highlighted by Lessa (2005: 176), the latest IR Graduate Programs have “more multidisciplinary features”, which may perhaps be

⁷ We chose not to include in the discussion that follows the master's course in “Strategic Studies of Defense and Security,” offered by the Fluminense Federal University (UFF), and the major, master's and doctorate in “International Strategic Studies,” offered by the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). The following are the 11 programs of graduate studies analyzed: CEBELA - *Centro Brasileiro de Estudos Latino-Americanos* (Rio de Janeiro, Master's, IR for South America); Rio Branco Institute (Brasília, Professional Master in Diplomacy); PUC Rio (Master's and Doctoral Degree in RI); PUC Minas (Master's in IR); State University of Paraíba (Master's in IR); State University of Rio de Janeiro (MD in RI); Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (Master's in IR); University of Brasília (Master's and Doctoral Degree in IR); State University of São Paulo (Marília, Master's in IR); University of São Paulo (Master's and Doctoral Degree in IR) and Federal University of Santa Catarina (Master's in IR).

⁸ Sources: website of Capes (<<http://capes.gov.br/>>), accessed on May 19, 2011, and websites of graduate programs on the Internet.

thought of as potentially able to induce the development of investigations seeking to open the “black box” of the State, as intended by the FPA, which, as we have seen, demand, require and come from interdisciplinarity.

What seems clear is that, even today, the sub-area of foreign policy analysis tends to be slightly underprivileged even in the curriculum of graduate courses in International Relations in Brazil.

2.2-Foreign policy in theses and dissertations

A review of dissertations and theses produced in International Relations Graduate Programs (IRGP) of the country shows itself as revealing. We will discuss below the result of a research on this type of production in the eleven Graduate P in IR we listed earlier. We consulted the websites of the programs and the Capes Database of Thesis. Note, however, that we count the papers that are available and not necessarily those actually defended within these 11 IRGP. Table 1 below presents a mapping and classification of theses and dissertations on foreign policy advocated in these programs (and available) between 1990 and 2010. It should be noted also that, for the reasons explained in the note to table, only the papers of 7 out of these 11 programs were counted.

The type of analytical treatment given to foreign policy in the theses and dissertations, ascertained through the title and abstract, method that we recognize as problematic, was classified according to our four categories: (a) Brazilian foreign policy (BFP); (b) foreign policy of other countries (FPOC); (c) analysis of Brazilian foreign policy (ABFP); and (d) analysis of foreign policy of other countries (AFPOC). The meaning and relevance of this distinction were discussed earlier.

The Foreign policy in theses and dissertations in the International Relations Graduate Programs (1990-2010)

PROGRAMS	Total Number	Monographs About Foreign Policy (FP + FPA)		Analysis of Brazilian Foreign Policy (ABFP)		Analysis of Foreign Policy of Other Countries (AFPOC)		Subtotal for Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA = ABFP + AFPOC)		Brazilian Foreign Policy (BFP)		Foreign Policy of Other Countries (FPOC)		Subtotal Foreign Policy (FP = BFP + FPOC)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CEBELA IRBr PUC/MG PUC/RJ (M+D) UFRGS UNB (M+D) UNESP	809	167	100,00	61	36,53	35	20,96	96	57,49	53	31,74	18	10,78	71	42,51

Notes: %: based on the total number of theses and dissertations on foreign policy (N = 167);

N = total number of theses or dissertations; UEPB, UERJ and USP: courses started in 2009 and had no dissertations/released in June 2011; UFSC: course began in 2011 and had no dissertations / released in June 2011; IRBr: since 2004, all approved in the competition for admission to the diplomatic career are automatically enrolled in vocational Master's in Diplomacy from the Rio Branco Institute, which makes it the master's degree program which has the highest annual number of students entering the fields of PC and IR (Santos & Fonseca, 2009). Source: Own elaboration from the site of programs and database of Theses and Dissertations CFPAs. Accessed June 20, 2011.

First, to emphasize that, out of 809 theses and dissertations available, only 167 (or 20.64%) were devoted to foreign policy. As we were unable to measure any differences between final papers that were effectively defended from those that were simply available, we will not make comparisons between programs. As shown in Table 1, the papers that we consider within the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) prevailed, which represent 96 (or 57.48%) of 167 theses and dissertations available on foreign policy. It is not surprising, of course, the fact that most of these 167 final papers on foreign policy were dedicated to the foreign policy of Brazil (BFP + ABFP) (comparative studies included here. See the fifth section of this article for an assessment of comparative foreign policy in the Brazilian academy). However, the fact that 53 (35 + 18) of them (31.74%) have as their object the foreign policy of other countries indicates that IR field in Brazil has formed internationalists who can hardly be regarded as self-centered⁹.

As the graduate programs in International Relations do not monopolize the studies on foreign policy, which should be thought of as positive, as we believe, we decided to check what Capes Database of Thesis could tell us. Table 2 below shows the results of research in this Database, which covers the period 1987-2009 and covers all areas of knowledge. From the search for the keywords “foreign policy” and “external policy” were reached, after the elimination of redundancies, the results of 588 theses and dissertations¹⁰. Remember that “167” is the number on the research did with IR Graduate Programs. It can be seen, therefore, that the vast majority of theses and dissertations on foreign policy were presented in programs other than the IR, which, in most cases, are quite recent. These final papers were not classified according to their approach

⁹ Note, however, the warning made by Amorim Neto, who, however, does not seem fully appropriate for the type of study that we are mapping: “(...) which leads one analyst to the subfield of comparative politics [that author considers also incorporating analysis of only one other foreign country, like the way comparative politics in the U.S. is defined] is to see how generalizable are the relationships that are established from the observation of the politics of his country. In this sense, comparative politics is not overcoming the parochialism, but a validation method of what is observed in the parish. Parochialism and multinational comparisons have, therefore, a relationship of mutual dependence, as one does not exist without the other” (p.330).

¹⁰ It should be noted that the fact that these terms have been selected by the author of the work as one of the keywords does not necessarily mean that the **main** focus of the study is foreign policy, which weakens the comparison we make afterwards, since the same note of caution **does not** apply to the selection of the work we did for final papers of IR Graduate Programs.

as we did in relation to theses and dissertations of IRGP. However, the subdivision of the accounted period (1987-2009) reveals that interest in foreign policy has been increasing, in a context, as we know, of great expansion of graduate programs in Brazil. It should be noted that the five year period from 2005-2009 concentrates more than 50% of the work on foreign policy defended in 23 years under analysis. It is therefore a fairly recent phenomenon.

Table 2
Theses and Dissertations on Foreign Policy
(All areas – Capes Database – 1987 to 2009)

Period	Theses		Dissertations		Professional Master's		Total	
	Nº	%	Nº	%	Nº	%	Nº	%
1987 to 1989	1	1,11%	10	2,30%	0	0,00%	11	1,87%
1990 to 1994	7	7,78%	34	7,83%	0	0,00%	41	6,97%
1995 to 1999	11	12,22%	49	11,29%	0	0,00%	60	10,20%
2000 to 2004	29	32,22%	113	26,04%	26	40,63%	168	28,57%
2005 to 2009	42	46,67%	228	52,53%	38	59,38%	308	52,38%
Total	90	100%	434	100%	64	100%	588	100%

Source: Own elaboration from Capes Database of Thesis, accessed on June 14, 2011.

<<http://www.capes.gov.br/avaliacao/cadastro-de-discentes/teses-e-dissertacoes>>.

3 - The research on foreign policy in the Brazilian academic forums

To evaluate the space given to the study of foreign policy, and also to International Relations in Brazilian academic forums about Social Sciences, we chose to analyze the scheduling of meetings of ABRI (Brazilian Association of International Relations), the ABCP (Brazilian Association of Political Science) and ANPOCS (National Association of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences). It will be analyzed the schedule of 3 meetings already held by ABRI, which are biennial, all seven meetings of the ABCP happened until 2011, which are also biennial, and annual meetings of the ANPOCS happened between 1998 (22th Meeting) and 2011 (35th Meeting .) Note that the national meetings of the ABCP occur in even years, while those of ABRI happen in odd

years, which means that events do not “compete” directly with each other and it allows scholars and students to more easily attend both. This rotation is of the utmost importance when considering the need for cross-fertilization between the areas, which is particularly important in the case of research on foreign policy, at least for that sub-area affiliated to the Foreign Policy Analysis. We will analyze only the contents of the working groups, seminars and thematic areas and round tables, which are probably the most important events of such academic forums. Information was obtained from the websites of associations and printed programs of the meetings.

ABRI is the smallest and newest of the 3 associations. It was created in 2005 and held its first national meeting in 2007. In June 2011, ABRI had 484 members, divided as follows: full (183), professionals (82) and students (219) (data provided to author by ABRI). Note, however, that these data relate to the period immediately preceding the completion of its 3rd meeting in July 2011. The number of members, as occurs in general, tends to increase significantly during the national meetings.

ABRI, naturally, gives the foreign policy since its inception, the same status granted to other subfields of the discipline since, in the Association, the field was divided, when its first meeting in 2007 in 6 thematic sections, namely: International Political Economy, International Institutions, Regional Integration, Foreign Policy, International Security, and Theory of IR. At the meeting in 2011, a new thematic area added to the previous (History of IR) and the International Institutions area became International Institutions and Organizations.

Any more systematic assessment of the evolution of the Association that focuses its national meetings is compromised by the fact that the second event was held in 2009 as a joint meeting between ABRI and ISA (International Studies Association). The achievement of this meeting together is, on the one hand, essential for the consolidation of the field in Brazil, and, on the other hand, it is also a complicating factor for a thematic and quantitative assessment of the evolution of ABRI. This is because in the first meeting were presented 190 papers in 47 panels. At the joint meeting of 2009, 1212 papers were presented in 233 panels. As to 2011, 507 papers were presented in 127 panels. Anyway, it is understood that the area, in general, has shown an

exponential growth, as reflected also by the expansion of graduate and postgraduate courses.

Because the 2009 meeting was so unusual, we will make only a comparison between the 1st and 3rd meetings. So what can be said is at the 2007 meeting, there were 8 round tables, but none of them focused on specific foreign policy. At the meeting in 2011, 5 roundtables held, one focused on foreign policy. It should be pointed out, too, that at the 2011 meeting, the Foreign Policy Thematic Area was the one that had the largest number of papers among the 507 presented – there were 107. The second area in terms of papers was Institutions and International Organizations, 85. The smallest of them, according to this criterion, was the International Political Economy, with 47 studies (data provided by the Association to the author).

ABCP, in turn, held its first biennial meeting in 1998. By 2011, 7 meetings were held, and, since its inception, the thematic areas covered expanded from 4 to 10. The Association had, in June 2011, 799 members¹¹. Table 3 below presents a snapshot of space given to International Relations and foreign policy at all meetings of ABCP.

Table 3
International Relations and Foreign Policy in the meetings of ABCP

Meetings	Number Thematic Areas/ Thematic Seminars	TAs/TSs International Relations	Sessions/ Panels on Foreign Policy	Total Number Round Tables	Number RTs on IR (including FP)	Number RTs on FP
1° - 1998	4 TSs	1 (4 sessions)	0	8	0	0
2° - 2000	6 TSs	1 (4 sessions)	1	14	3	0
3° - 2002	6 TAs	1 (7 panels)	2	10	2	1
4° - 2004	6 TSs	1 (7 panels)	2	14	4	0
5° - 2006	6 TSs	1 (6 sessions)	2	19	7	0
6° - 2008	7 TAs	1 (6 sessions)	1	23	8	1
7° - 2010	10 TAs	2 (6 sessions)	1	26	6	1
			Total	114	30	3

Source: Own elaboration based on printed programs of the biennial meetings and the Association website.

¹¹ The ABCP provides on its website, a list of members. <http://www.cienciapolitica.org.br/abcp/socios_associados.html>. Accessed on June 27, 2011.

Since the first meeting of ABCP, it had already established a Thematic Area (TA) of *International Relations*, which, in all meetings, has aggregated the research field. In the last meeting occurred in 2010, a new TA was created, one that also houses work in the area entitled *Teaching and Research in Political Science and International Relations*. Regarding the TA/Ts, thus, the space given to IR was constant until 2010, when it expanded. This is actually equivalent to a space dedicated to the major subfields of political science, for example, “Elections and Political Representation” and “Government and Public Policy.” The same can be said in regard to the number of round tables dedicated to the IR (30 out of 114, or 26.3%), a significant number and also seems proportional to the key sub-areas and certainly greater than the space occupied by others. However, with respect to the space given to foreign policy, taken as a sub-area of IR, the result seems more ambiguous. If in the case of sessions/panels the space given to foreign policy seems proportionate to that enjoyed by other sub-areas of the IR, except for the first meeting, when there was a session dedicated to foreign policy, the number of round tables of the sub-area FP is really low. Only 3 roundtables on foreign policy were conducted in seven meetings (3 out of 30 tables of IR, or 10%).

Consider now the space given to IR and foreign policy at meetings of the ANPOCS (National Association of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences). ANPOCS was established in 1977 and, according to its website, “acts in the representation and aggregation of research centers and postgraduate programs that operate in the field of social sciences in Brazil. ANPOCS has a membership of centers and programs that have postgraduate in anthropology, political science and sociology in their field”¹². It was within ANPOCS that was created at the beginning of the 1980s, the pioneering group of International Relations and Foreign Policy (GRIPE), which “allowed the articulation of a network of experts originally dispersed throughout the country” (Hirst, 1992, p.71). This group acted under that Association until 1994 (MIYAMOTO, 1999).

¹² Source: <http://www.anpocs.org.br/portal/content/view/1/41/>, accessed on June 21, 2011.

Table 4
International Relations and Foreign Policy at ANPOCS Meetings(1998-2011)

Encounters	Number of Working Groups/Thematic Seminars	WGs/TSs International Relations	Sessions Foreign Policy in WGs/TSs International Relations	Total Number of Round Tables	Nº of RTs on IR (including FP)	Number of RTs of FP
22nd - 1998	21 WGs	2 (3 sessions each)	1	n.a	n.a	n.a
23rd - 1999	21 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	0	n.a	n.a	n.a
24th - 2000	21 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	2	n.a	n.a	n.a
25th - 2001	24 TSs	1 (3 sessions)	0	n.a	n.a	n.a
26th - 2002	25 WGs	1 (3 sessions)	0	n.a	n.a	n.a
27th - 2003	27 TSs	2 (3 sessions)	0	23	2	n.a
28th - 2004	27 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	0	26	2	0
29th - 2005	27 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	1	27	2	0
30th - 2006	27 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	1	26	3	0
31th - 2007	35 TSs	2 (3 sessions)	1	26	5	0
32th - 2008	41 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	0	29	4	0
33th - 2009	41 WGs	2 (3 sessions)	0	21	2	0
34th - 2010	37 TSs	1 (3 sessions)	0	20	2	1
35th - 2011	38 WGs	3 (3 sessions)	1	n.a	n.a	n.a
Total	410 WGs / TSs	25 (75 sessions)	7	197	22	1

Note: n.a. = not available.

Source: Elaborated based on the printed programs and the annual meetings of the Association website

ANPOCS had, in June 2011, 99 research centers and postgraduate programs as members, 19 states of federation plus the Federal District. Table 4 below presents a snapshot of space given to IR and foreign policy in the 14 annual meetings that occurred between 1998 and 2011¹³. Being a much larger meeting than those made by ABRI and ABCP, because it is an association of a more clearly multidisciplinary vocation, several other types of activities take place, not only the Working Groups/Thematic Seminars and Round Tables, which are certainly among the main activities.

Initially, we note that, if the number of WGs/TSs has nearly doubled over this period, from 21 in 1998 to 38 in 2011, reflecting the expansion of postgraduate studies in Social Sciences in the country, the number of WGs/TSs dedicated to International Relations remained relatively constant over the period, which occurred in the boom of the IR in Brazil. As the area expanded so strongly in the period, one might think that the field has lost ground in ANPOCS or chose not to claim an extension of the place dedicated to IR. When one recalls that ABRI was established in 2005 and held its meetings in 2007, 2009 and 2011, it seems possible that we suggest that the constitution of the association of internationalists, certainly relevant and timely, if not responsible for the decline of “traditional” IR in the space of ANPOCS, did not contribute either to its expansion. From the standpoint of those interested in strengthening the Foreign Policy Analysis in Brazil, like this author, this development does not cease to be problematic in that the sub-area of the FPA, being openly multidisciplinary, requires the kind of cross-fertilization events provided by academic interdisciplinary as ANPOCS.

Continuing the analysis of Table 4, we should note that the space given to foreign policy remained scarce, despite the growing visibility and importance that this policy has taken in recent years, in Brazilian political agenda. In the 14 years analyzed there were only 7 FP sessions out of the total 75 sessions that happened in the 25 WGs/TSs of International Relations. Analyzing the Round Tables that took place in meetings about which information is available, we can highlight the following: out of the total of 197 RTs performed between 2003 and

¹³ The website of ANPOCS on Internet provides only the programs of the meetings that occurred between 1998 and 2011.

2010, 22 were dedicated to IR (11.17%). However, in that same period there was only one conducted Round Table focused on foreign policy, which definitely does not reflect the increased visibility of the Brazilian foreign policy during Lula's administration, both at the political and societal plan and the academic one.

4 - The foreign policy in the Brazilian academic journals in the field of International Relations

In this section, we evaluate the frequency and type of treatment given to foreign policy in articles published between the years 1990 and 2010, for those who consider the main journals of Brazilian International Relations, which are, in alphabetical order: *Cena Internacional*, *Contexto Internacional*, *Política Externa* and *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*¹⁴. It should be stressed that important works devoted to the study of Brazilian and other countries' foreign policy have also been published by other journals of Social Sciences and Humanities of Brazil, which, however, were not covered by the mapping we present below.

The journal *Cena Internacional* has been published by the Department of International Relations at the University of Brasilia (REL-UnB) and by the Alexandre de Gusmão Foundation (FUNAG) since 1998. The biannual magazine is evaluated on CAPES Qualis¹⁵, in the area of Political Science and International Relations in 2011, as B2. The journal *Contexto Internacional* has been published by the Institute of International Relations at the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (IRI-PUC/RJ) since 1985. The journal is also biannual, classified as A2 in Qualis. The journal *Política Externa* is published by *Paz e Terra* Publisher, with the support of the International Conjuncture Group of the University of São Paulo (USP) and the Institute of Economic and

¹⁴ Lessa (2005) considered "unreasonably restrict" the number of specialized journals, "especially in scientific journals that support and promote debate in the area." Note also that the author doesn't consider the journal *Política Externa* as "scientific", but dedicated to "serving articles written by diplomats and businessmen in the form of high disclosure" (2005, p.177). Cross & Mendonça, in turn, believe that the periodical is "one of the most important vehicles in the area," which is distinguished from other "by the extent of their movement and the diverse audience that reaches" (2010, p.309).

¹⁵ Qualis is the instrument developed by Capes, which evaluates and makes rankings of scientific journals.

International Studies (IEEI) of the State University of São Paulo (UNESP). The publication has been published quarterly since 1992 and has the concept B2 in Qualis. The *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* (RBPI) has been published by the Brazilian Institute of International Relations (IBRI) since 1957. The journal is biannual its release, being rated as A2 in the CAPES Qualis.

The articles devoted to foreign policy published by these four academic journals have been mapped and classified according to their titles and/or reading their summaries, which is a method that we take as problematic, though it becomes legitimate when it is recognized that in this period (1990-2010) these journals published a total of 1347 articles. Book reviews, interviews, notes, documents, “expedient” and “passages” (biographical comments about personalities from academia and recently deceased politician, published in the journal *Política Externa*) were excluded from the analysis. There were 224 selected articles devoted to the study of foreign policy (or 16.63% out of the 1347 total articles published¹⁶), and these were classified according to the same four categories presented earlier, namely: (a) Brazilian foreign policy (BFP); (b) foreign policy of other countries (FPOC); (c) analysis of Brazilian foreign policy (ABFP); and (d) analysis of foreign policy of other countries (AFPOC).

The table 5 below presents the overview found.

¹⁶ Journal *Política Externa* published, alone, nearly half of these 1347 articles (639 ou 47.44%). *RBPI* is the second, with 23.46% of them.

Table 5 - Foreign Policy in Major Brazilian Journals in the Area of International Relations (1990-2010)

	CENA INTERNACIONAL *		CONTEXTO INTERNACIONAL		POLÍTICA EXTERNA **		RBPI		TOTAL		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
FOREIGN POLICY POLICY (FP)	Brazilian	12	5.36	5	2.23	24	10.71	35	15.63	76	33.93
	In Other Countries	5	2.23	5	2.23	28	12.50	11	4.91	49	21.88
	Subtotal 1	17	7.59	10	4.46	52	23.21	46	20.54	125	55.80
FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS (FPA)	Brazilian	5	2.23	15	6.70	18	8.04	17	7.59	55	24.55
	In Other Countries	2	1	8	3.57	28	12.50	6	2.68	44	19.64
	Subtotal 2	7	3.13	23	10.27	46	20.54	23	10.27	99	44.20
TOTAL (PE + APE)		24	10.71	33	14.73	98	43.75	69	30.80	224	100

N = number of published articles on foreign policy.

(*) *Genia Internacional* Journal began publication in 1998.(**) *Politica Externa* Magazine began publication in 1992.

Source: Own elaboration based on information contained on the websites of the journals on the Internet

The fact that the articles devoted to foreign policy totaling only 224 (16.63%) of 1347 articles published by 4 journals between 1990 and 2010 is another indicator of the minority character of today's foreign policy in the IR field in Brazil. The analysis that follows is concentrated on these 224 articles.

Most of them (125) were classified under “foreign policy” (FP) category. Articles in related with FPA sub-area are fewer (99). Those dedicated to Brazil (BFP + ABFP) totaled 131, while those focused on foreign policy of other countries (FPOC + AFPOC) totaled 93. Intuitively, we could imagine a greater difference. The fact of this difference not being so large suggests that the Brazilian internationalist community is not so self-centered (there are articles written by foreigners, of course, but their number is reduced¹⁷). Regarding the distribution of these 224 articles devoted to foreign policy under the 4 categories proposed here, the result is the following, in descending order: BFP (76 or 33.93%); ABFP (55 or 24.55%); FPOC (49 or 21.88%) and AFPOC (44 or 19.64%).

In total numbers, the journal *Política Externa* is the one that published the highest number of articles on foreign policy (FP + FPA) (98) and *Cena Internacional* the lowest (24). However, given the differences in frequency of the journals, the date of its publication and the number of articles published in each volume, the question is interesting to observe also taking into account the percentages of the total number of articles from all IR sub-areas, published by each journal. After doing the math, it is *RBPI* the one which published the highest percentage of articles on foreign policy (FP + FPA) (21.84%). The others published, in descending order: *Cena* (16%), *PE* (15.34%) and *Contexto* (13.64%).

The journal, in the period in question, that published the most about ABFP in absolute numbers was *Política Externa* (18), followed by *RBPI* (17). However, as a percentage of the total overall of published articles by each of the journals, the one that published the most about ABFP was *Contexto* (6.2%), followed by *RBPI* (5.38%).

Regarding the FPA (ABFP + AFPOC), the one that published the most, in absolute numbers, was *Política Externa* (46), followed by *RBPI* and *Contexto* (tied with 23). As a percentage of total articles of each journal,

¹⁷ It should be noted, however, that in survey of comparative politics in Brazil, Santos & Coutinho (2002) analyzing 5 national journals of Social Sciences, among them only one of IR (*Contexto Internacional*), noted that “roughly 20 % of publications on the analyzed journals are of foreign authors” (p.11). We did not do similar calculation in our work.

however, the one that published the most on FPA was *Contexto* (9.5%), followed by *RBPI* (7.28%).

RBPI is the journal that published the most BFP both in absolute numbers (35) and as a percentage of everything published in the period (11.08%). When it comes to FP (BFP + FPOC), the most published in the period, in absolute numbers, was on *Política Externa* (52), followed by *RBPI* (46); whereas, as a percentage of all articles published in the journal, the one that published the most of FP was *RBPI* (14.56%), followed by *Cena* (11.33%).

So far, the situation was discussed for the period 1990-2010. So that we could get an idea of process, or evolution over time, the past decade has been divided into two periods of 5 years, which are: 2001-2005 (p1) and 2006-2010 (p2). When one considers the total number of articles on foreign policy (FP + FPA) published by the 4 journals that we are analyzing, there seemed to be an increase from 64 to 83 papers from p1 to p2 (+ 19 articles). The largest growth was FP (BFP + FPOC), from 32 to 44 articles (+ 12). The field of FPA (ABFP + AFPOC) increased in 7 studies (32 in p1 and 39 in p2). In 2006-2010 (p2), all four categories were improved, when compared with p1 (2001-2005): BFP from 21 to 25 articles (+ 4); FPOC from 11 to 19 (+ 8); ABFP from 15 to 20 (+ 5) and AFPOC from 17 to 19 (+2 articles).

To end the section, it is appropriate to repeat the findings that I consider most relevant. First, the fact that the space devoted to foreign policy in the 4 major IR journals in the country is almost peripheral (only 224 articles, out of 1347 published between 1990 and 2010, or 16.63% of them). It is also significant that the articles that belong to the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis are fewer (FPA = 99 < FP = 125). When contrasting the periods 2001-2005 and 2006-2010, yet all our 4 categories have been expanded (BFP; FPOC; ABFP and AFPOC) the FPA sub-area grew less (FPA + 7 e FP +12). Also these indicators point to a weaker development of the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis.

Another interesting finding is the fact that, in the period 1990-2010, the number of articles devoted to Brazil's foreign policy (BFP + ABFP) wasn't much larger than those devoted to FP in other countries (131 x 93), which, as we suggest, may denote little self-centered or parochial character of Brazilian internationalists.

A comparison of 4 journals between themselves reveals the following of most important: if the journal *Foreign Policy* published between 1990 and 2010, the largest number of articles on foreign policy (FP + FPA) (98), was *RBPI*, which among the 4, published the highest percentage of works in the area (21.84% of all articles that it published in the period). Both cases of FPA and ABFP, the journal that published more in the period, in absolute numbers, was *Política Externa*, which is quarterly, not biannual, as the other. However, in both cases, who published more FPA nad ABFP as a percentage of everything that was published was *Contexto Internacional*. Regarding the BFP, the journal that published more in absolute and relative terms was *RBPI*. As for FP (BFP + FPOC), who published more in absolute terms was the journal *Política Externa*, but as percentage this place was to *RBPI*.

5 - The compared foreign policy on the Brazilian International Relations

Depending on the relevance that the comparative study of foreign policy had, historically, on the conformation of the sub-area of Foreign Policy Analysis in the United States, originally formed as one of its pillars, we decided to also enjoy the use of comparisons on the works about foreign policy produced outside Brazil. Will be analyzed, then the theses and dissertations of IRGP and Capes Database, discussed in subsection 2.2 of this study, and articles on foreign policy published in 4 journals analyzed in Section 4, namely, *Cena Internacional*, *Contexto Internacional*, *Política Externa* and *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional (1990-2010)*.

By “comparative politics” we mean: (a) the study of similarities and differences between the courses of action adopted by two or more countries; and (b) the search for comparison within the same country, between governments or different periods, as well as among the treatment given by a single country or government to two or more foreign policy issues. This involves understanding the comparative politics as a field and not as a method. We recall here an important limitation of the survey presented below, made only by explicit mention in the title, the purpose of comparison. This method, known to be problematic, not capture, for example, those jobs, so common in the study of Brazilian foreign policy, seeking to analyze the famous “continuities and ruptures” promoted in this harvest, by different presidents. The method is sensitive to either “implicit comparisons” (AMORIM NETO, 2010).

Two previous studies have sought to map and characterize the comparative politics in the Brazilian Political Science, namely, Santos & Coutinho (2002) and Amorim Neto (2010). The first one also addressed, albeit not systematic, the area of international relations, while the second chose not to incorporate. This second study, following the American tradition, defines comparative politics as “the politics of others”, or the policy of “other people”, whether made **or not** effective or explicit comparisons. If we adopt this definition, we would also incorporate the work which we classify as FPOC (foreign policy of other countries) and AFPOC (analysis of foreign policy of other countries), which won’t be done here.

As seen in subsection 2.2 of this work, 809 theses and dissertations defended in International Relations postgraduate programs are available online. Of these, 167 (or 20.64%) are devoted to the study of foreign policy. Among these 167, only 11 (or 6.59% of the work on foreign policy) comparative studies can be considered according to the criteria presented above. A minority of them (5) compares the policies of two or more countries.

In the same subsection, we present the results of a survey, by keyword, made with Capes Digital Database of Theses and Dissertations. We recorded 588 works on foreign policy. Out of these, only 29 (or 4.93%) were comparative studies, and the minority of them (10) sought to compare two or more countries.

Regarding the articles published by 4 major journals in the IR area of the country, we show in section 4 that during the period 1990-2010 were published totally 1347 works, out of which 224 (16.63%) devoted to foreign policy. Out of these 224, only 19 articles (8.48% of the studies on FP) are comparative studies, being the minority (9) devoted to the comparison between countries.

What can be verified is the marginal character of compared foreign policy in Brazil, as opposed to what occurred as of the constitution of the sub-area in the United States. Bear in mind, however, the limitations and inaccuracies of the method used here. These figures would be much higher if we had understood as comparative politics also monographic studies on other countries, such as the definition prevailing in the U.S. Having adopted different criteria from ours and incorporating in a less systematic way the IR area, besides being a work of the early 2000s, Santos & Coutinho said:

“The field of comparative politics is poorly structured in the Brazilian academy. Although there is a significant number of papers, articles, theses and research projects that adopt a comparative perspective, there is not, in most major centers of research and postgraduate studies in Political Science and International Relations of the country, scientific coherently structured activities under this approach and not an institutional concern in developing the area. If we adopt the narrow conception of comparative politics, which requires reference to two or more countries, Brazilian scientific production reduces drastically. In fact, rarely Brazil compares with other countries. The comparisons are temporal. Brazil compares with Brazil.”(2002: 5).

Amorim Neto, in turn, using different definitions and criteria, besides deleting International Relations from his analysis, concluded:

“The intense dialogue with comparative theories is, indeed, a characteristic of Brazilian Political Science (...). So, if, regarding the explicit practice of comparative politics, the Brazilian situation gives no reasons for great optimism, with regard to the practice of implicit sub-discipline, the picture is more encouraging. Thus, Brazil applies perfectly well what Sartori said (...) in Italy: ‘In Italy, multinationals comparativists, so to speak, aren’t legion, but almost all of our political scientists are implicitly comparativists in the sense that its parameters are compared.’”(2010: 334).

6- Final considerations

Several recent studies have shown how the consolidation of Brazil's international relations has led to an increase in the redistributive impact, domestically, about the country's foreign policy, leading to an increased politicization of the policy, traditionally insulated and, sometimes, almost monopolized not too distant in the past by the Ministry of External Relations. The country's foreign policy mobilizes today, also because of the new international status of Brazil, a wide range of actors – societal and state alike – in a process that has been defined as an increasing pluralization (see, for example, CASON; POWER, 2009 and FARIA, 2012). In this context, of

difficult reversion, which also reflects the profound changes that have passed the international system, foreign policy becomes the object of partisan and electoral dispute, priority for different interest groups and sub-national governments and the target of increasing intervention by part of the legislature, gaining increasing attention in the media.

If the study of foreign policy, as that of international relations themselves, has traditionally been guided by the situation in Brazil and elsewhere, it does not seem surprising the growing interest, in the Brazilian academic field of IR, in foreign policy. The fact that this sub-area is today minority in the IR of the country, unlike what occurred in previous decades, as shown by this work, should be seen as further evidence of the expansion and maturation of the field among ourselves.

If the studies of foreign policy, as sub-area of IR, have become minority in the country, as evidenced here, we believe that we have also demonstrated a significant change in this subfield, to the extent that, in several instances of which we reviewed, the typical investigations of Foreign Policy Analysis came to prevail. Such investigations, to refute the view of the state as unitary actor, by emphasizing the domestic determinants of foreign policy, by focusing on decision-making processes and institutional component of this policy, have mobilized an analytical instrument that seems more appropriate to understand Brazil's current international insertion. The pluralization of actors, who are involved and interested in foreign policy, has been followed by a similar pluralization not only in the centers of education and research in the country, but also in their objects, approaches and methods of analysis.

REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA, Paulo Roberto de. (1993), "Estudo de relações internacionais do Brasil: etapas da produção historiográfica brasileira, 1927-1992". *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 36, 1: 11-36.
- _____. (1999a), *O estudo das relações internacionais do Brasil*. São Paulo, Unimarco Editora.

- _____. (1999b), “Relações Internacionais”. In: MICELI, S. (Org.). *O que ler na Ciência Social Brasileira (1970-1995): Ciência Política (Volume III)*. São Paulo, Ed. Sumaré/ANPOCS.
- AMORIM NETO, Octavio. (2010), “A política comparada no Brasil: a política dos outros”. In: MARTINS, C.B. (Coord.), *Horizontes das Ciências Sociais no Brasil: Ciência Política*, São Paulo, ANPOCS/Ed. Barcarolla.
- ARENAL, Celestino del.(1994), *Introducción a las Relaciones Internacionales*. 3a edição, Madrid, Tecnos.
- CASON, Jeffrey; POWER, Timothy. Presidentialization, pluralization, and the rollback of Itamaraty: explaining change in Brazilian Foreign Policy making from Cardoso to Lula. *International Political Science Review*. Vol. 30, No.2, p.117-140. 2009.
- CERVO, Amado Luiz. (1994), “As relações internacionais do Brasil”. In: CERVO, A.L. (org.). *O desafio internacional. A política exterior do Brasil de 1930 a nossos dias*. Brasília, Ed. UNB.
- CERVO, A.L. & BUENO, Clodoaldo. (2002), *História da política exterior do Brasil*. 2a edição. São Paulo, Ed. Ática.
- CRUZ, Sebastião C. Velasco e & MENDONÇA, Filipe. (2010), “O campo das Relações Internacionais no Brasil”. In: MARTINS, C.B. (Coord.). *Horizontes das Ciências Sociais no Brasil: Ciência Política*. São Paulo, ANPOCS/Ed. Barcarolla.
- FARIA, Carlos Aurélio Pimenta de (2012). “O Itamaraty e a política externa brasileira: do insulamento à busca de coordenação dos atores governamentais e de cooperação com os agentes societários”. *Revista Contexto Internacional* (no prelo).
- FONSECA JR, Gelson. (1989), “Estudos sobre política externa no Brasil: os tempos recentes (1950-1980)”. In: FONSECA JR, Gelson & Leão, Valdemar C. (Orgs.). *Temas de política externa brasileira*. Brasília, Ed Ática/IPRI.
- GERNER, Deborah J. (1995), “The evolution of the study of foreign policy”. In: NEACK, L.; HEY, J.A.K. & HANEY, P.J. *Foreign policy analysis. Continuity and change in its second generation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- GROOM, A.J.R. (2007), “Foreign policy analysis: from little acorn to giant oak?”. *International Studies*, Vol.44, No.3, pp.195-215.
- HERZ, Mônica. (2002), “O crescimento da área de relações internacionais no Brasil”. *Contexto Internacional*, 24, 1: 7-40.
- HILL, Christopher & LIGHT, Margot. (1986), “Foreign policy analysis”. In: LIGHT, M. & GROOM, A.J.R. (Eds.). *International relations: a handbook of current theory*, London, Pinter Publishers.
- HIRST, Mônica. (1992), “Relações Internacionais no Brasil como área de pesquisa”. In: MICELI, S. (Org). *Temas e problemas de Pesquisa em Ciências Sociais*, São Paulo, IDESP.
- HUDSON, Valerie M. (2005), “Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations”. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1, 1:1-30.

- _____. (2007), *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Lanham, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- HUDSON, Valerie & VORE, C.S. (1995). "Foreign policy analysis yesterday, today, and tomorrow". *Mershon International Studies Review*, 39:209-238.
- KAARBO, Juliet. (2003), "Foreign policy analysis in the Twenty-First Century: back to comparison, forward to identity and ideas". *International Studies Review*, 5, 2:156-163.
- KUBÁLKOVÁ, Vendulka. (2001), "Foreign policy, International Politics, and Constructivism". In: KUBÁLKOVÁ, V. (org.). *Foreign policy in a constructed world*. New York, M.E. Sharpe.
- LESSA, Antônio Carlos. (2005), "Instituições, atores e dinâmicas do ensino e da pesquisa em Relações Internacionais no Brasil: o diálogo entre a história, a ciência política e os novos paradigmas de interpretação (dos anos 90 aos nossos dias)". *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 48, 2: 169-184.
- _____. (2006), "A intensificação do debate acadêmico e social sobre relações internacionais e política exterior no Brasil" In: LESSA, A.C. & OLIVEIRA, H.A. (Orgs.). *Relações internacionais do Brasil: temas e agendas*. Vol.2. São Paulo, Ed. Saraiva.
- LIGHT, Margot. (1994), "Foreign policy analysis". In: GROOM, A.J.R. & LIGHT, M. (Eds.). *Contemporary international relations: a guide to theory*. London, Pinter Publishers.
- MIYAMOTO, Shiguenoli. (2003), "O ensino das relações internacionais no Brasil: problemas e perspectivas". *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, 20:103-114.
- _____. (1999), "O estudo das relações internacionais no Brasil: o estado da arte". *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, 12: 83-98.
- NEACK, Laura; HEY, Jeanne A.K. & HANEY, Patrick J. (1995), *Foreign policy analysis. Continuity and change in its second generation*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall.
- RIPLEY, Brian. (1993), "Psychology, foreign policy, and international relations theory". *Political Psychology*, 14, 3: 403-416.
- ROSATI, Jerel A. (2004), "The frustrating study of foreign policy analysis". *International Studies Review*, 6:109-111.
- SANTOS, Norma Breda dos & FONSECA, Fúlvio Eduardo. (2009), "A pós-graduação em relações internacionais no Brasil". *Contexto Internacional*, 31, 2: 353-380.
- SANTOS, Norma Breda. (2005), "História das Relações Internacionais no Brasil: esboço de uma avaliação sobre a área". *Revista História (São Paulo)*, 24, 1: 11-89.
- SANTOS, Maria Helena Castro & COUTINHO, Marcelo J.V. (2002), "Política comparada: estado das artes e perspectivas no Brasil". *BIB – Boletim Informativo e Bibliográfico em Ciências Sociais*, 54: 5-44.
- SARAIVA, José Flávio S. & CERVO, Amado Luís (Orgs.).(2005), *O crescimento das Relações Internacionais no Brasil*. Brasília, IBRI.
- SMITH, Steve. (1986), "Theories of foreign policy: an historical overview". *Review of International Studies*, 12, 1:13-29.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to analyze teaching and research on foreign policy in Brazil in the last two decades. The first section discusses how the main narratives about the evolution of International Relations in Brazil, considered as an area of knowledge, depict the place that has been designed, in the same area, to the study of foreign policy. The second section is devoted to an assessment of the status of foreign policy in IR teaching in the country, both at undergraduate and *scripto sensu* graduate programs. There is also a mapping and characterization of theses and dissertations which had foreign policy as object. The third section assesses the space given to studies on foreign policy in three academic forums nationwide, namely: the meetings of ABRI (Brazilian Association of International Relations), the ABCP (Brazilian Association of Political Science) and ANPOCS (National Association of Graduate Programs and Research in Social Sciences). In the fourth section there is a mapping and characterization of the published articles on foreign policy between 1990 and 2010, in the following IR Brazilian journals: *Cena Internacional*, *Contexto Internacional*, *Política Externa* and *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*. At last, the fifth and final section seeks to assess briefly the importance that comparative studies have in the sub-area of foreign policy in the country. The final considerations make a general assessment of the empirical research presented in the previous sections.

KEY WORDS

International Relations; Foreign Policy; Brazil

Received on 13 July 2012

Approved on 27 July 2012

*Translated by Gabriela Perin