

Global South Perspectives on International Relations: new frameworks for Transboundary Water Analysis

Perspectivas do Sul Global nas Relações Internacionais: novas estruturas para Análises Hídricas Transfronteiriças

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22456/2178-8839.113820>

Isabela Battistello Espindola

Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil

isaesvindola@hotmail.com  

Maria Luísa Telarolli de Almeida Leite

Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil

mltaleite@usp.br  

Abstract

International Relations (IR) are an interdisciplinary field of study; however, mainstream IR possesses a Western and North-centric focus that neglects or unequivocally reflects Global South perspectives and realities. Global events, including those related to transboundary water relations, are told from a Western and North perspective. That does not provide enough knowledge to understand developments occurring in the Global South, understood here as less economically developed countries, comprising a variety of states with diverse levels of economic, cultural, and political influence in the international order. In this sense, the article exposes some Latin American IR thinking, to offer new contributions to the process of theorizing transboundary water relations and broaden the field of view within IR and transboundary water. Following a qualitative methodology, based on the bibliographic revision of authors from the Global South in IR and hydropolitics, the paper argues that it is necessary to incorporate non-Western and non-Northern actors and thinking to explore how different actors challenge, support, and shape global and regional hydropolitics. The paper calls for more attention to how the analytical framework on transboundary water interactions can include Global South perspectives. The paper concludes with some suggestions for future research and policy discussions.

Keywords: Global south; Hydropolitics; International relations;

Resumo

As Relações Internacionais (RI) são um campo de estudo interdisciplinar, mas as principais vertentes possuem um foco centrado no Ocidente e no Norte que negligenciam ou refletem inequivocamente as perspectivas e realidades do Sul Global. Os eventos globais, incluindo aqueles relacionados às relações hídricas transfronteiriças, são contados a partir de uma perspectiva ocidental e nortista. Isso não fornece conhecimento suficiente para compreender os desenvolvimentos ocorridos no Sul Global, entendidos aqui como países menos desenvolvidos economicamente, abrangendo uma variedade de Estados com diversos níveis de influência econômica, cultural e política na ordem internacional. Nesse sentido, o artigo expõe algumas reflexões sobre as RI da América Latina, para oferecer novas contribuições ao processo de teorização das relações hídricas transfronteiriças e ampliar o campo de estudo em RI e águas transfronteiriças. Seguindo uma metodologia qualitativa, baseada na revisão bibliográfica de autores do Sul Global em RI e hidropolítica, este artigo argumenta que é necessário incorporar distintos atores e pensamentos para explorar como eles desafiam, apoiam e moldam a hidropolítica regional e global. O artigo enfatiza como estruturas analíticas sobre as interações hídricas transfronteiriças podem incluir as perspectivas do Sul Global. O artigo conclui com algumas sugestões para pesquisas futuras e discussões sobre políticas.

Palavras-chave: Sul-global; Hidropolítica; Relações internacionais;

Received: May 07, 2021
Accepted: September 01, 2021

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Conference on Transboundary Waters in International Relations "Mixing Water and International Relations Theory: Frameworks for Transboundary Water Analysis", organized by the Institute of Political and International Studies from ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences, Budapest, April 2020. The authors would like to thank the organizers and participants of the events for their helpful comments and suggestions. The authors would like to thank the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) and the São Paulo Research Foundation (Fapesp), which financed the research project related to Process n. 2017/17997-9. The opinions, hypotheses, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are the responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the vision of Fapesp.

Conflicts of interest: The authors did not report potential conflicts of interest



Introduction

International Relations (IR) is a relatively recent area of study, born and developed, especially in the 20th century. It is an area in constant evolution, addressing world changes endowed with an increasingly accelerated pace of renewal. IR theories seek to keep pace with those changes, trying to respond to the impact of the evolution of events. Given its transversality of themes, it ends up incorporating instruments from other areas of the human sciences. Therefore, IR analytical tools are constantly changing, incorporating elements that can encompass the speed at which the world transforms, as well as different regions, their diversified voices, and their interdisciplinarity.

Although characterized as an interdisciplinary field of study, IR is dominated by a Western and North-centric focus that does not reflect Global South perspectives and realities (KALIL, 2017; KRISTENSEN, 2020; TAYLOR, 2012). To Waeber (1998), this is one of the reasons why IR should be considered as a non-international discipline. According to Waeber (1998) and Acharya (2014), IR does not reflect the totality of contexts and perceptions diversified in its analyses. There is a lack of representativeness about voices, gender, experiences, knowledge, and contributions in IR (ACHARYA, 2014). The mainstream IRs are produced by Western and North schools. Those schools shape and remodel the World according to their imposing universalist order that underestimates and not recognizes certain knowledge. Also, they create analytical lenses and discourses that do not provide enough knowledge to understand developments occurring in the Global South, recognized here as less economically developed countries, comprising a variety of states with diverse levels of economic, cultural, and political influence in the international order (HOUNTONDJI, 2006).

Non-Western and Non-Southern perspectives are mainly left out of the discussion, which makes it difficult to consolidate themselves among IR debates. Acharya and Buzan (2009; 2017) believe that non-Western and non-Southern attempts to be included in the IR discussion are barred by an environment dominated and conditioned by power practices and politics that exclude different perspectives. There is a certain tradition in perpetuating politics of exclusion and ethnocentrism in IR. To solve this situation, Acharya (2018) argues that the IR discipline needs to be reconstructed as a field of study that incorporates the diversity and plurality that exists in the World. New, inward, and non-traditional perspectives should be considered. This, according to the author, would establish the basic needs incorporate new concepts, theories, and methods that pay attention to ethnocentrism and exceptionalism. It would lead to diversification in the field of IR, and to recognize the production of knowledge beyond the central states. The notion of this Global IR has enabled the development of a research agenda that seeks to identify how to introduce new ideas, concepts, standards, and different forms of non-Western and Non-North agencies and thus expand existing knowledge in IR (ACHARYA, 2014).

This article may offer an original contribution to the debate as it focuses on how non-mainstream IR thinking, such as theories, originated in Latin America can contribute with knowledge, subjectivities, and political perspectives to hydro-political studies. Here, IR theories are understood as the construction of theoretical-conceptual tools so that it is possible to understand phenomena related to the action of actors that transcend the national scope of States and act in the International System (BATTISTELLA, 2014; CASTRO, 2012). In turn, hydro-politics are the ongoing process of political decisions regarding water resources, influenced by relations between states, non-state actors, citizens, and markets. It “takes into consideration power relations, institutions, legislation, technologies, and available infrastructure” (ESPINDOLA; LEITE; SILVA, 2020, p. 2).

The discussion presented here is not intended as a critique of the “West” versus “non-West” or the “North/South” IR thinking and literature per se. Also, it does not question the West/non-West binary or Global North/South binary. Many have spoken eloquently about this process and joined forces to decolonize IR, and it would be a pity not to recognize the relevance of those works¹. This article states that the difference exists in the IR debate and aims to look at it to contribute to exploring connections between IR thinking and transboundary water analysis.

¹ Acharya, (2014; 2016; 2017; 2018); Benabdallah; Adetula; Murillo-Zamora (2017); Deciancio (2016); Frasson-Quenoz (2016); Kalil (2017); Kristensen (2020); Taylor (2012); Tickner (2008); Trowsell et al., (2021).

This article follows a qualitative methodology, based on the bibliographic revision of authors from the Global South, first in IR and second in hydropolitics. This study is, therefore, exploratory and descriptive in nature. For its purposes, the article is structured as follows: the first part, through a literature review, presents conceptual discussions based on Latin American perspectives of IR, trying to answer whether or not there is one Latin American IR. Some of the historical relations, geopolitical interactions, legal and organizational arrangements are analyzed in this part. The second part focus on connections between Latin American IR and hydropolitical studies.

Results and discussion

Why focus on Latin American IR?

There is no doubt that Western and Northern IR have contributed with significant insights to understand global politics, shaping our comprehension of world history. However, theirs believes and histories and not global. To Acharya (2014) the global order has traditionally been conceptualized as an extension of the European State system and, later, as a byproduct of a liberal hegemonic order led by the United States. Since American and European ideas are dominant, Acharya (2014) believes that their influences on the formation of institutions are predominant, even though these same institutions pledged to have a universal character. Cervo (2008) observes that this process would reflect the incorporation of forged explanatory scopes, linked to the interests, values, and standards of certain countries. Trying to solve this issue, Cervo (2008) suggests that the function of theories should be reduced during IR analysis. At the same time, he proposes to raise the role of concepts, either regarding the productions of new understandings or to support IR decision-making processes.

Cervo (2008) also raises the question that theories are neither exempt nor impartial. To him, they are only appropriate during two situations: first, as a theoretical basis for academic studies; second, as subsidies to decision-making only when taken with critical sense or when they reverse the content they convey. Its use in other cases may result in leading intellectuals to incongruous paths, as well as creating a situation that will turn governments against the interests of their people (CERVO, 2008). Trying to offer a solution to this reality, Acharya (2014) proposes to build IR discipline in an inclusive foundation table, by this, to recognize the multiple and diverse perspectives from non-Western IR.

According to Kristensen (2020), Asia has been the principal focus of studies of non-Western IR. Here, the focus shifts towards Latin America. Some of the main aspects of IR theories developed in the region are examined to offer new contributions to the process of theorizing transboundary water relations and broaden the field of view within IR theory and transboundary water. The reason behind this choice is based upon some considerations. First, this article is written as a Latin Americanist and by Latin Americans, bringing “a particular geographical and disciplinary perspective to the question of power in the region” (TAYLOR, 2012, p. 1).

Second, Latin America operates between different traditions, being influenced by diverse horizons. This is one of the main reasons why classical IR concepts (such as the notion of the international system, the understanding of power, and the idea of cooperation) feel foreign to Latin America. Latin American IR is not monolithic. There are multiple IR theories identities with a distinct view on what IR looks like. Indigenous perspectives are envisioned as IR theories in Andean countries (i.e. Pachamama), and, at the same time, Brazilian thinkers attempt to theorize IR in a closer relation with West and North terms, following a hybrid Western-but-Southernness subjectivity (KRISTENSEN, 2020; TAYLOR, 2012). Still, questions remain over whether West and North “methods would lead to different research designs among new generations of researchers” in Latin America (VILLA *et al.*, 2017, p. 264).

Third, drawing on the importance of water resources available in the region, this article claims that water is a key strategic factor for Latin America IR, acting as a powerful connector in the region, involving diverse agents and multiple demands. Water resources are intertwined between power, politics, economics, history, culture, and the social

foundations of Latin America. They are the reason behind some of the conflict and cooperation processes that happened in Latin American history (HATCH KURI; RIBEIRO, 2020).

Barlow and Clark (2007) say that Latin America is water abundant, both surface and groundwater. The region, for example, houses the Amazon Basin, which permeates eight countries (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guyana, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, and Venezuela), the Guarani Aquifer, which extends over four countries (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay) and is one of the largest transboundary aquifers in the World, and the La Plata Basin, shared among five countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay) (DUARTE *et al.*, 2019; ESPINDOLA; LEITE; RIBEIRO, 2020; SENHORAS; MOREIRA; VITTE, 2009).

Nevertheless, this does not imply guaranteed water access to all Latin Americans. Neither translates into a situation of absence of conflict in the region. Multiple demands coexist within the Latin American region. Regarding the first statement, inequality in access to water supply and sanitation services (WASH² services) has been considered as one of the main challenges in achieving the commitments made in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development³ in Latin America (QUEIROZ; CARVALHO; HELLER, 2020).

Other examples range from the full use of water resources for electricity generation in the region (ALDOMONTE *et al.*, 2013), exploitation and pollution of water resources by mining companies in Colombia (ULLOA, 2020), to the pulp mill case on the banks of the Uruguay River, which was taken by Argentina and Uruguay to the International Court of Justice for its resolution (GEARY, 2012), among others. Some of these transboundary water interactions have been analyzed through the lens of cooperation and conflict from hydropolitics scholars from Latin America (ESPINDOLA; RIBEIRO, 2020; LEITE; RIBEIRO, 2018; SILVA, 2017). They stated that water interactions in Latin America are complex and in constant changes, demanding further considerations and analysis.

In sum, there are numerous outbreaks of economic, political, social, and environmental conflicts in Latin America that are related to water. These outbreaks can influence and shape the transboundary water interactions among riparian countries, affecting the course of many IR in the Latin America region. They create a unique stage for IR studies and discussion, offering a distinctive source of IR practice that demonstrates that IR “does not have to be inherently and inevitably Western” (ACHARYA; BUZAN, 2009, p. 3).

Is there one Latin American IR?

Latin America can be characterized by a complexity of variables, from colonial policies, diverse cultures, conflicting national development agendas, nation-state issues, unstable economies, civil society movements, and constant political changes. These dynamics reflect on the IR theories being developed in the region, creating a significant specificity when compared to other IR productions. A growing body of scholarship has been examining IR thinking in Latin America (FAWCETT, 2012; JULIÃO, 2011; KALIL, 2017; KRISTENSEN, 2020; LOCKHART, 2008; MEDEIROS *et al.*, 2016; TICKNER, 2003; 2008). They demonstrate that Latin American IR thinkers have worldings in their own right and are more than able to analyze developments occurring around the globe from their perspective (KRISTENSEN, 2020).

Similar to other IR thinking around the globe, Medeiro *et al.* (2016) remember that Latin American IR has its roots in other sciences, such as Political Science, Economics, and Sociology. These IR supporting areas of knowledge also range from critical geography, sociology, or even postcolonial studies. Through debates in these areas, it was disseminated that the plurality of concepts and perspectives was necessary for Latin America. They emphasized the need to decentering

² WASH is an acronym that stands for water, sanitations, and hygiene.

³ The 2030 Agenda is an international framework for an action plan through the adoption, at various levels, of 17 Sustainable Development Goals, the SDGs, and 169 goals, to eradicate poverty and promote dignified life for all, within the limits of the planet. These are clear goals and objectives, so that all countries take into practice according to their own priorities and act in the spirit of a global partnership that guides the choices needed to improve people's lives (BRASIL, 2021).

the “West” and “North” IR, arguing that Western and Northern experiences were not universal and should not be the exclusive starting point for conceptualizing or theorizing IR in Latin America (MANSOUR, 2016).

Many of the first contributions to the IR debate in Latin America came from authors with origins in these other areas mentioned above. Table 1 presents a list of selected Latin American scholars and their main works. Some of those will be authors will be discussed in this paper.

Table 1: List of selected Latin American scholars and their main works

	Latin American scholars	References
1	Aldo Ferrer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferrer, A. Modernización, Desarrollo Industrial e Integración Latinoamericana. Desarrollo Económico, n. 14-15, vol. 4, p. 195 a 205, Jul./dec, 1964. Ferrer, A. Hechos y ficciones de la globalización: Argentina y el Mercosur en el sistema internacional. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1997. Ferrer, A. De Cristóbal Colón a Internet: América Latina y la globalización. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999.
2	Amado Cervo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cervo, A. L. Sob o signo neoliberal: as relações internacionais da América Latina. <i>Rev. Bras. Polít. Int</i>, 43(2), 5–27, 2000. Cervo, A. L. Conceitos em relações internacionais. <i>Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional</i>, 51(2), 8–25, 2008.
3	André Gunder Frank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frank, A. G. La sociología del desarrollo y el subdesarrollo de la sociología. In: ——— (Org.). América Latina: subdesarrollo o revolución. México: Era, 1993. Frank, A. G. El desarrollo del subdesarrollo: un ensayo autobiográfico. Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 1991.
4	Bernal-Meza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bernal-Meza, R. Dos aportes teóricos latinoamericanos de relaciones internacionales y su utilización por el pensamiento chino contemporáneo: los casos de Prebisch y Escudé. <i>Revista de Estudios Sociales</i>, 64, 75–87, 2018a. Bernal-Meza, R. Nuevas Ideas En El Pensamiento Latinoamericano En Asuntos Internacionales. <i>Análisis Político</i>, 31(94), 31–48, 2018b.
6	Carlos Escudé	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Escudé, C. Realismo Periférico: fundamentos para la nueva política exterior argentina. Buenos Aires: Planeta, 1992. Escudé, C. El realismo de los estados débiles: la política exterior del primer gobierno Menem frente a la teoría de las relaciones internacionales. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latino Americano, 1995. Escudé, C. Estado del Mundo. Las nuevas reglas de la política internacional vistas desde el Cono Sur. Buenos Aires: Editora Ariel, 1999.
7	Carlos Puig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Puig, J. C. América Latina: políticas exteriores comparadas. Tomo I. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano, 1982. Puig, J. C. Lineamientos de un nuevo proyecto nacional, Buenos Aires, 1969. In: DI MASI, J.R. Las relaciones entre el este de Asia y América Latina en el marco de una visión autonomista de la política exterior. V Reunión de la Red América Latina y el Caribe del Centro de Estudios de Asia- Pacífico. Buenos Aires, 2002.
8	Celso Lafer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lafer, C. A identidade internacional do Brasil e a política externa brasileira: passado, presente e futuro. – São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 2001. Lafer, C. Política Externa Brasileira: Três Momentos. – São Paulo: Konrad Adenauer-Stiftung, Papers nº 4, 1993.
9	Edmundo Heredia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heredia, E. A. La región en la globalización y en la historia de las relaciones internacionales latinoamericanas. Ciclos en la historia, en la economía y en la sociedad, v.7, n.12, p.78-97, 1997. Heredia, E. A. Relaciones Internacionales latinoamericanas: historiografía y teorías. Córdoba: Junta Provincial de Historia de Córdoba, 2009.
10	Enzo Faletto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cardoso, F. H.; Faletto, E. Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina: Ensaio de Interpretação Sociológica (Quarta Edição). Zahar Editores, 1977. Cardoso, F. H.; Faletto, E. Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina. In: R. Bielschowsky (Ed.), Cinquenta anos de pensamento na Cepal, 1st ed., 490 p., 2000.

11	Felipe Herrera	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Herrera, F. Nacionalismo Latinoamericano, Santiago de Chile, editorial Universitaria, 1968. Herrera, F. Nacionalismo, regionalismo, internacionalismo, Buenos Aires, Intal, 1970.
12	Fernando Henrique Cardoso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cardoso, F. H.; Faletto, E. Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina: Ensaio de Interpretação Sociológica (Quarta Edi). Zahar Editores, 1977. Cardoso, F. H.; Faletto, E. Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina. In: R. Bielschowsky (Ed.), Cinquenta anos de pensamento na Cepal, 1st ed., 490 p., 2000.
13	Hélio Jaguaribe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jaguaribe, H. Introdução ao desenvolvimento social: as perspectivas liberal e marxista e os problemas da sociedade não repressiva. Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão, 2013. Jaguaribe, H. Autonomía periférica y Hegemonía céntrica. Estudios Internacionales, XII, 46, 1979.
14	Heraldo Muñoz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muñoz, H. A Nova Política Internacional. São Paulo: Editora Alfa-Omega, 1995. Muñoz, H. Política Internacional de los nuevos tiempos. Editora: Los Andes, 1996.
15	Hérrnan Santa Cruz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cruz, H. S. Cooperar o perecer: Los años de creación 1941 -1960, Volume 1. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano, 1984.
16	José Paradiso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paradiso, J. Um lugar no mundo: a Argentina e a busca de identidade internacional. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005. Paradiso, J. Ideas, ideologías y política exterior en Argentina. In: DEP: Diplomacia, Estrategia y Política / Proyecto Raúl Prebisch no. 5 (enero/marzo de 2007) -. Brasília: Proyecto Raúl Prebisch, 2007.
17	Luciano Tomassini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tomassini, L. Transnacionalización y desarrollo nacional em América Latina. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano, 1984. Tomassini, Luciano. Teoría y Práctica de la Política Internacional; Santiago; Ediciones de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, 1989.
18	Mario Rapoport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapoport, M. Problemática y desarrollo de la Historia de las Relaciones Internacionales en América Latina y en la Argentina desde fines del siglo XX. Revista Il Politico, n . 3, año, pp. 84-100, 2013. Rapoport, M. Globalización y relaciones internacionales: los desafíos del siglo XXI. In: Martins, E.C. R (org.), Relações Internacionais. Visões do Brasil e da América Latina, IBRI-FUNAG, Universidade de Brasília, Brasil, 2003, pp. 37-62, 2003.
19	Moniz Bandeira	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bandeira, L. A. M. A desordem mundial (6a ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 2016. Bandeira, L. A. B. Estado Nacional e Política Internacional na América Latina: o Continente nas Relações Argentina-Brasil (1930-1992). Brasília: Editora UnB, 1995.
20	Oswaldo Sunkel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sunkel, O. En busca del desarrollo perdido. Problemas del desarrollo, v.37, n.147, pp.13-44, 2006. Sunkel, O. El subdesarrollo latinoamericano y la teoría del desarrollo. Buenos Aires: Editora Siglo XXI, 1999.
21	Raul Prebisch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prebisch, R. El desarrollo económico de la América Latina y algunos de sus principales problemas. Santiago: Cepal, 1949. Prebisch, R. Perspectivas para la creación del Mercado Común Latinoamericano. In: INTAL. La Integración Latinoamericana Situación y Perspectivas. Buenos Aires: Instituto para la integración de America Latina, 1965, p. 189-217, 1965.
22	Theotônio dos Santos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dos Santos, T. Quais são os inimigos do povo? Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1962.

Source: own elaboration.

Another characteristic of Latin American IR is that the discussion started in institutions other than universities (MEDEIROS *et al.*, 2016). In the 1950s and 1960s, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (Eclac)⁴, for example, produced considerable contributions to the debate, touching on topics related to capitalism expansion, international asymmetry, and Latin American integration. In Brazil, IR thought began in institutions such as Itamaraty, the federal government responsible for Brazilian foreign affairs, and the Armed Forces. As a consequence of this

⁴ Eclac (or CEPAL for its Spanish acronym) was established on 25 February 1948 to contribute to the Latin American development by promoting the region's social development and coordinating actions directed towards this end. It is one of the five regional commissions of the United States and it includes 46 members states from Latin America and the Caribbean region.

institutional influence on Latin American IR, the studies and discussions were guided “by practical concerns, prioritizing historic and geopolitical approaches” (MEDEIROS *et al.*, 2016, p. 3). During this period, the Latin American IR elite was mainly composed of bureaucrats, diplomats, politicians, and a small portion of researchers.

With the increasing creation of universities, undergraduate and graduate IR courses all around Latin America, especially in the 2000s, new IR theoretical trends started to spread in the region. One of them was related to regional integration analysis. The regional integration processes of the 1990s, such as Southern Common Market (Mercosur for its Spanish initials)⁵, were the main influence behind this. Latin American IR scholars were concerned with the consequences of importing models from other regions to explain and structure regional integration processes in Latin America. To them, it was necessary to construct tools for analyzing regional integration movements according to Latin America particularities (BRICEÑO RUIZ, 2018; MALAMUD, 2004; PERROTTA, 2013).

By doing so, they would avoid categories and comparisons with authors and processes that occurred in Europe (BRICEÑO RUIZ, 2018; MALAMUD, 2004; PERROTTA, 2013). To Malamud (2004), Latin American integration structures reproduce the logic of the State that was behind its creation. In this sense, the safeguarding of sovereignty is part of the formation and development of the institutional design of the integration. They would create instances of prospecting for topics of regional interest, which most assume an intergovernmental logic. This is the opposite of the European case.

However, to another group of Latin American IR scholars, these particularities were not sufficiently capable of constituting a Latin American school of IR theories (JULIÃO, 2011). To them, many of the processes that took place in Latin America mimicked, from the colonial period to recent years, systems of power and political ordering of consolidated national states. Tickner (2003; 2008) and Vidal and Brum (2020) argue that Latin America has a historical exposure to United States's influence. This often resulted in the reproduction of perspectives and knowledge that overlooked Latin American reality. This positioning is shared by Julião (2011), Bernal-Meza (2018a; 2018b), and other scholars (KALIL, 2017). They reproduced asymmetries and supported economic structures for the export of primary goods that were created when they were colonies from European countries. The political implications of this would reflect in the IR developed by Latin American countries.

The fact that Brazil was a colony and after an empire, for example, reflects until nowadays. Brazil established itself as the hegemonic nation in the region since its independence from Portugal, suppressing much of its colonial status. Any attempt to change the status was considered a threat to the country and a priority issue among Brazilian governments. Kristensen (2020) argues that Brazil's behavior as a colonizing colony is still noted when the country engages with other Latin American countries. In the past, Brazil engaged “in internal colonization of domestic subalterns” (KRISTENSEN, 2020, p. 6), which demonstrates the country's ambiguous Western-but-Southern identity in IR. Nowadays, this posture can be noted during negotiation, as it was demonstrated by Brazil in 2009 during the renegotiation of the Itaipu Treaty (ESPINDOLA; RIBEIRO, 2020). Also, another example that exemplifies this behavior is the negotiation of the Guarani Aquifer Agreement (LEITE, 2018).

Yet, it is argued here that Latin America has “sought autonomy of thought and offered an alternative analytical framework” when it comes to its IR theory (MEDEIROS *et al.*, 2016, p. 5). After the II World War and the reorganization of the international system⁶, Latin American countries have undergone major transformations, from economic to political and cultural spheres. These processes were able to influence Latin American thinking, creating not only the foundations for the development of IR theories within the region (PIMENTA, 2009) but also critical readings of classical IR concepts (LOCKHART, 2008). In short, there is not just one Latin American IR. They are diverse and reflect the region's diversity.

In relation to Latin American readings of classical IR concepts, Lockhart (2008) argues that Latin Americans developed critical perspectives to the realist IR approach, stating different assumptions of the logic of power, national

⁵ A South American trade bloc established by the Treaty of Asunción in 1991 and the Protocol of Ouro Preto in 1994.

⁶ With the Cold War, the expansion of the global capitalist system, the African and Asian decolonization process, the creation of international organizations, the development of new states, among other events.

interests, and the international system. In this respect, Latin Americans were able to develop a diverse understanding of power relations and sovereignty. Lockhart (2008, p. 6), Latin American perceptions of the international system “include the idea of a certain hierarchy” based on “the power relations between powerful states and powerless or weak states”. Therefore, the international system does not consist of equal units in a horizontal relationship. Powerful states dictate the criteria and agenda considering their own advantage and interests. Peripheral or underdeveloped States, on the other hand, would be only able to follow and reproduce orders.

Regarding the concept of power in Latin America, to Lockhart (2008), is much more than military power and brutal force (or hard power). Latin American countries are known for using soft power (such as bargaining power, technological power, cultural power) in their IR. These different manifestations of power make it possible for them to force their will on powerful States. An example of this can be seen in negotiations related to natural resources. Latin American countries possess considerable natural resource reserves, such as water, copper, and oil. With good management of these resources, they can build up power and enhance their positions during negotiations. This is one of the reasons why traditional concepts of power based on material forces are not enough to explain Latin America's reality.

This is also related to Latin American perceptions of the concept of interdependence. Latin American countries' interactions are not essentially conflictive. There is a common understanding in the region that interrelations in different areas are opportunities to build up power. To Long (2019), although cooperation is becoming more important in Latin America, the region faces a dilemma related to struggles to spur regional responses. Regional organizations, such as the Union of South American Nations (Unasur) and Mercosur, are unable to foster mapmaking efforts to obstacles and solve the region's shared challenges.

Regarding some of the theories developed in Latin America that contributed to IR thinking, Tickner (2003; 2008) and Villa e Pimenta (VILLA *et al.*, 2017) states that the Dependency Theory, which has as main authors Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto (CARDOSO; FALETTTO, 1977; 2000), is one of the first genuine peripheral approaches developed in Latin America to discuss the problems of development and international insertion. However, the Dependency Theory is not an IR theory per se. Much of its work was done in sociology and political economy studies. But Cardoso and Faletto's theory is, to Silva (2014), a relevant model to analyze Latin American reality. Tickner (2003; 2008) complements, saying that it was from its development that Latin America was able to build its thinking, developing a hybrid theory that articulates local contributions to realist and liberal IR interpretations coming from core regions.

To Tickner (2008) some of the dependency's concerns were used in other Latin American IR writings. Aspects of lack of sovereignty among Latin American countries, the influential role of elite groups, and the region's potential for outgrowing its dependent status guided Latin American IR debate during the 1960s and 1980s. They were responsible, for example, for the development of critics to realism, the predominant United States IR theory, which they consider limited to the analysis and practice of Latin American IR. It was the start of a conflict between local IR formulations and the imported US perspectives. The tension led to the development of a hybrid model that incorporates pieces of United States and Latin American IR theories.

The theory of autonomy (JAGUARIBE, 1979; 2013) is another example of a theory that finds its origin in Latin America. To Lockhart (2008, p. 8) this Latin American theory considers that “the status of being a peripheral country—characterized by economic and social underdevelopment—is not inescapable”. According to this theory, the peripheral status and international constraints from Latin America could be overcome through two axes: economic and social development. Jaguaribe (1979; 2013) argues that this autonomy could be achieved through integration. Still, Latin American countries had yet to incorporate this autonomy as a policy objective, both within the State territories' policies and with foreign relations.

Another contribution lies in the regionalism process in Latin America. The regional processes ranged from traditional economic-driven blocs to the incorporation of non-state actors and sharing common values that decentralized

IR settings in the region. By this, they were able to reshape Latin American IR, offering explanations that other IR studies have missed or were unable to give (DECIANCIO, 2016). Several Latin-American scholars use the lenses of regionalism to approach IR theory, establishing a pioneering agenda that questioned imperialist theoretical frameworks and rejected European-led approaches. Theoretical debates on Latin American IR built on the regionalism process generally focus on three factors: (1) regional economic development; (2) regional integration as an instrument for autonomy; (3) post hegemonic regionalism, that incorporates new agendas and approaches.

Considering the presented above, it is argued here that Latin America possesses the basic elements to be recognized as a school of IR theories (FRASSON-QUENOZ, 2016). The region has a collective identity among its authors. There is a sharing of world opinions, ontological references, and methodological tools are also shared. Finally, it is noted that the region has an independent and specific research agenda (BERNAL-MEZA, 2018b; JULIÃO, 2011). The theorizing IR aspects from Latin America covers culture, civilizational resources, religions, ancient philosophies, coloniality, imperialism, dependency, exploitation, peripherality, and the search for autonomy, development, and insertion in the global order. Another characteristic of Latin America refers to its security threats. Kristensen (2020) presents that Latin America is more concerned with economic rather than military or terrorist threats. Tropical problems, such as diseases, are other concerns noted in Latin American studies.

Considering the stated above, Latin American IR exists and emerged from its hardships, especially its economic and political development dilemmas. It was influenced by a clear Western and Northern vision of IR but assumed unique characteristics of the region. They question the North-South relations, offering new nuances of international political economy, and embrace logics of security relations of autonomy, integration, power, and hegemony.

Connections between Latin American IR and hydropolitical studies

Incorporating non-Western and non-North thoughts into the IR and water debate offers ways to explore and understand how transboundary water interactions occur in different countries around the Globe. In this sense, it is necessary to expose some of the Latin American productions on hydropolitics, especially those that offer theoretical contributions on the theme and made use of IR theories for unpacking transboundary water interactions. Following the dossier proposal, special emphasis is given to works developed by Latin American women.

The necessity to highlight non-traditional hydropolitics perspectives was stated by Martinez (2012) and Sant'Anna and Villar (2015). To them, Latin America offers different realities to hydropolitical analysis that can enrich the IR and water debate, since they entangle much more than governance and management water discussion. Martinez (2012) remembers that the hydropolitical debate spread primarily from the United States and European countries, focusing mainly on issues related to transboundary basins. The hydropolitical literature has a history of centralizing its analysis on transboundary river basins. This tendency, however, blindfolds the importance of transboundary aquifers to hydropolitical studies.

Another consequence is that the United States and the European countries, to Martinez (2012), produced a huge amount of hydropolitical analysis that focused on places where water is a scarce resource, like the Middle East and South Asia (MESA) region and Africa. To Martinez (2012), these regions possess different characteristics when compared to Latin America, where water is abundant. Martinez (2012) argues that when water is abundant, the hydropolitical debate behaves differently. The transboundary water interactions are, according to Martinez (2012), more cooperative and peaceful.

This does not mean that conflicts related to water do not occur in Latin America. According to Martinez (2012) and Hatch Kuri e Ribeiro (2020), Latin American conflicts assume different forms, causes and include diverse actors in it. They can, for example, be framed by distinct political and ideological perspectives, involve market forces and the private sector, and be related to the institutional restructuring of the water sector (HATCH KURI; RIBEIRO, 2020). In this regard,

Ribeiro (2012) argues similarly, stating that the Latin American hydrogeopolitics could not be interpreted only via classical IR concepts because they are not able to fully explain contemporary transboundary water interactions in the region.

When analyzing Latin American hydrogeopolitics, Ribeiro (2012) was able to establish basic connections with three IR tools: sovereignty, State, and interdependence. To Ribeiro (2012) and Queiroz (2016), interdependence is a key factor in transboundary waters, especially in Latin America. To them, transboundary water resources remind us about the connection that exists between riparian countries. It is not only about the hydrological and physical association between those countries, but also how changes in the regional balance of power, economic development, and internal political stability can affect beyond the state borders. According to Queiroz (2016), hydrogeopolitical interdependence could influence and shape the IR of a given region.

Although important, the States are not the only actors present in Latin America's hydrogeopolitics. Sovereignty, to Ribeiro (2012), has its limits when it comes to transboundary waters, and thus interdependent sovereignty should be the goal and path to riparian countries. From Martinez (2012) and Ribeiro (2012) arguments, Sant'Anna and Villar (2015) defend that transboundary water interactions between riparian countries in Latin America range from state-centric approach, a prevailing dynamics in IR, to the inclusion of different actors (such as private sector and other stakeholders), incorporation of governance mechanisms, and the adoption of cooperation arrangements. To Sant'Anna and Villar (2015), the models adopted so far presents fragilities that incapacitate much of its success related to the equitable and shared management of mutual water resources. Issues of lack of social participation, difficulties in structuring a common project of development, and institutional problems are common in Latin America.

Regarding the diversification of actors, Guivant and Jacobi (2003) and Sindico, Hirata and Manganelli (2018) demonstrate how non-state actors are relevant and present in water management in both superficial and groundwater cases. Taking the municipality of São Paulo as a case study, Guivant and Jacobi (2003) argue that the community, businessmen, and non-governmental organizations are important hydrogeopolitical actors. Besides the presence of the state, Guivant and Jacobi (2003) believe that these non-state actors can shape hydrogeopolitics, especially sub-national, by participating in the negotiation, debate, and articulation around water resources management and governance. Their inclusion in the debate can reshape power relations, creating and influencing new dynamics in relations between municipalities within the same regions. This would affect how water resources are managed and could result in the creation of policies and other legislations related to water.

Sindico, Hirata and Manganelli (2018) also believe that different actors must be considered during transboundary water interactions studies. They argue that sub-national governments possess a critical role in the political management of groundwater resources. This is also the reason why Silva and Hussein (2019) believe that hydrogeopolitical studies should consider different scales, such as political, economic, and ecological, in the analysis. According to them, these different scales are socially contingent products. They are a result of power relations and can acquire status based on how these power relations influence national political goals. In this sense, different actors are involved in the process. Silva and Hussein (2019) consider that the Guarani Aquifer System (GAS) is an example of a different hydrogeopolitical scale that exists within the La Plata basin region.

In their analysis, Granja and Warner (2006) cover another aspect of Latin American hydrogeopolitical studies as they try to determine how political and governmental systems adopted by a country can influence their hydrogeopolitics. In this sense, they consider Brazilian federalism as a study case. Brazil is one of the largest federal states in the world, and the authors consider Brazilian federalism as unique and far stronger when compared to any other Latin American country. Granja and Warner (2006) argue that Brazil is an example of cooperative and integrative federalism, where diverse actors can influence and construct the country's decision, under democratic criteria.

The 1988 Brazilian Constitution empowers different levels of government, from municipalities, states, and the federal district of Brasilia. It also establishes the division of responsibilities and autonomy between these different

governmental levels and places popular participation as one of the main tools to formulate and manage public policies and resources (GRANJA; WARNER, 2006). This includes water management. To Granja and Warner (2006) 1988 Brazilian Constitution is very progressive when is stated that civil society could participate in water management discussions through the hydrographic basin councils and committees. These water committees and councils are important mechanisms that ensure the diversification of actors other than the states in hydropolitics issues, especially sub-national ones.

Espindola, Leite and Silva (2020) also investigate Brazilian hydropolitics, trying to understand how the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goal 6 (SDG6) can influence and impact national hydropolitics. The authors believe that the SDG6 concepts and statements are related to hydropolitics, presenting similar characteristics that combine IR, environmental discussions, and governance tools in their scope. Furthermore, Espindola, Leite and Silva (2020) endorse the arguments that different scales and actors are part of hydropolitics. To achieve the 2030 Agenda and the SDG6, the authors advocate that hydropolitics should incorporate actors beyond the State, following the Brazilian example of public participation in water councils and committees. For them, SDG6 would be much more achievable if subnational hydropolitics were enhanced within the States.

Besides the analysis of subnational hydropolitics, Latin American hydropolitical approaches also incorporate basin-wide studies. Martinez (2012), for example, contemplates the Amazon Basin and the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO). To the author, the existing dynamics in the Amazon basin are centered around a situation of water abundance. This led to predominantly cooperative and peaceful interactions among the riparian countries and ACTO members. However, Martinez (2012) highlights that a macro analysis is not enough to fully comprehend the interactions that exist in the basin, because it can result in an incomplete perception of the basin variables.

Thus, Martinez (2012) defends that a microanalysis is needed. This micro analysis should focus on the effectiveness of the river basin organization, paying attention to subnational disputes, existing operations (political, diplomatic, strategic, and technical), the quality of the established cooperation, and other perceptions over the shared water resource. When analyzing the Amazon Basin and the ACTO, Martinez (2012) concludes that the created hydropolitical regime is weak, inconsistent, and does not fully incorporate the riparian's needs. The ACTO, to Martinez (2012), was not able to strengthen synergies among its eight members. Consequently, the hydropolitical regime of the Amazon Basin has failed.

Another example lies with analysis of the La Plata Basin⁷, the Guarani Aquifer⁸, and the El Paso del Norte binational region⁹. The El Paso del Norte region is an arid area located between the twin cities of El Paso (Texas, United States) and Ciudad Juárez (Chihuahua, Mexico) that houses two small transboundary aquifers: Bolsón del Hueco and Bolsón de la Mesilla. Both aquifers suffer from greater recharge limitations and conflicting interests from the United States and Mexico, being issues of constant conflict between the two countries.

This creates not only political-diplomatic problems for the United States and Mexico but also a series of water-related problems that contribute to instabilities between the nations and within its borders. Water scarcity, unequal use of water resources, urban growth, infrastructure asymmetry are some of the problems faced in the El Paso del Norte region (TURNER; HAMLIN; HERNÁNDEZ, 2003). In addressing this case, Kuri (2017) stresses that the competition for access and appropriation of transboundary groundwater in recent decades, based on asymmetric institutional processes and mechanisms, has resulted in local political tensions. According to the author, Mexico should pay attention to the legal and

⁷ For the La Plata basin, it is recommended to read the following works: Alcañiz; Berardo (2016); Capaldo (2009); Castillo (2011); Espindola; Leite; Ribeiro (2020); Espindola; Ribeiro (2020); Gilman; Pochat; Dinar (2008); Maciel (2019); Neto, 2016; Queiroz (2016, 2011, 2012); Schwertner; Andrade; Correia (2020); Silva (2017); Silva; Hussein (2019).

⁸ For the Guarani Aquifer, it is recommended the following references: Espindola; Leite; Ribeiro (2020); Leite; Ribeiro (2018); Mariano; Leite (2019); Ribeiro (2008); Santos (2020); Silva; Hussein (2019); Sindico; Hirata; Manganelli (2018); Villar (2015, 2016); Villar; Ribeiro (2011).

⁹ For the El Paso del Norte binational region, it is recommended the following references: Kuri (2017); Turner; Hamlyn; Hernández (2003).

institutional gaps to constitute a sovereign and interdependent water policy, based on the cooperation and equitable distribution of cross-border groundwater.

When dealing with hydropolitics related to transboundary aquifers, Santos (2020) argues that international organizations play a significant role in the discussion, being capable of influencing the result of this hydropolitical game. Therefore, they are examples of non-state actors that can shape and bring new elements and interests to the discussion. They demonstrate that water processes go beyond the socio-political and territorial issues of countries (and within their jurisdiction) and permeates an international sphere. Market by power struggles and the influence of the World Bank, the Guarani Aquifer System (SAG) is a perfect example of this situation to Santos (2020). She argues that the World Bank portfolio of projects assimilates distinct interests for transboundary waters, both superficial and groundwater. The World Bank was able to deeply interfere with the SAG project, shaping the development of policies, legislation, and even the creation of institutions and multilateral agreements between its riparian countries.

Groundwater governance has been defined as a comprehensive structure of groundwater laws, regulations, and customs, as well as processes involving the public sector, the private sector, and civil society responsible for defining how groundwater is managed and aquifers used (IGRAC, 2021). In the case of GAS, effective governance should include rules, practices, and formal institutions within an interaction between actors and formal and formal institutions at different scales. However, cross-border governance is shaped by the most powerful actors, who can exert their influence to support institutions, regulations, and joint processes, as well as delay or disrupt their creation (SILVA; HUSSEIN, 2019). Therefore, elements of critical hydropolitics theories need to be considered to complement the literature on transboundary groundwater governance.

Silva and Hussein (2019) were responsible for initiating research on the GAS based on the theoretical framework of critical hydropolitics and hydro-hegemony. According to the authors, Brazil would be the most powerful country in the region, given its economic, military, and geopolitical influence, and would act as a hydro-hegemonic actor, determining the dynamics of cooperation for the shared aquifer. In 2005, Brazil used bargaining power to protect its sovereignty and interests, strongly opposing a clause on dispute settlement mechanisms (SILVA, 2017; SILVA; HUSSEIN, 2019).

This action was aimed at preventing non-hegemonic countries from seeking support and benefiting from dispute settlement and arbitration mechanisms. In the absence of such provisions, Brazil would benefit, because power asymmetries would often determine the outcome of the dispute resolution. For Silva and Hussein (2019) The critical hydropolitics device helps explain the current arrangements and dynamics around this clause, identifying power asymmetries between the four countries, as well as helping to demonstrate that Brazil has used bargaining power through tactics and strategies designed to delay negotiations and push for a general and flexible agreement that does not establish clear dispute resolution mechanisms but preserve the status quo and current power relations. The recent developments of hydropolitical relations for GAS are open, because, after ten years, the Agreement for the Guarani Aquifer had its ratification process finalized, but there is still no clarity as to the regional approach of the subject (VILLAR, 2020). It is noteworthy that the World Bank¹⁰ has started a new project to assist management, especially in areas considered critical of the GAS, but it is paralyzed due to the pandemic (HIRATA; KIRCHHEIM; MANGANELLI, 2020).

Regarding the La Plata Basin, Queiroz (2011, 2012, 2016) argues that aspects of security, interdependence, hegemony, asymmetry of power, and institutional cooperation are common among riparian countries. Queiroz (2012) incorporates the Hydropolitical Complexes (HC) model¹¹ in his analysis and applies it to the La Plata Basin. He argues that

¹⁰ The World Bank is one of the largest development and international financial institution in the world, created after the II World War, in 1944, during the Bretton Woods Conference. It is responsible for offering loans, grants, and technical assistance to governments (especially low and middle-income countries) to support expanding or improving their infrastructure, reconstruction and development.

¹¹ To Queiroz (2012), and based on Schulz (1995), Allan (2001) and Turton (2003) formulations, hydropolitical complexes (HC) refers to a geographically contiguous area where a set of states interact based on their hydrological interdependence. A stable HC is related to the existence of stronger cooperation ties. When the interactions between riparian countries turn to instability and disputes, a Hydropolitical Security Complex (HSC) is created.

water is a securitized topic in the La Plata Basin, being a constant theme in the international hydropolitical scenario and subject to externalities. To Queiroz (2012), the La Plata Basin HC can be classified as unstable until 1979, when Argentina and Brazil reached an agreement over their water dispute. From then onwards, the La Plata Basin HC turned into a stable one based on the prevailed structural stability.

From Queiroz (2011, 2012, 2016) HC model, Neto (2016) shift the macro analysis of the La Plata Basin to a micro one, taking the Garabi-Panambi Binational Hydroelectric Complex, a binational project between Argentina and Brazil in the Uruguay River (a sub-basin of the La Plata), as a case study. Neto (2016) argues that Garabi-Panambi Hydroelectric Complex faces development conflicts, environmental impacts, and social issues due to its impact on the host municipalities (both from Argentina and Brazil). He remembers that bilateral initiatives related to the utilization of the Uruguay River date to the 1960s. The construction of dams and power plants are examples of these projects. This is also a characteristic of the La Plata hydropolitics: investments and development of bilateral relations and agreements due to infrastructure projects are common among its riparian countries. And are influenced by the asymmetric interdependence and power that exists between States that share water resources. Neto (2016) believes that the Garabi-Panambi Binational Hydroelectric Complex and the relations between Argentina and Brazil are demonstrations of this characteristic.

Silva (2017) also focuses his analysis on sub-basins of the La Plata. He studies the Apa river basin, shared between Brazil and Paraguay, and the Quaraí river basin between Brazil and Uruguay. To Silva (2017), it is easier to comprehend subnational hydropolitics by considering sub-basin scales. According to him, subnational hydropolitics are more interviewed with local territorial actors, such as mayors, municipal governments, traditional communities, and social movements, than other hydropolitics scales. Even in a situation of decentralized and localized approach, aspects related to the multipolarization of different interests and intentions of the territorial actors remain at the center and play a relevant part in the transboundary water interactions. In this sense, interactions are still conditioned by power and influenced by territorial sovereignty.

Although Latin American hydropolitical studies recognize different scales and diverse actors in transboundary water interactions, Granja and Warner (2006), Procópio (2007), Queiroz (2011), Ribeiro (2012), and García and Pereira (2017) remember that the State is still a fundamental actor for hydropolitics and, thus, cannot be disregarded from any analysis. Procópio (2007) and García and Pereira (2017) defend that Latin American hydropolitics are developed following the interests and ideologies of its States and governments, being deepened related to its capacity and ability to manage and govern water resources. Questions of defense of national interests and protection of natural resources may emerge in the hydropolitical discussion if they are part of the country's ideology. However, their incorporation will mainly depend on the State's abilities and power to ensure that its interests and objectives are present and achievable in hydropolitical discussion. This implies that the role of the State is relevant in water cooperation and diplomacy processes. When it comes to the signing of water cooperation treaties and agreements, States are, according to García and Pereira (2017), the only ones that are capable to do it. Therefore, questions of hegemony and power are still common in Latin American hydropolitical analysis.

Final considerations

This paper is a brief examination of Latin American IR thinking, offering insights from a “non-Western” and “non-North” region. It has sought to expose the contribution of Latin American IR theories (and practices) to transboundary water analysis, strengthening reflections on the Global South from plural and critical perspective. It has been stated that hydropolitical studies can incorporate narratives that surpass the limitations of the US and European-dominated IR discipline. These restrictions exist because European and US perspectives in the IR field are not capable to grasp Latin American reality. Consequently, their produced theories and dominant ideologies are not enough to encompass and explain the multiple interests, values, and patterns present in the Latin American region.

Although Latin America has been caught between North-South and Western–non-Western traditions, it was capable of charting different courses for itself. By exploring Latin American IR, it was noted that its worldview is unique, and the core thinking is related to the empirical observation of specific contexts that confronts Western and North knowledge. Latin American IR scholars contributed to the development of theories that embrace peripheral and tropical problems. Debates related to autonomy, development, and insertion into the international system are at the core of Latin American IR discussions.

Furthermore, the Latin American hydropolitical productions are not restricted to the works mentioned in this paper. This paper is not intended to extinguish the discussion and debates around Latin American hydropolitics. It shows that the field of discussion is much broader and capable of incorporating all the methodological and conceptual pluralism that exists in the Latin American region. The works mentioned above contribute and articulate the concept of hydropolitics with (1) the hydrodependence of riparian states; (2) hydrosecurity linked to the social, economic, political, and environmental spheres; (3) the diversity of actors involved in watershed management; (4) the variety of scales that must be analyzed in the hydropolitical analysis; (5) the role played by international organizations, as well as its influences; (6) the political-administrative systems sensitivity to changes (internal and external); (8) the binomial between the internal and foreign policies of the riparian states; and (9) that the water resources can also lead to conflicts.

There is room for a better valorization of Latin American hydropolitical studies. Therefore, this article should be read (and considered) as encouragement of further explorations of the different perspectives to guide the debates on alternative IR discussions.

References

- ACHARYA, Amitav. **Constructing Global Order: Agency and Change in World Politics**. Cambridge, United Kingdom, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- ACHARYA, Amitav. Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds. **International Studies Quarterly**, v. 58, n. 4, p. 647–659, 2014. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12171>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ACHARYA, Amitav; BUZAN, Barry. Why is there no non-Western international relations theory?: An introduction. In: ACHARYA, Amitav; BUZAN, Barry. **Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives On and Beyond Asia**, 2009, p. 1–26. Available at: <<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/edit/10.4324/9780203861431/non-western-international-relations-theory-amitav-acharya-barry-buzan>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ACHARYA, Amitav; BUZAN, Barry. Why is there no non-western international relations theory? Ten years on. **International Relations of the Asia-Pacific**, v. 17, n. 3, p. 341–370, 2017. Available at: <academic.oup.com/irap/article/17/3/341/3933493>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ALLAN, Tony. **The Middle East water question: Hydropolitics and the global economy**. Londres: I. B. Tauris & Co, 2001.
- ALDOMONTE, Hugo et al. **Recursos naturais na União das Nações Sul-americanas (UNASUL): Situação e tendências para uma agenda de desenvolvimento regional**. Santiago: CEPAL 2013. Available at: <https://www.cepal.org/sites/default/files/publication/files/3118/S2013196_pt.pdf>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- BARLOW, Maude; CLARKE, Tony. The Struggle for Latin America's Water. **NACLA**, 25th sep. 2007. Available at: <<https://archive.globalpolicy.org/social-and-economic-policy/global-public-goods-1-101/46052-the-struggle-for-latin-americas-water.html>>. Access on: 24 abr. 2021.
- BATTISTELLA, Dario. **Teorias das relações internacionais**. São Paulo: SENAC, 2014.
- BERNAL-MEZA, Raúl. Dos aportes teóricos latinoamericanos de relaciones internacionales y su utilización por el pensamiento chino contemporáneo: los casos de Prebisch y Escudé. **Revista de Estudios Sociales**, n. 64, 2018a, p.75-87. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.7440/res64.2018.06>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- BERNAL-MEZA, Raúl. Nuevas Ideas En El Pensamiento Latinoamericano En Asuntos Internacionales. **Análisis Político**, v. 31, n. 94, 2018b, p. 31–48. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.15446/anpol.v31n94.78238>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- BRASIL. **A Agenda 2030 para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável**. 2021. Available at: <<http://www.agenda2030.org.br/sobre/>>. Access on: 9 Jul. 2021.

- BRICEÑO RUIZ, José. **Las teorías de la integración regional: más allá del eurocentrismo**. Bogotá: Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia: Centro de Pensamiento Global, 2018. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325893651_Las-teorias-de-la-integracion-regional-mas-alla-del-eurocentrismo>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- CARDOSO, Fernando Henrique; FALETTO, Enzo. **Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina: Ensaio de Interpretação Sociológica**. 4 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1977.
- CARDOSO, Fernando Henrique; FALETTO, Enzo. Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina. In: BIELSCHOWSKY, Ricardo (org.). **Cinqüenta anos de pensamento na Cepa**. 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 490 p., 2000.
- CASTRO, Thales. **Teoria das Relações Internacionais**. 4 ed. Brasília: 2012. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.20889/10160>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- CERVO, Amado Luiz. Conceitos em relações internacionais. **Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional**, v. 51, n. 2, 2008, p.8-25. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-73292008000200002>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- CERVO, Amado Luiz. Sob o signo neoliberal : as relações internacionais da América Latina. **Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional** v. 43, n. 2, 2000, p.5-27. Available at: <<https://www.scielo.br/j/rbpi/a/T8n9bgHtg77JHByfKCNdqbN/?lang=pt>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- DECIANCIO, Melisa. International relations from the south: A regional research agenda for global IR. **International Studies Review**, v. 18, n. 1, 2016 p. 106–119. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viv020>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- DUARTE, Miqueias Lima et al. Vulnerabilidade natural à contaminação do aquífero Alter do Chão na área urbana de Manaus, Amazonas, Brasil. **Revista Monografias Ambientais**, v. 18, n. 1, 2019, p.7. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.5902/2236130837231>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ESPINDOLA, Isabela Battistello; LEITE, Maria Luisa Telarolli de Almeida; RIBEIRO, Wagner Costa. South-American Transboundary Waters: The Management of the Guarani Aquifer System and the La Plata Basin Towards the Future. In: Brears R.C. (eds). **The Palgrave Handbook of Climate Resilient Societies**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, p. 1-35. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32811-5_51-1>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ESPINDOLA, Isabela Battistello; LEITE, Maria Luisa Telarolli de Almeida; SILVA, Luis Paulo Batista da. Brazilian Hydropolitics under the United Nations 2030 Agenda. **Meridiado 47 - Journal of Global Studies**, v. 21, n. e21011, 2020, p.1-20. Available at: <<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.20889/M47e21011>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ESPINDOLA, Isabela Battistello; RIBEIRO, Wagner Costa. Transboundary waters, conflicts, and international cooperation - examples of the La Plata Basin. **Water International**, v. 45, n. 4, 2020, p. 329–346. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060.2020.1734756>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- FAWCETT, Louise. Between West and non-West: Latin American contributions to international thought. **International History Review**, v. 34, n. 4, 2012, p. 679–704. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2012.707980>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- FRASSON-QUENOZ, Florent. Latin American Thinking in International Relations Reloaded. **OASIS**, v. 23, 2016, p. 53–75. Available at: <<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18601/16577558.n23.04>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- GARCÍA, Viviana Plata; PEREIRA, Carlos Vera. Incidencia de la hidropolítica en el departamento de Santander caso: Represa Hidrosogamoso. In: **II Congreso Internacional en Administración de Negocios Internacionales – CIANI 2017**. Bucaramanga, Colombia: Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana Seccional Bucaramanga, Colombia, 2017. p. 733–745.
- GEARY, Mirta. O debate sobre a fábrica de celulose no Rio Uruguai: um conflito ecológico distributivo. **GEOUSP - Espaço e Tempo**, n. 31, 2012, p. 161–172. Available at: <<https://www.revistas.usp.br/geousp/article/view/74277>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- GRANJA, Sandra Inês Baraglio; WARNER, Jeroen. A hidropolítica e o federalismo : possibilidades de construção da subsidiariedade na gestão das águas no Brasil ?. **Revista de Administração Pública**, v. 40, n. 6, 2006. Available at: <<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-76122006000600009>>. Access on: Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- GUIVANT, Júlia Silva; JACOBI, Pedro Roberto. Da hidro-técnica à hidro-política : novos rumos para a regulação e gestão dos riscos ambientais no Brasil. **Cadernos de Pesquisa Interdisciplinar em Ciências Humanas**, v. 4, n. 43, p. 2–26, 2003. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.5007/1950>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- HATCH KURI, Gonzalo; RIBEIRO, Wagner Costa. Gestión del agua y relaciones de poder en América Latina. **Agua y Territorio**, n. 15, 2020, p. 11–12. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.17561/at.15.5492>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- HIRATA, Ricardo et. al. Diplomatic Advances and Setbacks of the Guarani Aquifer System in South America. **Environmental Science and Policy**, v. 114, 2020 p. 384–393. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.07.020>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- HOUNTONDJI, Paulin. Global Knowledge: imbalances and current tasks. In: NEAVE, Guy (org.). **Knowledge, Power, and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society**. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2006, p. 41–60.

- JAGUARIBE, Hélio. Autonomía periférica y Hegemonía céntrica. **Estudios Internacionales**, Santiago, v. XII, n. 46, 1979. Available at: <<https://revistaei.uchile.cl/index.php/REI/article/view/16458>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- JAGUARIBE, Hélio. **Introdução ao desenvolvimento social : as perspectivas liberal e marxista e os problemas da sociedade não repressiva**. Brasília: Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão, 2013.
- JULIÃO, Taís Sandrim. Theory and History of International Relations: a Latin American School? **Revista Conjuntura Austral**, v. 2, n. 7, 2011, p. 51–66. Available at: <<https://seer.ufrgs.br/ConjunturaAustral/article/view/21212>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- KALIL, Mariana Alves da Cunha. **Thinking past the Latin American Hybrid: Rationalism in Exile – A Brazilian Contribution to the Theory of International Relations**. Tese de Doutorado (Relações Internacionais), Universidade de Brasília, Brasil, 2017, 325 p. Available at: <<https://repositorio.unb.br/handle/10482/35537>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- KRISTENSEN, Peter Marcus. The South in “Global IR”: Worlding Beyond the “Non-West” in the Case of Brazil. **International Studies Perspectives**, v. 22, Issue 2, 2021 p. 1–22. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekz029>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- KURI, Gonzalo Hatch. Agua subterránea y soberanía interdependiente: El caso de los Sistemas Acuíferos Transfronterizos en la región binacional de Paso del Norte. **Norteamérica**, v. 12, n. 2, 2017, p. 113–145. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.20999//nam.2017.b005>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- LEITE, Maria Luisa Telarolli de Almeida. **O Acordo do Aquífero Guarani e ótica da integração regional**. 243 f. 2018. - Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio De Mesquita Filho” Universidade Estadual De Campinas Pontifícia Universidade Católica De São Paulo, 2018.
- LEITE, Maria Luisa Telarolli de Almeida; RIBEIRO, Wagner Costa. The Guarani Aquifer System (Gas) and the Challenges for Its Management. **Journal of Water Resource and Protection**, v. 10, n. 12, 2018, p. 1222–1241. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.4236/jwarp.2018.1012073>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- LOCKHART, Nicolás Falomir. A Latin American Reading of the Classical Concepts of International Relations Theory. **Relaciones Internacionales**, v. 4, n. SE, p. 0–0, 2008.
- LONG, Tom. There Is No Map: International Relations in the Americas. **Latin American Research Review**, v. 54, n. 2, 2019, p. 548–555. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.459>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- MALAMUD, Andrés. Regional integration in Latin America: Comparative theories and institutions. **Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas**, v. 44, p. 9–11, 2004. Available at: <<https://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/53566>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- MANSOUR, Imad. A Global South Perspective on International Relations Theory. **International Studies Perspectives**, v.18, Issue 1, 2016. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekw010>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- MARTINEZ, Mónica Montana. **Bacia Amazônica e Hidropolítica: Interdependência Hidrológica, Incipiente Regime Regional e Baixo Conflito**. 342 f. 2012. - Universidade de Brasília (UnB), 2012. Available at: <https://repositorio.unb.br/bitstream/10482/11422/1/2012_MonicaMontanaMartinez.pdf>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- MEDEIROS, Marcelo De Almeida et al. What does the field of International Relations look like in South America? **Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional**, v. 59, n. 1, 2016, p. 1–31. Available at: <<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201600104>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- NETO, Mario Joaquim dos Santos. Hidropolítica e hegemonia na Bacia do Prata: o caso do complexo hidrelétrico binacional Garabi-Panambi. In: **3º SEMINÁRIO DE RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS DA ABRI**. FLORIANOPOLIS: 2016. Available at: <http://www.seminario2016.abri.org.br/resources/anais/23/1474768066_ARQUIVO_HidropoliticaeHegemonia_MarioJoaquim_ABRI_2016_final.pdf>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- PERROTTA, Daniela Vanessa. **El regionalismo de la educación superior en el proceso de integración regional del MERCOSUR: políticas de coordinación, complementación, convergencia y armonización en las iniciativas de acreditación de la calidad de carreras de grado (1998-2012)**. 267 f. 2013. - Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 2013. Available at: <<https://repositorio.flacsoandes.edu.ec/handle/10469/5069>> Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- PIMENTA, Gabriel Fernandes. Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina : uma perspectiva alternativa da teoria de Relações Internacionais. **Fronteira**, v. 8, n. 16 2009, p. 7–25. Available at: <<http://periodicos.pucminas.br/index.php/fronteira/article/view/3836/0>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- PROCÓPIO, Argemiro. A hidropolítica e a internacionalização amazônica. **Meridiano 47 - Journal of Global Studies**, v. 86, n. set 2007, p.4-5. Available at: <<https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/MED/article/view/2794>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- QUEIROZ, Fábio Albergaria de. A hidropolítica platina no contexto do complexo regional de segurança da América do Sul: entre o conflito e a cooperação (1960-1979). **Contexto Internacional**, v. 34, n. 2, p. 573–616, 2012. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1590/s0102-85292012000200007>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- QUEIROZ, Fábio Albergaria de. **Hidropolítica e segurança: as Bacias Platina e Amazônica em perspectiva comparada**. 2011. xxi, 373 f., il. Tese (Doutorado em Relações Internacionais), Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2011. Available at: <<https://repositorio.unb.br/handle/10482/8017>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.

- QUEIROZ, Fábio Albergaria de. *Hydropolitics in South American international relations: A perspective on Water Governance at the Prata Basin - Between Conflict and Cooperation (1960-1992)*. In: Sai Felicia Krishna-Hensel. (Org.). **New Security Frontiers: Critical Energy and the Resource Challenge**, 2016, p. 139–172. Available at: <<https://www.routledge.com/New-Security-Frontiers-Critical-Energy-and-the-Resource-Challenge/Krishna-Hensel/p/book/9781138250413>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- QUEIROZ, Vitor Carvalho; CARVALHO, Rodrigo Coelho de; HELLER, Léo. New approaches to monitor inequalities in access to water and sanitation: The SDGs in Latin America and the Caribbean. **Water (Switzerland)**, v. 12, n. 4, 2020, p. 1–16. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.3390/W12040931>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- RIBEIRO, Wagner Costa. Soberania: conceito e aplicação para a gestão da água. **Scripta Nova**, v. 41, n. 108, 2012. Available at: <<https://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/ScriptaNova/article/view/14816>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- SANT'ANNA, Fernanda Mello; VILLAR, Pilar Carolina. Transboundary water resources governance: institutional fragilities in South America. **América Latina Hoy**, v. 69, 2015, p. 53–74. Available at: <<https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.14201/alh2015695374>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- SANTOS, Cinthia Leone Silva dos. **O sistema aquífero guarani e o banco mundial: neoliberalismo, soberania e hidropolítica**. 405 f. Tese de Doutorado. Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2020. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.11606/T.106.2020.tde-27102020-180542>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- SCHULZ, Michael. *Hydropolitical security complex - The case of Euphrates - Tigris and the states of Turkey, Syria, and Iraq*. In: OHLSSON, Leif. (org.). **Hydropolitics: Conflicts over Water as a Development Constraint**. London: Zed Books, 1995.
- SENHORAS, Eloi Martins et. al. A agenda exploratória de recursos naturais na América do Sul : Da empiria à teorização geoestratégica de assimetrias nas relações internacionais. In: **12º Encuentro de Geógrafos de América Latina - caminando en una América Latina en transformación**. Uruguai: Montevideo [s. n.], 2009. p. 1–15.
- SILVA, Luis Paulo da Batista da. **Hidropolítica sul americana e a Bacia do Prata o lugar das sub bacias em zonas de fronteira internacional**. 272 f. Tese de Doutorado. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro. 2017. Available at: <http://www.retis.igeo.ufrj.br/wp-content/uploads/2017_hidropolitica_bacia_do_Prata.pdf>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- SILVA, Luis Paulo da Batista da; HUSSEIN, Hussam. Production of scale in regional hydropolitics: An analysis of La Plata River Basin and the Guarani Aquifer System in South America. **GEOFORUM**, v. 99, January 2019, p. 42–53. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.11.019>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- SILVA, Paulo Roberto. Applicability of Cardoso and Faletto Model to Analyze the Current Latin American Reality. **SAGE Open**, v. January-Ma, 2014, p. 1–4. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014523790>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- SINDICO, Francesco et. al. Regional Studies The Guarani Aquifer System: From a Beacon of hope to a question mark in the governance of transboundary aquifers. **Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies**, v. 20, n. September 2017, 2018, p. 49–59. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2018.04.008>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- TAYLOR, Lucy. Decolonizing international relations: Perspectives from Latin America. **International Studies Review**, v. 14, n. 3, 2012, p. 386–400. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2012.01125.x>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- TICKNER, Arlene B. Hearing Latin American voices in international relations studies. **International Studies Perspectives**, v. 4, n. 4, 2003, p. 325–350. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1111/1528-3577.404001>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- TICKNER, Arlene B. Latin American IR and the Primacy of lo practico. **International Studies Review**, 2008, p. 735–748. Available at: <<https://pure.urosario.edu.co/en/publications/latin-american-ir-and-the-primacy-of-lo-pr%C3%A1ctico-2>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- TURNER, Charles; HAMLYN, Edwin; HERNÁNDEZ, Óscar Ibáñez. El reto de equilibrar el abastecimiento y demanda de agua en el Paso del Norte. In: MICHEL, Suzanne (org.). **The U.S.-Mexican Border Environment: Binational Water Management Planning**. San Diego: San Diego State University Press, 2003. p. 185–246.
- TURTON, Anthony. **The political aspects of institutional developments in the water sector: South Africa and its international river basins**. 2003. The University of Pretoria, South of Africa, 2003. Available at: <<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.734.4936&rep=rep1&type=pdf>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- ULLOA, Astrid. The rights of the Wayú people and water in the context of mining in La Guajira, Colombia: demands of relational water justice. **Human Geography**, v. 13, n. 1, 2020, p. 6–15 Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1177/1942778620910894>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- VIDAL, Camila Feix; BRUM, Luan Correa. Por uma outra forma de (re) pensar as Relações Internacionais : hegemonia e criação de consenso Towards another way of (re) thinking International Relations : hegemony and consensus building. **Conjuntura Austral**, v. 11, n. 56, 2020, p. 109–121. Available at: <<https://seer.ufrgs.br/ConjunturaAustral/article/view/105342>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.
- VILLA, Rafael A. Duarte et al. Is International Relations still an American social science discipline in Latin America? **Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 23, n. 1, 2017, p. 261–288. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-01912017231261>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.

VILLAR, Pilar Carolina. The Agreement on the Guarani Aquifer enters into force: what changes now?. **International Water Law Blog**, 16 Nov. 2020. Available at: <<https://www.internationalwaterlaw.org/blog/2020/11/16/the-agreement-on-the-guarani-aquifer-enters-into-force-what-changes-now/>>. Access on: 30 jan. 2021.

WAEVER, Ole. The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations. **International Organization**, v. 52, n. 4, 1998, p. 687–727. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550725>>. Access on: 16 Jul. 2021.

Authors' Contributor Roles

Isabela Battistello Espindola:

Conceptualization; Methodology; Validation; Data Curation; Project Administration; Formal Analysis; Funding Acquisition; Investigation; Writing (Original Draft Preparation); Writing (Review & Editing);

Maria Luisa Telarolli de Almeida Leite:

Conceptualization; Methodology; Validation; Data Curation; Formal Analysis; Resources; Investigation; Writing (Original Draft Preparation); Writing (Review & Editing);

Information provided by the authors according to the [Taxonomy of author contributions \(CRediT\)](#)