

## **THE CORNERSTONES OF BRAZIL'S DEFENSE POLICY**

*Speech by Defense Minister Celso Amorim at the joint session of the Swedish National Defence College and the Swedish Institute of International Affairs*

**Stockholm, April 4, 2014**

I wish to thank the National Defence College and the Institute of International Affairs for inviting me to this joint session.

This is my first visit to Stockholm in my capacity as Defence Minister.

The relationship between Brazil and Sweden has never been as promising as it is today.

Back in 2009, our Governments decided to establish a Strategic Partnership. The very fruitful meetings I held in Stockholm today confirmed our common resolve to inaugurate a Strategic Partnership in Military Aviation, but also in other fields related to Defence.

Earlier, Minister Karin Enström and myself signed a Framework Agreement on Defence Cooperation.

This set the basis for a long-term association between Brazil and Sweden in the area of defence, with important industrial and technological dimensions.

As our countries draw closer on defence issues, it is also appropriate that our political-strategic dialogue rises to a new level.

In this spirit, I wish to share with you some thoughts on how Brazil looks at the international security landscape and the role played in it by strategic partnerships such as the one between Brazil and Sweden.

\*\*\*

Let me speak a little bit about Brazil.

In recent years Brazil has experienced great changes politically, economically and socially.

Democracy was reestablished in 1985, after twenty one years of authoritarian rule.

Democratic principles and practices have been consistently strengthened and deepened.

People's yearning for freedom, justice and solidarity was enshrined in our Constitution promulgated in 1988.

Another essential step was the resumption of sustainable economic growth.

Hyperinflation was overcome; foreign debt was paid; Brazil became a net creditor.

In 2012, Brazil became the world's sixth largest economy.

If you take today's exchange rate you will see Brazil as the 7<sup>th</sup>, but we hope this will change and will become the 6<sup>th</sup> again.

Our exports comprise a great variety of goods, which include mineral and agricultural products, and high technology items such as civilian and military aircraft.

(Even when we speak of agriculture, we have to take into account that our agricultural products are nearly food stuff in the same sense that coffee used to be 50 years ago, when I started my life in diplomacy. Our agricultural products derive their competitiveness not only

from favorable natural conditions but also from intense research conducted locally. EMBRAPA, which is a Brazilian company that develops most of this research, is most certainly the more productive institution in research in tropical agriculture. For instance, soybeans that were considered to be unadaptable to tropical lands, it was considered a tempered product. Now Brazil is the second larger exporter of soybeans. It is not the largest because the US exports are benefited by government subsidies, which is not our case).

Since I am Minister of Defence, you will understand if I put particular emphasis on Embraer's light attack plane, the Super Tucano, which has been bought by many countries throughout the world.

It was recently selected by the U. S. Air Force for counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan and it has been bought by many countries large and small in Latin America, Africa and another places.

We are also developing a new transport and refueling plane, KC 390, meant to replace the old Hercules, which is coming to the end of its life cycle. Other countries as Argentina, Portugal and the Czech Republic are involved in this project. Other countries have exposed their interest in it.

In the last decade, Brazil accumulated significant amount of foreign reserves, which have helped our country to navigate in the midst of the financial crisis sparked by the Lehman Brothers crash.

Five years into the international crisis, the Brazilian economy has shown resilience and keeps growing, even if more slowly under restrictive global conditions.

One important aspect of this trend is given by the fact that employment been kept at record levels.

Political and economic progress has enabled Brazil to systematically tackle its greatest historical challenge: social inequality.

Indeed, until a decade ago, no matter how other indicators behaved, the Gini coefficient (which measures income disparity) always worsened.

This tendency has been reversed.

Remarkable improvements in the living conditions have been made in the last ten years.

Efforts to eradicate extreme poverty have produced concrete results.

40 million people (one fifth of Brazil's population) have risen out of poverty since 2003.

A huge income-transfer program known as the "Bolsa Família" (Family Stipendium) has directly benefitted 14 million low income families.

I am not exaggerating when I say that this program became a worldwide reference in the endeavor towards poverty reduction.

Programs like this have been initiated by President Lula, on the basis of previous achievements, and have been further developed by President Dilma Rousseff, in the area of housing, electricity and family agriculture.

Indeed, the motto of President Rousseff's administration is very telling.

It says – 'a rich country is a country without poverty'.

\*\*\*

Brazil's international strategy – in both foreign policy and defense policy – has a clear priority: the integration of South America.

The core of economic integration in South America is Mercosul, a customs union between Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, and, since 2012, Venezuela.

Bolivia and Ecuador are also expected to join it.

On the political level – which does not exclude the social and economic dimensions –, Brazil has championed the creation of Unasul, the Union of South American States.

I would like to stress one aspect.

I don't know how many of you are conversant with the debates about South American integration and different trade policies and so on, but very often we see a kind of opposition between Mercosul and the so-called Pacific Alliance, which would be more open to trade.

Let me just remark in this regard: Mercosul has free trade agreements with all the countries that are part of the Pacific Alliance, so in a way we have done that even before this debate had started.

No doubt these agreements can be deepened, of course.

But this was the economic basis on which we created Unasul, in order to avoid that it would be more of a rhetorical effort than an integration effort.

All twelve South American countries are members of this new institution, born in Brasília in 2008.

The South American Defence Council, an integral part of UNASUR, has been instrumental in the management of crises, such as the one between Colombia and Venezuela in 2009.

UNASUR's credibility stems from the principles on which it is based: prohibition of the use of force, peaceful solution of crises, full respect for members' sovereignty, territorial integrity and respect for democratic institutions and, last but not least, no extra-regional interference.

Together with our neighbors, Brazil has worked to establish new inter-regional dialogue mechanisms.

Summits of Heads of States and Governments of South American and African countries, called “ASA”, and South American and Arab countries, called “ASPA”, became regular features of our diplomatic calendar.

Brazil has also engaged in a range of associations aimed at new forms of cooperation and alternative perspectives in world affairs.

In 2003, Brazil joined India and South Africa to create the IBSA Dialogue Forum.

IBSA members are like-minded democracies based on multicultural and multiethnic societies from the developing world, all of which have experienced important political transitions towards greater democracy.

The IBSA Forum has engaged itself in a variety of initiatives relative to South-South cooperation, to the benefit of either poorer or vulnerable nations such as Haiti, Guinea Bissau and Palestine.

IBSA countries have been invited to take part in major conferences on Middle Eastern affairs, such as the Annapolis Conference of 2007 and the Geneva II Conference earlier this year.

Cooperation between IBSA countries has been progressively extended to the defense area, including naval exercises, known as IBSAMAR.

In 2008, Brazil, Russia, India, China and (at a later stage) South Africa formed the BRICS, a group of leading emerging economies seeking changes in global governance, especially in the economic and financial fields.

In this respect, of course, it was not us who invented the acronym BRICS.

Everybody knows that this comes from Jim O'Neill of the Goldman Sachs.

But if you allow me to go into (poor) philosophical terms, I would say that what might be considered as a reality in itself became a reality for itself.

So that is what the BRICS became.

In line with its pursuit of greater plurality in the global economy, the BRICS group is now in the process of establishing its own Development Bank.

In economic and financial matters, a clear sign of change came with the establishment of the G20 group of Leaders, which for all practical purposes took over responsibility for global economic stability from the now nearly-extinct G8.

In matters relating to world trade, Brazil and India took the lead in a coalition of developing countries, the G20 (not to be confused with the Financial G20), with great impact on trade negotiations.

Emphasis on South-South cooperation does not exclude mutually beneficial relations with our developed partners.

In 2007, Brazil established a strategic partnership with the European Union, at the invitation of Brussels, I must say.

Strategic partnerships were also established with individual countries in Europe, such as France (in 2006) and Sweden (in 2009).

While some success was obtained in the reframing of the global economic architecture, the international security framework remains out of touch with 21st century reality.

Ten years ago, Brazil, India, Japan and Germany formed the G4, to carry forward long-overdue reform in the membership and working methods of the UN Security Council.

In our view, these four countries, together with two African nations, should be admitted as new permanent members, albeit possibly without the veto power.

The veto, by the way, should in time wither away or be restricted to very special situations.

Efforts at reforming the Security Council have not as yet borne fruit, to the detriment of that body's legitimacy and efficacy.

This is not a self-serving statement by an aspiring country.

This is a fact acknowledged by a growing number of specialists in both the developed and the developing world.

The paralysis of the Council in major crises as well as the all-too-frequent recourse to unilateral action over the past fifteen years underscores the need for an overhaul of the collective security system.

The vitality of UN norms governing the use of force is an objective of strategic significance for Brazil (I believe also for Sweden, by the way).

Brazil is widely recognized as a peaceful country.

We have lived in peace with our neighbors for close to 150 years.

And we have ten neighbors.

We have forsworn nuclear weapons.

These aspects are themselves relevant contributions to peace.

But we have also shown our willingness to discharge our duties as a peace-providing country.

Brazilian blue helmets are on the ground helping to foster peace and stability in such faraway places like Haiti and Lebanon.

Brazilian troops have been in Haiti since 2004, where they constitute the largest contingent in the UN mission.

Brazilian generals have succeeded each other in the command of Minustah – the UN Mission in Haiti –, which has helped restore peace, security and the rule of law in that sister nation of Latin America.

It was also very instrumental after the terrible earthquake that struck that country in 2010.

Our biggest challenge now in Haiti is to transform this peace and security mission into one that promotes social and economic development, without which stability will never be totally guaranteed.

In Lebanon, Brazilian frigates have served as flagships of the naval task force of Unifil.

Not many people know, even in Brazil, that we are present in that form in this traditional theater.

This naval force, in turn, has been headed by succeeding Brazilian admirals.

An important aspect to point out, and I think again that very few people know this outside Brazil, is that we have twice as many Lebanese in Brazil as in Lebanon.

So this shows the importance of our strong relation.

In Africa, a Brazilian Army General is now commanding Monusco, the UN Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Monusco is the largest UN peacekeeping force, and the one with the most robust mandate.

We are very proud of what General Santos Cruz has achieved so far.

Peacekeeping is not the only activity we have been involved in which is related to peace.

In 2010 Brazil and Turkey, serving as non-permanent members at the UN Security Council, jointly sought a peaceful solution to the question of the Iranian nuclear program.

Contrary to the very specific indications we received at the highest level, the agreement Brazil and Turkey ultimately brokered with Iran (the Tehran Declaration of May 2010), was not given a chance in the Security Council, which opted instead for further sanctions against Iran.

Brazil warmly welcomes the fact that the five permanent members of the Council plus Germany reached a provisional agreement with Iran late last year.

We strongly hope it can become a permanent one.

Attempts have been made to compare the terms of this provisional agreement with those of the Tehran Declaration of 2010.

To my mind this is a very difficult exercise, given the changes in forms and circumstances.

But I think it is fair to say that the Turkish-Brazilian initiative had a role in showing to skeptics that the negotiating path was a viable one.

I am very happy to recognize the positive attitude of Sweden, specially of the Foreign Minister Carl Bildt, towards the efforts conducted by Brazil and Turkey.

In early 2013, Brazil, Sweden and Turkey joined together in a new coalition, the Trilateral Solidarity for Building Peace.

These three countries decided to coordinate positions on such diverse issues as Palestine and internet freedom.

It is my firm belief that like-minded countries such as ours, coming together from different regions and different situations, can work in favor of innovative partnerships that strengthen the cause of peace.

\*\*\*

In the late years of the Cold War, a Brazilian Foreign Minister famously said that Brazil was the only really non-aligned country, since it didn't align its positions with anyone, not even with the Non-Aligned Movement.

This was not only a clever statement meant to provoke conservative minds.

It was also a prescient remark.

The world we live in today is no longer divided into opposing blocks.

Hence, it does not impose predefined allegiances.

Today, the refusal of automatic alignment can help build a multipolar world order.

When the Berlin Wall fell, bipolarity turned into unipolarity for a brief moment.

The existence of a 'lone superpower' was a defining feature of international relations of the 1990s.

But unipolarity might well be thought as an 'interlude' between the old bipolar world and an emerging multipolar order.

As many have said then, and I think it would be appropriate now with the historical hindsight to say, that was a unipolar moment which is no longer there.

One need not subscribe to questionable 'declinist' theses, very popular in the United States, to see that the international system has been marked by the emergence of new trends and actors.

One fundamental question posed by this development can be summarized as follows: 'whether world peace will depend on an order inspired on and guaranteed by a single hegemonic power, or result from more complex and yet more democratic and equitable arrangements, encompassing a greater diversity of power centers and, consequently, a greater plurality of ideas'.

Brazil is convinced that a multipolar world – i.e. one in which power is reasonably distributed among countries and regions – is the one that is most conducive to international stability, peace and development.

We see our partnership with Sweden, partly, under this light.

A fair distribution of power encourages states to agree on a framework of multilateral principles.

Multipolarity and multilateralism are different concepts, but they are mutually reinforcing.

They should be the pillars of a peaceful world order, which creates better conditions for national development.

Multipolarity opens new horizons and creates new opportunities for cooperation between and among countries.

Were we still living under a strict bipolar or unipolar world order, one might wonder whether Brazil and Sweden would have established a strategic partnership such as the one we are building – I personally doubt it.

But multipolarity has not yet come of age.

We still live in a world that bears the marks of unipolarity.

And there are even those who say that a new kind of bipolarity may characterize the next decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

We learned from the hard lessons of the Cold War to favor an open and plural world order.

Experience shows that bipolarity narrows policy space, both domestically and internationally.

Likewise, the idea that a unipolar order encourages a peaceful and rule-based order does not, in my opinion, stand the test history.

Suffice it to recall that in 2003 Iraq was invaded by a so-called ‘coalition of the willing’, without authorization of the UN Security Council.

That ‘coalition of the willing’ was thus an euphemism for unilateralism.

Since I am in the land of Alfred Nobel – even if I know that the Nobel Prize for Peace is given in Oslo – let me also recall, that the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons was deliberately set aside in that episode.

The OPCW, then headed by a national of Brazil (Ambassador Bustani), was well-positioned to prove that the arguments invoked for waging the war against Iraq were inaccurate.

So did also a very distinguished Swede, my friend Hans Blix.

But the OPCW was not heard, and its Director-General was dismissed in the most arbitrary fashion.

A decade later, the OPCW was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

(This is a good signal).

Three years ago, the conflict in Libya led the Security Council to authorize the establishment of a no-fly-zone to avert a possible massacre of the civilian population, in principle a very laudable objective.

However, the Security Council mandate was unduly interpreted as a license to topple the regime in Tripoli.

The targeting of command and control became an excuse for a search and kill exercise aimed at the country's leader.

No matter what we think about him, that went far beyond what the Security Council authorized.

Facts like those generated doubts about the real goals of so-called humanitarian intervention, which are at the root of the much-criticized inaction by the Council in the Syrian crisis.

It is a matter of concern that military alliances could be used, under the pretense of collective action, to promote unilateral objectives.

This question is not unrelated to the debate regarding the expanded role some advocate for NATO, for instance.

(This is none of my business, but I am just theorizing here a little bit based on what I read).

In some cases, such an expansion may prove a risky exercise.

It is no wonder that such a hard-skinned realist as former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger suggested, in a recent article, that a cautious approach should be taken with regard to the expansion of the alliances' membership.

Interestingly enough, the father of the doctrine of containment of the Soviet Union, George Kennan, had second thoughts about NATO expansion.

In 1997, Kennan wrote that this would be 'the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-Cold War era. Such a decision may be expected to inflame the nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies [of a certain power]; (...) to restore the atmosphere of the Cold War to East-West relations'.

As I said, as far as it concerns Europe, this may be very remote for us (although everything affects everything in a globalized world).

But of course, when you think of North Africa, and how it can affect Libya and then proceed to Mali, and then to Guinea Bissau, and then it comes near the South Atlantic and then near to areas of our direct concern.

And what I am saying about NATO I would say about any military alliance, by the way.

\*\*\*

Instability caused by unilateralism and geopolitical rivalry is magnified by new technologies that violate state sovereignty.

Electronic espionage and cyberwarfare pose serious challenges to international order.

The editor-at-large of *Foreign Affairs* magazine, David Rothkopf, has coined the expression Cool War, as opposed to the Cold War, to refer to this new reality.

According to Rothkopf, this new type of warfare is 'cool' not only due to the cutting edge technologies deployed, but also because it is a little 'warmer' than the Cold War.

According to Rothkopf, this 'Cool War seems likely to involve almost constant offensive measures that, while falling short of actual warfare, regularly seek to damage or weaken rivals or gain an edge through violations of sovereignty and penetration of defenses'.

One should add that technological asymmetries between the strong and the weak, as well as a low human toll on the side of the offense, create incentives for aggressive measures which are implemented with impunity (such as the case, for instance, of attacks with drones).

The recent disclosure of massive electronic espionage against several countries, including Brazil, shed light on a hitherto unimaginable scale of violation of state sovereignty.

These practices were at first justified by the claim that surveillance was solely aimed at terrorism.

But further disclosures on eavesdropping of the personal communications of heads of state and government of friendly nations totally disproved that argument.

The fact that Brazil's leading energy company was also the target of espionage, was equally disturbing.

It did not go unnoticed.

Speaking at the UN General Assembly soon afterwards, President Rousseff called illegal electronic surveillance 'unacceptable'.

Brazil, she said, 'knows how to protect itself. We reject, fight and do not harbor terrorist groups'.

President Rousseff called upon the United Nations to 'play a leading role in the effort to regulate the conduct of states with regard to these technologies'.

As is well known, Brazil and Germany, with the help of many others, have since then been leading this effort in the United Nations.

In a recent speech before the German Parliament last January, Chancellor Angela Merkel pointed out that 'When we proceed as if the ends justify the means, when we do everything that is technologically possible, we damage trust; we sow mistrust. In the end there is less, not more, security'.

\*\*\*

As we transition from the current world order towards a new one, the resilience of unipolarity intertwines with the indications of multipolarity and even with the possibilities of bipolarity.

This is a complex reality that breeds uncertainty.

Other factors as diverse as climate change and resource scarcity can be added to this picture.

Should unilateralism prevail over multilateralism, the United Nations may find itself unable to solve conflicts arising out of multiple sources of tension.

From the point of view of Defence, it would be imprudent not to consider the possibility of a breakdown in collective security, or individual acts of aggression.

In other words, much as we loathe the idea of war, we cannot exclude it from our preoccupations.

Brazil firmly believes that being peaceful is not the same as being defenseless.

And Brazil is also convinced that our defence cannot be, in anyway, outsourced.

That is why our peaceful foreign policy must be supported by a more robust defence policy.

Deterrence is a main element of our defence policy.

We must build capacities that are adequate to raise the costs of aggression.

We must also be able to protect ourselves against side-effects from conflicts between third parties.

Let me recall in this regard that Brazil was dragged into war in 1942, after Nazi U-boats attacked several of its merchant vessels in the South Atlantic.

But our defence policy also places high value on cooperation.

We have very close ties in matters concerning defence with every one of our neighbors.

Brazil is an active member of the South American Defence Council (CDS), whose creation within the frame of Unasul it promoted vigourously.

In the CDS, we seek to promote confidence-building and transparency.

We are also committed to developing a South American vision of defence.

We are in the process of establishing a South American Defence School, respecting the pluralistic nature of the membership of Unasul.

Joint projects related to the Defence industry are under way.

These are important steps towards strengthening a “peace and security community” in our region.

And I just recalled what Karl Deutsch, the famous political scientist, used to say – that a security community is one in which war becomes unthinkable as a mean of solving problems.

That's what we see in South America.

Such a community will certainly contribute to a more peaceful and stable world order, based on multipolarity.

Brazil has been working closely also with its African neighbors across the Atlantic to strengthen the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic.

Our shared goal, as expressed in the UN resolution that created this mechanism, is to help the South Atlantic to stay free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as from rivalries which are foreign to it.

The South Atlantic has a very different dynamic from the North Atlantic, which was unfortunately historically marked by conflict.

This is why instead of being a military alliance, the South Atlantic is a zone of peace and cooperation.

And we want to keep it that way.

Brazil also conducts bilaterally a number of joint exercises, especially in naval area, and are helping to train the coast guards and navies of countries like Cape Verde and Namibia.

We are just in the process – this is not an Atlantic but an Indian Ocean country – of donate three training airplanes to Mozambique.

Apart from cooperation with partners from its strategic environment, Brazil has a range of defence relationships in the developed world and with emerging countries.

Brazil's National Defence Strategy states that a fundamental principle of our defence policy is the link between the modernization of the Armed Forces and national economic development.

This is reflected in the Strategy's focus on the strengthening of Brazil's defence industry and on our constant efforts to ensure that our acquisitions of defence material involve transfer of technology, on the widest possible scale.

And indeed with several countries, developed as well as developing, Brazil has establishing partnerships based on this principle.

\*\*\*

Brazil and Sweden now face a historic opportunity: the two countries can build a truly strategic defence partnership in jet fighters and beyond.

Sweden is a highly developed economy and Brazil is rising to a new level of economic and social development.

More than mere complementarities, our partnership can create real dynamism.

We are two democracies with a strong focus on social welfare domestically and an equally strong disposition to act in favor of peace on the world stage.

That is why I am so optimistic about the potentialities of the strategic partnership between Brazil and Sweden.

Thank you very much.