



Reconsidering the consistency between principles and practices for Technical Cooperation between Developing Countries: A critical analysis of ProSavana

Reconsiderando a consistência entre princípios e práticas para a Cooperação Técnica entre Países em Desenvolvimento: Uma análise crítica do ProSavana

DOI: 10.21530/ci.v11n3.2016.354

Niels Søndergaard¹

Abstract

The present article analyses the relationship between principles and practices for Technical Cooperation between Developing Countries (TCDC), in the case of Brazilian-Mozambican collaboration within the ProSavana programme. The notion of horizontality can be identified as a strong part of the ideational basis for Brazilian development cooperation. Such egalitarian conceptions are also strongly reflected within the discourse of the ProSavana programme, but their effectuation encounters a range of complications related to the practical implementation and difficulties with aligning the multitude of different motivations, development perceptions and particular interests permeating the programme. Analysis aimed at the implications of the initiative at the local level indicates that a series of socio-economic issues, related to land tenure and community inclusion might conflict directly with the notion of horizontal cooperation. The article therefore argues that a layered approach, with a focus beyond inter-governmental relations, and comprising of local community consultancy and civil society inclusion, is necessary for such cooperation projects to be consistent with their basis of principles.

Keywords: Cooperation, development, agriculture, South-South relations, Mozambique.

¹ Doutorando no Instituto de Relações Internacionais (IREL) da Universidade de Brasília, (UnB).

Artigo submetido em 08/03/2016 e aprovado em 18/07/2016.





Resumo

O presente artigo analisa a relação entre princípios e práticas na Cooperação Técnica entre Países em Desenvolvimento (CTPD), no caso da colaboração Brasileira-Moçambicana dentro do programa de ProSavana. O conceito de horizontalidade pode ser identificado como uma parte substancial da base ideacional na cooperação pelo desenvolvimento do Brasil. Tais concepções igualitárias também refletem fortemente dentro do discurso do programa de ProSavana, porém, a sua efetuação encontra uma série de complicações relacionadas à implementação prática e dificuldades de alinhar a multiplicidade de diferentes motivações, percepções sobre o desenvolvimento e interesses particulares que permeiam o programa. Análise focada nas implicações dessa iniciativa no nível local indica que uma série de questões socioeconômicas, relacionadas à posse de terra e inclusão de comunidades, possa contrariar a noção de cooperação horizontal. O artigo portanto argumenta que uma abordagem abrangendo diferentes níveis de foco, indo além das relações inter-governamentais, e que compreende consulta das comunidades locais e inclusão da sociedade civil, é necessária para que tais iniciativas sejam coerentes com a sua base de princípios.

Palavras chaves: Cooperação, desenvolvimento, agricultura, relações sul-sul, Moçambique.

Introduction

South-South cooperation, and the question of whether such initiatives represent a fundamentally alternative model for development assistance, has gained evermore attention along with its increasing proliferation from the turn of the millennium. The present article evaluates the consistency between the conceptual basis and practical implementation of Technical Cooperation between Developing Countries (TCDC) in the case of the Brazilian engagement within Mozambique, through the ProSavana trilateral development initiative. The concept of horizontality and principles adjacent to this notion are reviewed within literature focusing upon South-South cooperation, and scrutinized in relation to their appearance within Brazilian TCDC. The underlying principles for Brazilian cooperation practices have gained a more concrete character within the Brazilian Cooperation Agency's (ABC) essential guidelines for development projects². These guidelines serve to structure the analysis of ProSavana in order to evaluate to what extent the dimensions to

² The central guidelines for Brazilian technical cooperation are formulated by the ABC as: 1) emphasis on home country development priorities, 2) preference for programs which deepen political and economic relations, 3) emphasis upon knowledge transfer, 4) emphasis upon human recourse training, consultancy and institutional infrastructure support, 5) preference for programs with local recourse mobilization, 6) prioritization of projects with high multiplier effects and, 7) orientation towards projects with concentrated results. (ABC, 2005).





which they relate are characterized by horizontal interactions between Brazil and Mozambique. Though the trilateral constitution of ProSavana also comprises Japan, emphasis is put on the Brazilian engagement within Mozambique, which is considered a significant case in displaying the opportunities, limits and trade-offs that result from cooperation strategies with highly multifaceted objectives. The article applies a dual analytical focus upon official governmental interactions as opposed to local stakeholders and rural communities, in order to understand how the differentiated consequences produced at these two levels entail different sets of conclusions regarding the horizontal nature of the ProSavana initiative.

Perspectives on cooperation between developing countries

Cooperation between Third World countries emerged as an alternative development path in the 1960's, inspired by the same ideological currents that led to the Non-Aligned Movement, and has strong roots stretching back to Bandung Conference of 1955. Its incipient institutionalization began with the Buenos Aires Plan of Action, created at the UN Conference of 1978, within which it was formulated as Technical Cooperation between Developing Countries (TCDC). Today, it is often treated as a phenomenon within the category of South-South cooperation, which is defined by the United Nations Development Program as '*a broad framework for collaboration among countries of the South in the political, economic, social, cultural, environmental and technical domains.*' When South-South cooperation is supported by traditional donator countries or by multilateral organizations, it is characterized as 'triangular cooperation' (UNDP, 2016).

The surge in cooperation initiatives amongst developing countries after the turn of the millennium has also spurred a great amount of academic interest in mapping, critically scrutinizing and conceptualizing this type of international engagement. Fantu Cheru (2011) ascribes great importance to the room of maneuver which the translocations within the international system, from a bipolar towards a more multipolar order, have left for developing countries (CHERU 2011, p. 47). Cheru stresses how this has resulted in a newfound 'policy space' (Ibid) within which developing countries have gained an unprecedented opportunity to pursue an offensive strategic engagement in order to alter global economic arrangements to their favor (Ibid, p. 45). Some of the essential changes around which the





interests of developing countries may converge are pinpointed by the author as a more democratized system for global governance, an increasingly horizontal international trade regime as well as the re-evaluation of aid conditionality (Ibid 2011, p. 50-52).

Francisco Simplício similarly perceives the present momentum for cooperation amongst developing countries as a unique historical opportunity, due to the unprecedented monetary and technical recourses that have become available in these parts of the world (SIMPLÍCIO 2011, p. 35). The task at hand is to define a range of institutional and financial mechanisms through which these capabilities may be transformed into a mutually beneficial cooperation between the partners involved (Ibid, p. 19). Simplício also underlines the importance of the logic permeating South-South cooperation being essentially different from that of North-South arrangements, through an increased attention to home countries development priorities, combined with an aspiration towards mutual gain which serves to dissolve the 'donator-recipient' paradigm (Ibid, pp.4-5). The surging trend of Southern cooperation initiatives is even characterized by Patrick Clairzier (2011) as directly consequential of the negative experiences faced by developing countries, due to the free-marked oriented conditionality of North-South official development assistance (CLAIRZIER, 2011).

Thus, cooperation amongst developing countries may, in this perspective be seen as a trend of collective contestation of an externally imposed developmental vision. An analogous perspective is expressed by Diego Rodrigues (2010), who underlines how the institutionalization of coalitions of developing countries has become a strategic recourse in order to confront inequalities embedded within the international system, through more horizontal modes of cooperation (RODRIGUES, 2010). The notion of horizontality as opposed to verticality, is also central to Caicedo and Castro (2010), and lies at the hearth of their explanation of how the power to define ideas and their concomitant development models, has been deprived from the South. The horizontal mode of cooperation is, thus, born out of, and simultaneously foments, a crucial ability to reflect upon themselves as generators of legitimate development experiences (CAICEDO; CASTRO 2010, p. 93). Yet, Caicedo and Castro also draw attention to the danger of South-South cooperation assuming the same vertical character as that of North-South relations, and thereby spur inequality within the South (Ibid, p. 99). In relation to this question, Renu Modi accentuates how the nature of relationships between emergent intermediate states and African countries is of a somehow more 'genuine' nature, and involves





projects with a broader development impact, empowering African countries and stimulating their independent engagement at the global level (MODI, 2011).

This raises the question of whether the shared development experiences of countries of the Global South have indeed produced some sort of kinship and congenial mutual empathy. Nel & Taylor (2013) have analyzed the notion of South-South solidarity through use of the Durkheimian distinction between mechanical and organic solidarity. While the first refers to a more objective identification of affiliation with an ‘other’ which is in a less fortunate situation than oneself, the latter is associated with a much deeper appreciation of the distinctiveness of this ‘other’, and with the recognition of the essence of his/her needs. Through an evaluation of the relationships between a group of relatively powerful emerging states and less recourse-endowed and smaller countries, Nel & Taylor identify a clear tendency amongst the dynamic emergent economies to disregard the interests of their more fragile peers. As the character of South-South cooperation often does not reach beyond what is termed as mechanical solidarity, the authors underline that this type of engagement losses its essence and runs the risk of becoming a fetishisation of growth and trade. (NEL; TAYLOR 2013, pp.1106-1107)

Though some of the prevailing perspectives on technical cooperation amongst developing countries diverge to some degree over the issue of distribution of benefits between nations, they do tend to converge to the extent that they all apply a state-centric perspective. Sanusha Naidu (2011), for example, emphasizes the differentiated impacts which the entry of emergent intermediate states has *within* African countries. This approach begs a range of questions related to how this affects the ability of civil society and social movements to promote their own interests and poses the question of whether the “national interests” of African governments are indeed analogous to the “national interests” of the population at large (Ibid, p. 211-212). Thus, Naidu draws analytical attention to civil society struggles for inclusivity and the issue of how South-South cooperation affects social development (Ibid, p. 215-216).

Brazilian cooperation and the notion of horizontality

Reducing asymmetries within the international system has been a central Brazilian policy priority since the turn of the millennium. This urge for transformation has resulted in an activist foreign policy through which the aspiration to create





consensus for change within the South has been backed by investment, the provision of technical assistance and political support for other developing countries (PINO 2012, p. 194). Since the creation of the Brazilian Agency for Cooperation (ABC) in 1987, the intention has been to pursue a strategy for international cooperation emphasizing a non-vertical approximation with other developing countries (MENDONÇA; FARIA 2015, p. 7). Various Brazilian governments have sought to distinguish ‘aid’ and ‘assistance’ from ‘cooperation’, which reflects the will to dissociate Brazilian initiatives from the perceived paternalism and political interference of traditional development assistance on a more fundamental ideational level (INOUE; VAZ 2013, p. 509-510).

Cooperation initiatives with other developing countries gained unprecedented significance during the administrations of the centre-left President Lula da Silva, and many political and organizational recourses were allocated to this area. Lula’s restructuring of the Foreign Ministry also meant that the Africa Department was separated from the Middle East Department, which implied a stronger bureaucratic specialization in African affairs (MENDONÇA; FARIA, 2015 p. 11). The Lula government’s spotlight on Africa is illustrated by the number of presidential visits to African countries, totaling 29, distributed on 12 trips from 2003 to 2010 (MUKWEREZA 2015, p. 5). The 30% increase in the number of Brazilian embassies abroad during the Lula period was also strongly felt in Africa. This was highly linked to the increase in cooperation projects, which served as a foreign policy instrument related to the goal of projecting international influence, the opening of markets and support for the internationalization of Brazilian companies (INOUE; VAZ 2013, p. 529). The explicit objective of fomenting the global engagement of Brazilian companies was a marked foreign policy concern during the Lula government (CERVO; BUENO 2011, p. 544-545). This goal thereby constituted a tendency which coincided with the African focus, and also concretely became manifest through the significant personal efforts of the president as a distinguished representative of Brazilian business in the continent, which helped secure a range of major agreements. Though some Brazilian companies have been present in Africa since the 1980’s, recent diplomatic engagement has served to open many new doors for businesses exploiting the opportunities of the booming raw material prices at the time. This has been characterized as a second wave of Brazilian investment, which not only includes the more established private players within construction and resource extraction, but also a range of newly internationally oriented small and medium companies (RENZIO et al. 2014, p. 11).





The principles of Brazilian international cooperation can be traced back to the Bandung Conference (1955) and the Buenos Aires Plan of Action (1978) and aims at substituting an assistencialist approach with one of mutually beneficial cooperation (MILHORANCE 2013, p. 6). As a fundamental guideline for Brazilian engagement in South-South cooperation, the notion of horizontality has come to assume an outstanding importance (CABRAL; SHANKLAND 2012, p. 3; INOUE; VAZ 2013, p. 510; PATRIOTA; PIERRI 2013, p. 129; STUENKEL 2014, p. 3;). The ABC defines horizontality as one of the pillars of Brazilian technical cooperation and stresses its importance in relation to intensifying partnerships with developing countries, as well as its essentiality as part of a solidarity-oriented foreign policy (ABC, 2016 (1)). A range of significant principles for Brazilian TCDC which are either born out of, or adjacent to the idea of horizontality, can nonetheless be identified as; solidarity diplomacy (PATRIOTA; PIERRI 2013, p. 129) the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs (CABRAL et al 2013, p. 2), demand driven projects (BRY 2015, p. 453), appreciation of local knowledge (LEITE et al. 2014, p. 21), non-conditionality (SANTOS; CERQUEIRA 2015, p. 38), and no association with commercial interests (BARBOSA, 2012, p. 117-118). Considering these principles as sub-components of the general concept of horizontality within Brazilian cooperation, it becomes possible to treat this notion in a more concrete manner. It also permits the identification of different dimensions of this principle within ABC's guidelines for technical cooperation, which are stated as 1) emphasis on home country development priorities, 2) preference for programs which deepen political and economic relations, 3) emphasis on transference of knowledge, 4) emphasis on human recourse training, consultancy and institutional infrastructure support, 5) preference for programs with local recourse mobilization, 6) prioritization of projects with high multiplier effects and, 7) orientation towards projects with concentrated results (ABC, 2005). Through these guidelines, principles of horizontality appear to have assumed a more tangible nature, which thus allows a more concrete evaluation of the manner in which they characterize particular projects of Brazilian cooperation.

As Fernando Abreu, General Director of the ABC stressed in a 2013 article, the horizontal modality of Brazilian cooperation also serves an important functional purpose within the country's foreign policy, by intensifying relations with developing partner countries (ABREU, 2013, p. 7). Some of Brazil's 'comparative advantages' in terms of development cooperation are formulated by the ABC as 'Geographical location, cultural heritage, social and economic challenges common





to those of beneficiary countries' (ABC, 2016 (2)). Due to the subordination of Brazilian cooperation initiatives below the broader foreign policy framework, an important aspect has to do with the instrumental concern of projecting influence amongst developing countries, which in term is translated into an increased legitimacy and weight within international negotiations (PINO 2012, p. 198). Brazilian engagement in Africa has generally been justified through the horizontality and Southern solidarity discourse, which nonetheless has been partly challenged by the practical experiences generated by the increased presence of its corporations (CABRAL 2015, p. 5). Though the ABC clearly underlines that Brazilian cooperation is unrelated to any commercial purpose, its market-opening and trade facilitating potential has been hinted at (INOUE; VAZ 2013, p. 527). Vaz also underlines that in addition to other foreign policy objectives, the interests of the Brazilian agribusiness sectors have been a vital part of the country's strategy for agricultural cooperation in Africa (VAZ, 2015, p. 166).

The mutual presence of altruistic/solidary as well as pragmatic concerns in Brazilian cooperation policies, raises the question as to what degree they are compatible, or whether they might imply some inherently incongruent features which may compromise their horizontal character. Even though he accentuates that Brazil's cooperation efforts in Africa do indeed imply a noticeable economic aspect, Vaz stresses that it should not be perceived as a primary concern (VAZ 2015, p. 178). In spite of the large proportion of agricultural projects within Brazilian TCDC, no official policy has yet been formulated in relation to projects specifically within this sector. This may in part be explained by the fragmented nature of Brazilian institutions for agricultural governance (CABRAL; SHANKLAND 2012, p. 12; CABRAL et al 2013, pp.9-10). Hereby, the internal power struggles within the Brazilian agricultural regime spill over onto the international sphere, where – as the paper shall explore – new sub- and transnational issue coalitions emerge with the purpose of contesting or influencing the definition and implementation of agricultural cooperation projects.

A marked feature of Brazilian cooperation is that it relies extensively on technical and practical experiences accumulated within a range of public institutions (PINO 2012, p. 198). The Institute for Agricultural Research (Embrapa), for example, gained vital significance within the Brazilian cooperation policy (STOLTE 2012, p. 11). As the proportion of projects related to agriculture within Brazilian international cooperation amounted to 21,9% between 2003-2010 (SCHLESINGER 2013, p. 8), Embrapa has played a central role. In 2008 approximately half of





ABC's programs in Africa involved Embrapa's participation, through transfer and implementation of agricultural technology, training personnel and provision of access to Brazilian agribusiness (ARKHANGELSKAYA; KHAMATSHIN 2013, p. 165; MILHORANCE 2013, p. 13). Embrapa opened its first African office in Ghana in 2008, and by 2012 the institute was involved in projects in 15 different African countries, spanning over seed adaptation and conservation, improvement of crop resistance, soil optimization and post-harvest technologies (STOLTE 2012, p. 12). The ABC works closely together with Embrapa, but as it is an agency of the Foreign Ministry, its autonomy is limited and its function is often narrowed to coordination of operations (CABRAL; SHANKLAND 2012, p. 12-13; CABRAL et al 2013, p. 4). Embrapa has been strongly involved in triangular cooperation in its operations in different African countries, whereby either an international organization or a developed country finance the transfer and implementation of Embrapa's technological expertise (IZIQUE 2008, p. 35). Triangular cooperation projects have come to constitute around 20% of ABC's portfolio, and are highly concentrated in Mozambique (PINO 2012, p. 200). There is a tendency for such triangular initiatives to become an increasingly common feature of Brazilian TCDC (INOUE; VAZ 2013, p. 521). It has also been connected to the country's recent craving for recognition within multilateral fora and to gain a leading stand amongst developing countries (GARCIA et al. 2013, p. 14).

Brazil's foothold in Africa

Although often dated to the wave of decolonization in the 1960's, the birth of relations between Brazil and Africa can be traced to the late 1940's (SARAIVA 2010, p. 174). Relations were carried on and partially intensified throughout the authoritarian period, but Africa lost some relative weight as a Brazilian foreign policy priority by the end of the century. With Lula assuming the presidency in 2003, the emphasis on strengthening ties with the Global South meant that the African continent, – which had been less prioritized during Fernando Henrique Cardoso's years in power – became more significant to the Brazilian international strategy (FILHO 2012, p. 305). President Lula's visits to different African countries in 2003 and 2004 were landmarks in the rebirth of the transatlantic Southern approximation (SARAIVA 2010, p. 179). What has been known as Lula's presidential diplomacy, thus, was also emblematic of Brazil's African relations during his term. This is





reflected in a comparison of the number of cooperation agreements signed with different African countries during the eight years of Cardoso and Lula respectively: while during Cardoso's period a total of 36 agreements were signed, during Lula's this number surged dramatically to 238 accords (MENDONÇA; FARIA 2015, p. 14).

Agriculture has been one of the main focus points for Brazilian cooperation projects in Africa, and has accounted for 19% of total resources allocated to the area (RENZIO et al. 2014, p. 13). The partnership with Brazil became a development alternative to many African countries, while it simultaneously helped to secure Brazil some important international leverage, as was the case with the election of José Granizo da Silva as the Director General of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) in 2011 (Ibid, p. 7). The public initiative has thereby been an essential factor, which has helped to garner diplomatic support and international standing, but it also appears to have been an important driver in order to spur intensifying economic relations (STOLTE 2012, p. 9). In the past decade, trade between Brazil and Africa expanded rapidly, growing from \$4,3 billion in 2000 to \$28,5 billion in 2013 (MUGGAH, 2015). Brazilian investments also surged during that period, from a \$69 billion in 2001 to \$214 billion in 2009, spread widely beyond Brazil's initial foothold in the Lusophone African countries (ECONOMIST, 2012).

The Brazilian history of rapid agricultural production increases in the past decades has also become a development experience which serves a purpose of attraction in relation to many African countries (CHICHAVA et al 2013, p. 21). The efforts to transfer these policies in form of development cooperation have even been referred to as making Brazil a grand exporter of social technology (STUENKEL 2014, p. 4). Such circumstances have paved the ground for the somewhat controversial statement by the former Brazilian Foreign Minister, Celso Amorim, that 'for every African problem, there exists a Brazilian solution' (AMORIM, 2011).

ProSavana and Mozambican realities

In Mozambique, agriculture holds a vital economic significance, as it is the primary source of livelihood for approximately 80% of the population. (CHICHAVA et al 2013, p. 5). Most of the country is situated on the Guinean Savannah, that stretches throughout 481 million square kilometers in 25 countries on the African sub-continent, and which is characterized by climatic conditions and soil types





that are largely similar to those on the Brazilian Cerrado savannah. At present, estimates suggest that only 6,8% of the area is occupied by agriculture. (HARBS; BACHA; HARBS. 2015, p. 63) Because Sub-Saharan Africa never has been through an agricultural green revolution similar to that of many other developing countries, it has been deemed the last agricultural frontier on the planet (WOERTZ; KEULERT 2015, p. 786). It is estimated that only around 14% of Mozambique's 36 million hectares of arable land are cultivated. Nearly all of the land is farmed by smallholders with an average farm size of 1,1 hectares (ROSARIO 2012, p. 3). Yet, evaluations of land use are extremely difficult to make because of crop rotation, and because land not directly cultivated also may hold a purpose as source of nutrition or even a specific cultural and religious significance (ROSSI 2015, p. 240). Agricultural productivity in Mozambique is nonetheless very low. A 2006 FAO study suggested that 38% of its inhabitants are undernourished (THALOR 2013, p. 148). The main reasons for the productivity problems in Mozambican agriculture have been singled out as the long period of internal conflict, the lack of infrastructure and investment from public and private sources, as well as poor governance (ROSARIO 2012, p. 5). In Mozambique, all land officially belongs to the state. Access is granted through the Land Use and Benefit Titles also called DUAT (*Direitos de Uso e Aproveito de Terra*). This permits foreign investors to lease the land in periods up to 50 years, for a fee down to US \$1 per hectare a year (CLEMENTS; FERNANDES 2013, pp. 51-52). Individuals holding a land certificate may choose to sell or rent out the land, which also creates room for the entry of private foreign capital, though investors are obliged to seek consultation with the local community regarding the specific use of the farmland (MILGROOM 2015, p. 592).

The ProSavana initiative was agreed upon in 2009, through a memorandum of triangular cooperation signed by Mozambique, Brazil and Japan. The goal is an extensive expansion of agricultural production and productivity in the provinces of Cabo Delgado, Niassa, Nampula and Zambésia, situated in what is known as the 'Nacala Corridor' in the northern part of the country, spanning over an area of around 540.000 square kilometers (PATRIOTA; PIERRI 2013, p. 132). These areas have been selected due to their heavy rainfall and what has been estimated as a high degree of available arable land (CLEMENTS; FERNANDES 2013, p. 54) as well as the climatic and topographical similarities with the Brazilian Cerrado (GARCIA et al 2013, p. 16). Embrapa describes ProSavana as a 'project for the improvement of the research capacity and technology transfer for the development of agriculture in the Nacala Corridor.' (EMBRAPA, 2016).





ProSavana has been structured around three central components: The first component, also known as the Investigation Plan, which is intended to run from 2011-2016, involves research with focus upon soil and plant properties and a series of crop tests. The second central component of the program, the Director Plan, consists of a mapping of the individual region's producers and characteristics, in order to define recommendations for cultivation and processing in six different areas. The third and final stage, the Plan for Model Extension, focuses on the proliferation of the techniques and models developed as part of the program. There is a long-term perspective for the gradual implementation of the initiative towards 2030. (HARBS; BACHA; HARBS 2015, p. 73-74)

The plan for ProSavana aims at constructing different clusters, within which the production and processing of one or a few similar crops is concentrated, in order to develop value added activities and reap the benefits of geographic proximity, concentration of input providers and economies of scale. The plan currently seeks to establish two clusters focusing on grains, one on horticulture, one on cashew production, one on tea, and finally an integrated horticulture/grain cluster. (SCHLESINGER 2013, p. 24) ProSavana relies strongly on the participation of Embrapa, which is responsible for technical aspects of the initiative, while the project department of the Getúlio Vargas Foundation's (*FGV Projetos*) main responsibility is to define the Master Plan and to bring private capital into the project. The program is implemented in cooperation with the Mozambican Agricultural Ministry (MINAG) (MILHORANCE; GABAS 2015, p. 7). Within the official Mozambican account of the program, the multifaceted purpose of productivity increases, employment creation, poverty reduction, food security and the incitement of marked-oriented rural development is emphasized (GOV. MOZ, 2016).

Although ProSavana wields a strong focus on family agriculture, it also implies a significant private sector aspect, related to agro-industrial expansion on the African Savannah. Therefore, while the operational aspects of the program are within the Foreign Ministry's area of responsibility through ABC, the Getúlio Vargas Foundation manages the mobilization of private capital from the Brazilian agribusiness sector, which so far has displayed a considerable amount of interest in the project. (VAZ 2015, p. 180) The foundation's goal is to raise some US\$2 billion amongst Brazilian and Japanese investors, offering a minimum annual return of 10% while aiming at 20-22% (BATISTA, 2012). The Nacala Corridor Fund focuses strongly on generation of returns for investors, through the implementation of an integrated and competition oriented agribusiness model (FUNDAÇÃO GETÚLIO





VARGAS, 2015). The FGV works in close conjunction with the DWS Investments, a Management enterprise below Deutsche Bank (SCHLESINGER 2013, p. 9).

In 2011, chairman of the cotton producers' association in MatoGrosso, Carlos Ernesto Augustin, emphasized cheap access to farmland, absence of environmental regulation and the relative proximity to the Chinese market, as factors that should raise interests amongst Brazilian agribusiness in repeating the agricultural expansion in the Cerrado region, some 30 years ago (MELLO, 2011). In 2012, the Mozambican Prime Minister at the time, Aires Bonifácio Baptista, also strongly urged Brazilian agricultural investors to come to the country, assuring them that they would face a favorable operational environment (CLEMENTS; FERNANDES 2013, p. 51). On the Japanese side, the main interest has been associated with depressing the price of certain strategic agricultural commodities imported by the country, by increasing the global supply.

Controversies and resistance

Issues pertaining to land distribution have been some of the most controversial aspects of ProSavana, and have given birth to much questioning and contestation regarding the program. The schism between traditional family farming and commercial agriculture, which so strongly characterizes Brazilian agricultural debates, seems to have been reproduced within a Mozambican context. As private investment is ingrained as a significant element within ProSavana, a large measure of uncertainty prevails regarding how much land is to be allocated to agribusiness expansion as opposed to internal food consumption, and where this is to be found (PATRIOTA; PIERRI 2013, p. 133). The Mozambican government has recently been very active in facilitating foreign land acquisition, and between 2004 and 2009, more than a million hectares were conceded to international investment. This made critical voices characterize the FRELIMO government as 'complicit in promoting land grabbing practices'. (CLEMENTS; FERNANDES 2013, p. 42)

The uncertainty and arbitrary information about the likely extent of Brazilian agribusiness expansion in Mozambique has also fueled much concern, as has been the case with the reports of official promises of designating as much as 6 million hectares for this purpose (GARCIA et al 2013, p. 31). Although official data indicate that 93% of the country's arable land is presently uncultivated, other assessments set that number much lower, at only around 7 million hectares; a number which is





likely to fall markedly in the near future due to the country's high rate of population growth (THALOR 2013, p. 150). Projections based on satellite pictures of the Lurio River Valley in the northeast of Mozambique point towards a more serious perspective of potentially up to 500.000 people affected and 100.000 displaced in that area alone (REUTERS, 2015). The divergence between official narratives of "land abundance" and the perceptions of the local population is often remarkable. The Niassa province serves as an example, as it is considered by program directors to be a scarcely populated region, with a high potential for extensive agricultural expansion. Yet, peasants living there claim that most of the area fit for cultivation already is occupied, and that there is no space for the introduction of crops which demand large trenches of farmland (SCHLESINGER 2013, p. 44).

A preliminary version of the Master Plan for ProSavana, which came to the public's knowledge in 2013, demonstrated that many projects were in a more advanced stage of planning, than had so far been presumed. Amongst other things, the plan aimed at abandoning crop rotation in favor of permanent soil use, the extension of land titles as part of the identification of suitable areas for agribusiness expansion, as well as the intensification of production through the increased use of fertilizer and improved seeds (ROSSI 2015, p. 254-255). In this regard, the project may be interpreted as an ambition towards an accelerated enclosure movement implying the commodification of land and the intensification of its use through modern agricultural inputs. Though the obtainment of land titles might serve as a means for the local rural population to document its claim to the land, the practical consequences of implementing a formalized system for land tenure, in a social context in which traditional norms imply fundamentally different definitions of the notion of land property, remain to be seen. The leaked plan also revealed that of 16 projects proposed, 6 implied the risk of non-voluntary relocations of the rural population (SCHLESINGER 2013, p. 29). In a similar manner, the use of the term 'available land' has come to refer to land that might be open for investment, – which does not discard the possibility that it already might be claimed by someone else (Ibid 2013, p. 29). Yet, the proposal for the Master Plan does not appear to outright exclude family agriculture, which is the focus of many central projects within it. Rather, it seems to be the case that family agriculture is sought incorporated into a more intensified and commercially oriented production model, which apart from the previously mentioned changes also implies the introduction of contract farming and development based on integration within product clusters for value added activities (MILHORANCE; GABAS 2015, p. 11).





A joint statement signed by a range of Mozambican and international NGOs in April 2013 also assumed a strongly critical stance towards the formulation of ProSavana in the leaked documents. These groups were strongly opposed to what they perceived as the forced abandonment of traditional farming practices, implying the insertion into a contract farming regime and a production model entailing dependence upon input purchases from agro-corporations (JOINT STATEMENT, 2013). Other worries have been expressed with regards to the fundamental restructurings of the socioeconomic rural structure, which local organizations fear that the ProSavana might bring about, by introducing a new set of employer-employee production relations and undermining more diverse cultivations for domestic consumption (GUARDIAN, 2014). Some of the criticism which has been directed at ProSavana has expressed an essential preoccupation with what appears to be an attempt to reproduce the Prodecer program for large-scale agricultural expansion on the Cerrado, from the 1970's. This critique thereby implies a contestation of the fundamental model for rural development, which resulted from the extensive introduction of commercial agriculture in central Brazil. The negative assessments of the potential impact of capital intensive agribusiness expansion in Mozambique revolves around the question of food security (CLEMENTS; FERNANDES 2013, p. 62), neglect of the needs of local communities (RENZIO et al. 2014, p. 14-15; CABRAL 2015, p. 5) as well as environmental degradation (CHICHAVA et al 2013, p. 22). The experiences and errors of the Cerrado cultivation nonetheless appear to have resulted in some measure of attention towards avoiding some of the potentially negative consequences of this development strategy. Embrapa does seem to have a certain degree of consciousness in terms of anticipating and possibly ameliorating environmental impacts. This has been expressed through Embrapa's project for soil preservation and recuperation in northern Mozambique (PATRIOTA; PIERRI 2013, p. 133). The provision of locally produced food for school meals stands as another initiative that pays attention to social development, inspired by Brazil's national program for school feeding (THALOR 2013, p. 156). Such initiatives, though, still constitute a relatively small part of the program portfolio, and it remains to be seen whether they may provide a viable path to guaranteeing a significant element of social and environmental sustainability within the general project.

Although ProSavana is still only just in its initial stages, the project has become widely contested by Mozambican farmers and civil society. In October 2012, the National Farmers Union (UNAC) published a statement which rejected





the implementation of the model for agricultural expansion on the Brazilian Cerrado within Mozambique. It also strongly criticized what was perceived as a top-down implementation of a pre-defined project, which did not take the demands of the rural population in the Nacala Corridor into consideration (UNAC, 2012). Particularly, the lack of consultation seems to constitute a very significant obstacle to the implementation of the programme. According to official sources, only about 1000 farmers were previously consulted, which amounts to about one in every four thousand peasants in the provinces included within ProSavana (ROSSI 2015, p. 242). The alleged lack of transparency has led to widespread fear of losing their land amongst farmers in the northern part of the country, and contributed to a negative perception of the initiative (CARVALHO, 2015).

The dispute about ProSavana has also gained an international dimension, as opposing forces in Mozambique have begun to form transnational links with peasant movements and NGO's abroad, and launched a joint campaign against it (MILHORANCE; GABBAS 2015, p. 11-12). In 2013, civil society organizations in Mozambique, Japan and Brazil published an open letter with a harsh critique of ProSavana (ROSSI 2015, p. 235-236). At the Second Triangular Peoples Conference in Maputo in July 2014, the ProSavana's focus on export-oriented agriculture was strongly contested, and social movements present at the event called for a fundamental redefinition of the purpose of the program, in the direction of strengthening the emphasis on food production for local communities (SUZETE, 2014).

Within Mozambique, lines of contestation can be identified between the government and a critical movement amongst peasants and rural organizations. The political elite within the country tends to accentuate the importance of modernization and the pursuit of a technology-intensive development model (CHICHAVA et al 2013, p. 24). This has led to a perception of traditional agriculture as backwards, and to a tendency to exclude smallholders from public policy programs within agriculture, which lean towards supporting export-oriented agriculture (MILHORANCE; GABBAS 2015, p. 10). The close ties between the agrarian and the political elite within Mozambique, also serve to cement a consensus of agricultural policies favoring foreign investment and more capital intensive production (CABRAL et al 2016, p. 17). In Brazil, segments within governmental institutions have characterized the mobilization against ProSavana as ideologically motivated, and strongly related to well-defined positions within the Brazilian struggle to define agricultural policies (CABRAL 2015, p. 13). Intra-institutional divisions nevertheless also appear to be evident in Brazil, as





the Ministry for Agrarian Development (MDA) – which normally is identified as supporting smallholders – has begun to distance itself from ProSavana and portrayed it as a model that should not be followed (CABRAL et al. 2016, p. 18).

Re-evaluating horizontality

In line with Naidu’s (2011) emphasis on the issue of civil society inclusion within South-South cooperation, the formulation and initial repercussions of ProSavana also point towards very different reactions and impact perceptions at the official level and at the local level, respectively. The official guidelines for Brazilian cooperation, which are strongly nurtured by principles of horizontality, must thereby be evaluated within both of these dimensions, in order to reach an understanding of whether the specific formulation and preliminary repercussions of the ProSavana initiative reflect their ideational basis. Chart 1 illustrates the difference in repercussions and critical assessments of ProSavana between these two levels of analysis, in relation to each of the essential guidelines for Brazilian cooperation projects:

Chart 1: Guidelines for Brazilian technical cooperation and their ramifications within the national and local dimensions of ProSavana

	State-to-state level analysis	Local level analysis
Emphasize projects linked to national programs and development priorities	The official Mozambican posture is strongly emphatic of the possibilities which Pro-Savanah contains in order to confront some of the crucial development challenges of the country.	The Director Plan in its present formulation has character of a top-down technically driven process, largely negligent to the particular needs of each region, which the absence of consultative mechanisms exacerbates.
Give preference to programs that provoke intensification of relations and open good perspectives for political, commercial and economic cooperation with partners	The central role of private foreign investment in ProSavana’s present formulation, has been strongly endorsed by the Mozambican government, and does hold the potential of intensifying politico-economic relations between Mozambique and Brazil.	It is highly uncertain whether private investments will produce constructive impacts amongst local populations and stakeholders. They risk becoming "isolated islands" and object of local recent due to any negative spillovers of the lax regulation which attracted investment in the first place. Transnational NGO mobilization against ProSavana indicates a tendency for this program to backlash upon the governments involved through the antagonization of rural communities and civil society.

continua...





	State-to-state level analysis	Local level analysis
Emphasize programs that enable transfer and absorption of knowledge within a critical perspective which produces innovation, creation and consequently, internalization.	<p>The strong emphasis on transfer of agricultural technology within ProSavana implies a potential for significant technical innovation, through active internalization by Mozambican actors. The cluster-based development model is characterized by a strong element of specialization in the production of a particular crop, and above all, the Brazilian technical capacity in grain and cashew production holds the potential to boost production of crops with a high export-potential.</p>	<p>The program contains a goal of technological transfers to industrialized agriculture as well as smallholders, but the balance between these two elements is still uncertain. Technological innovations imply differentiated consequences regarding the socio-environmental impacts of their adoption, particularly within the agricultural field.</p> <p>The introduction of specialized monoculture in certain regions of the country, also means that though tea, cashew and horticulture – in contrast to large-scale grain production – might be adopted by smallholders, this implies a profound restructuring in direction of commercial dependency away from self-sufficiency. Expansion of plantation cultures upon land previously used for a social purposerisks substituting self-sufficient family farming by wage labor, spurring the proletarianization of the rural workforce.</p>
Emphasize projects which integrate the basic components of technical international cooperation, such as consultancy, formation of human recourses, personnel training and complementation of institutional infrastructure.	<p>The Master Plan lays a strong emphasis on supporting the Mozambican government’s institutional planning capacity, as well as a significant element of technological transfer and training.</p>	<p>The aim of technology transfer towards the Mozambican National Directorate of Rural Extension does reflect a considerable focus upon human and institutional capacity development at the local level.</p> <p>Yet, the strong emphasis upon the governmental partners in the formulation of the Master Plan means that so far, it has been articulated as a top-down implementation of a production model upon smallholders, without proper previous consultation and evaluation of needs formulated at the local level. Legalization of land entitlement risks spurring an enclosure movement, and the commodification of land which previously served a more diffuse, yet essential social purpose. Such a development collides strongly with the notion of local consultation and other fundamental practices of development assistance.</p>





	State-to-state level analysis	Local level analysis
Give preference to projects that are clearly matched by recourses mobilized by the counterpart and constitute a substantial part of the general budget.	Due to a lack of capital, Mozambican recourse mobilization has mostly been expressed as the promise of designating 6 million hectares of land to agribusiness expansion. In some sense, this does constitute a significant effort of recourse mobilization, but also raises the question of whether the close-to-unconditional opening of land markets to foreign capital is in line with the notion of non-conditionality of cooperation.	The difficulty of mobilizing recourses amongst subsistence farmers at the local level means that these have only gained a limited influence within the project formulation, and may be negatively affected by the concessions of common lands by the government to foreign investors. The strong accentuation of private investments in the project formulation also raises a critical question, related to whether the imperatives of capital return are compatible with inclusive rural development.
Prioritize projects that enable the creation of multiplier effects	The third stage of the Plan for Model Extension which implies the proliferation of techniques and models developed within the program contains a potential for generation of multiplier effects and important national spillovers within Mozambican agriculture at large.	Dispersion of the model developed in the Nacala Corridor, depending on the results of its final implementation, holds the risk of materializing as an intend to forcefully disseminate an exclusionary rural development model. It is furthermore questionable whether large-scale industrial monoculture will imply positive spillovers for local production.
Prioritize projects which guarantee a broad results, thereby avoiding the pulverization and dispersion of efforts	The marked geographical concentration of the ProSavana program within the Nacala Corridor reflects a planning structure which is highly likely to ensure that productive synergies are achieved between the different agriculturally related industries. If successfully executed, the replication of the Proceder program of the Cerrado does hold the potential to spur production of crops with a high export potential, and thus provide broader economic impacts.	At its present formulation, the program appears to be somewhat characterized by a uni-dimensional emphasis upon economic results, in terms of growth and exports. A more multifaceted perspective upon the diversified social, environmental and economic consequences of such a development model should be applied, so as to evaluate the whole scale of results from such a profound rural restructuring, and how they interact.

Source: author's own elaboration

The evaluation of ProSavana's estimated consequences, its repercussions and reception so far, indicates a very evident difference between the official and the local level. On the level of official interactions between Brazil and Mozambique,





there is a consistency between the underlying principles for Brazilian TCDC, the concrete guidelines they nurture and the resultant initiatives within ProSavana. Yet, this consistency cannot be identified at the local level, where the estimated impacts of the program either are not in accordance with the guidelines, or in case that they are, often fail to produce results reflective of horizontal interactions. This has become evident through what has come to assume the character of a top-down implementation of a predefined package of initiatives, with a minimum of resort to consultancy with the local population. The focus of the initiative appears to be the proliferation of an agro-industrial development model, and though smallholder segments are not directly excluded from the scope of the initiative, the present state of the program's planning reflects a presumption of their adaption and eventual insertion into this model.

The differentiated consequences of ProSavana which analysis through a local-level perspective reveals, also mean that essential elements of Brazilian technical cooperation such as demand-drivenness, appreciation of local knowledge and non-conditionality, are hard to identify within this context. Though official Brazilian-Mozambican relations with regards to ProSavana may be characterized by these principles, these do not seem to materialize on the level of the communities directly in contact with the program. The principle on non-interference in domestic affairs even contains the danger of an interpretation which leads to the neglect of the needs and demands of local stakeholders, by restricting planning and decision making to a sphere of intergovernmental exchanges.

Though a genuine intend of spurring inclusive social and economic development is apparent within the initial formulation of the Master Plan, a lack of attention to the affected rural populations autochthonous perceptions of development is evident. This approximates Nel and Taylor's (2013) notion of mechanical solidarity, because even though an altruistic intention of aiding someone identified as a less fortunate 'other' is evident, this condescending attitude does not entail an effort to understand the deeper nature of his/her needs. Such vertical imposition of the assisting party's own vision of development is reminiscent of the critique directed at much of the North-South development assistance.

The transfer of agricultural policies inspired by the Procer program from Brazil towards Mozambique, in line with Milhorange (2013) may be perceived as permeated by a technical logic, which does not account for the capacity of the home country to absorb these policies, nor of their particular consequences within different national contexts. ProSavana thereby appears to be highly reflective of





Naidu's description of a present situation in Africa, in which rhetoric stressing a common identity is applied by wealthier developing countries, in order to push for the expansion of private capital into African markets. This has led to a dynamic by which the entrance of Southern capital has resulted in the formation of new class alliances and constellations of political interests (NAIDU, 2011). In this respect, it is interesting to observe how the nascent triangular constellation between the Mozambican politico-agrarian elite, and Brazilian public institutions and agribusiness has constituted the driving force at the core of this particular type of cooperation project between developing countries. It is equally remarkable how the opposing forces have consolidated themselves as a transnational movement, with a foothold in both Mozambique, Brazil and Japan.

The case of ProSavana indicates that new lines of contestation are being drawn. These materialize as an alignment between political elites and national champions of intermediate states, LDC ruling classes and international commodity corporations, in diametric opposition to peasant organizations, local NGO's, transnational grassroots networks and civil society organizations. This suggests the importance of a stronger attentiveness to the subnational level, but also of considering events and actors engaged at the transnational sphere, when analyzing the process of formulation and contestation of international cooperation projects.

Conclusion

The analysis of the case of ProSavana indicates that even though horizontal principles are essential to Brazilian TCDC, they appear to be present mostly at the intergovernmental bilateral level, while absent at the point of local implementation of the program. This is grounded in a certain lack of sensibility to the stratified impact of the project sought implemented, meaning that stakeholders on a range of different socioeconomic and geographical levels are affected. The same *sine qua non* character which is naturally ascribed to official home country participation and endorsement of development initiatives, does not seem to apply in relation to the approval of rural communities and civil society concerning ProSavana.

Evaluation of the degree to which the present state of the initiative reflects a compliance with the central guidelines for Brazilian technical cooperation therefore leads to a two-folded conclusion, suggesting a horizontal nature of





official interactions, contrasted by a vertical imposition in relation to the local level. This points to the importance of an attentiveness towards the broad range of national stakeholders which inevitably become involved or affected by large-scale development programs. It similarly becomes relevant to keep an eye on the process of transnational mobilization of a range of private and civil society stakeholders, as part of the process of formation and contestation of such initiatives.

The foregoing analysis also points towards a reevaluation of some of the constitutive principles below the notion of horizontal cooperation. As in the case examined, the principle of non-interference implies the danger of an interpretation which restricts dialogue and joint planning to the governmental level. In a similar way, examination of ProSavana also clearly indicates the presence of significant commercial interests, as well as the difficulties related to their reconciliation with inclusive social development. Yet, the foundational principles for Brazilian cooperation practices do appear to wield an undisputable power of attraction to other developing countries. The present analysis, therefore rather than refuting their intrinsic value, points towards the importance of ensuring their effective materialization in all of the dimensions of Brazilian TCDC initiatives.

References

- ABC. 2016, (1) Vertentes da Cooperação Internacional. Agência Brasileira de Cooperação. Ministério de Relações Exteriores. 2016. Disponível em: < <http://www.abc.gov.br/CooperacaoTecnica/Vertentes> > . Acesso em: 4 jun, 2016.
- ABC. 2016, (2) Cooperação Técnica Brasileira; Agricultura, Segurança Alimentar e Políticas Sociais. Agência Brasileira de Cooperação, Ministério de Relações Exteriores. 2016. Disponível em: < http://www.abc.gov.br/training/informacoes/ABC_en.aspx > . Acesso em: 23 fev, 2016.
- ABC. 2005. Formulação de Projetos de Cooperação Técnica Internacional (PCT). Manual de Orientação. 2016. Disponível em: < <http://www.abc.gov.br/imprensa/publicacoes> > . Acesso em: 5 jun, 2016.
- ABREU, Fernando. J.M. A Evolução da Cooperação Técnica do Brasil. Mural Internacional. v. 4, n. 2. 2013, p. 3-16.
- AMORIM, Celso. 2011. A África tem Sede de Brasil. Carta Capital, 28/05 2011. Disponível em: < <http://www.cartacapital.com.br/politica/a-africa-tem-sede-de-brasil> > . Acesso em: 14 fev, 2016.





- ARKHANGELSKAYA, Alexandra & KHAMATSHIN, Albert. South-South Cooperation in Agriculture: the India, Brazil and South Africa Dialogue Forum, in MODI, Renu, and Cheru, FANTU, (eds.) Africa Now: Agricultural Development and Food Security in Africa: The Impact of Chinese, Indian and Brazilian Investments. London: Zed Books. 2013. Cap. 9, p. 159-169.
- BARBOSA, Pedro. H.B. The Instrumental Bias of Brazilian Horizontal Technical Cooperation. *The Perspective of the World Review*, v. 4, n. 1, 2012, p. 113-145.
- BATISTA, Fabiana. Fundo da FGV quer captar US\$ 2 bi para investimentos em Mozambique. *Valor Econômico* 4/7, 2012. Disponível em: < <http://www.valor.com.br/agro/2738490/fundo-da-fgv-quer-captar-us-2-bi-para-investimentos-em-mocambique> > . Acesso em: 20 fev, 2016.
- BRY, Sandra. The production of soft power: practising solidarity in Brazilian South-South development projects. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*. v. 36, n. 4, 2015, p. 442-458.
- CABRAL, Lídia; SHANKLAND, Alex. Brazil's Agriculture Cooperation in Africa: new paradigms? in III Conferência Internacional do IESE "Mozambique: Acumulação e Transformação em Contexto de Crise internacional." Maputo. Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Econômicos. 2012. Conference Paper no.23. Disponível em: < http://www.iese.ac.mz/lib/publication/III_Conf2012/IESE_IIIConf_Paper23.pdf > . Acesso em: 2 fev, 2016
- CABRAL, Lídia; SHANKLAND, A., Favareto, A.; VAZ, A. C. Brazil-Africa Agricultural Cooperation Encounters: Drivers, Narratives and Imaginaries of Africa and Development. *IDS Bulletin*, v. 44. n. 4, 2013, p. 1-17.
- CABRAL, Lídia; RUSSO, Giuliano; WEINSTOCK, Julia. Brazil and the Shifting Consensus on Development Co-operation: Salutary Diversions from the 'Aid effectiveness' Trail? *Development Policy Review*, v. 32 n. 2, 2014, p. 179-202.
- CABRAL, Lídia. Priests, Technicians and traders: the Discursive Politics of Brazil's Agricultural Cooperation in Mozambique. *China and Brazil in Africa Agriculture (CBAA), Future Agricultures Working Paper 110*. 2015, p. 1-26. Disponível em: < <http://www.future-agricultures.org/publications>. Acesso em 12 fev, 2016.
- CABRAL, Lídia; FAVARETO, Arilson; MUKWEREZA, Langton; AMANOR, Kojo. Brazil's agricultural politics in Africa: More Food International and the disputed meanings of 'family farming' Global governance/politics, climate justice & agrarian/social justice: linkages and challenges. An international colloquium. 2016 Hague. Disponível em: < http://www.iss.nl/research/research_programmes/political_economy_of_resources_environment_and_population_per/networks/critical_agrarian_studies/icas/icas_colloquium/global_governancepolitics_climate_justice_agrariansocial_justice/. Acesso em 3 fev, 2016.





- CAICEDO, Jerónimo D.; CASTRO, Alejandro B. Subiendo al Sur: África y América Latina en las nuevas dinámicas de la cooperación Sur-Sur. *Humania del Sur*. n. 8. 2010, p. 89-106.
- CARVALHO, Nelson. Camponeses do Norte de Mozambique Rejeitam ProSavana. *Deutsche Welle*. 15/5, 2015 Disponível em: < <http://www.dw.com/pt/camponeses-do-norte-de-mo%C3%A7ambique-rejeitam-prosavana/a-18452296> Acesso em 15 fev, 2016.
- CERVO, Amado. L.; BUENO, C. 2011. História da política exterior do Brasil. Brasília: Editora UnB.
- CHERU, Fantu. South-South cooperation: what prospects for a new Bandung Consensus? in MODI, Renu (ed.) *South-South Cooperation: Africa on the Centre Stage*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, Cap.3, p. 42-58.
- CHICHAVA, Sérgio; DURAN, Jimena, CABRAL, Lídia; SHANKLAND, Alex; BUCKLEY, Lila; LIXIA Tang; YUE, Zhang. Chinese and Brazilian Cooperation with African Agriculture: the case of Mozambique. *China and Brazil in African Agriculture (CBAA)*, Future Agricultures working paper 049, 2013, Brighton. Disponível em: < <http://www.future-agricultures.org/publications/research-and-analysis/1637-chinese-and-brazilian-cooperation-with-african-agriculture-the-case-of-mozambique/file> > . Acesso em: 2 fev, 2016.
- CLAIRZIER, Patrick. Paths to Development through Trade: EU-Led Trade Liberalization vs South-South Cooperation. *Socialism and Democracy*, v. 25, n. 2, 2011, p. 64-80.
- CLEMENTS, Elizabeth A. & FERNANDES, Bernardo M. 2013. Land Grabbing, Agribusiness and the Peasantry in Brazil and Mozambique. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 41-69.
- ECONOMIST. A New Atlantic Alliance. *The Economist*. Available from: <http://www.economist.com/news/21566019-brazilian-companies-are-heading-africa-laden-capital-and-expertise-new-atlantic-alliance>. Acesso em 03 fev, 2016.
- FUNDAÇÃO GETÚLIO VARGAS. Nacala Corridor Fund. 2015. Fundação Getúlio Vargas Projetos. Rio de Janeiro.
- FILHO, Pio Penna. África: desafios e oportunidades no novo milênio. *Revista de Educação Pública*, v. 21, n. 46, 2012, p. 303-318.
- GARCIA, Ana Saggiaro; KATO, Karina; FONTES, Camila. A história contada pela caça ou pelo caçador? Perspectivas sobre o Brasil em Angola e Moçambique. *Misereor, PACS*, 2013, p. 6-64. Disponível em: < <http://www.pacs.org.br/files/2013/03/Relatorio-Africa.pdf> > . Acesso em: 5 fev. 2016.
- GOV, MOZ. Government of Mozambique. ProSavanah. What is ProSavanah. Disponível em: < <http://www.prosavana.gov.mz/what-is-prosavana/> Acesso em 15/02, 2016.
- GUARDIAN. Mozambique's small farmers fear Brazilian-style agriculture. *The Guardian*. January 1, 2014. Disponível em: < www.theguardian.com > . Acesso em: 7/6, 2016.





- HARBS, Renato; BACHA, Carlos J. C.; HARBS, Ricardo. Poderá a África ser concorrente do Brasil na Produção da Soja? *Revista de Política Agrícola*. ISSN 1413-4969. n. 3, 2015, p. 62-76.
- INOUE, Cristina Y. A. & VAZ, Alcides C. Brazil as 'Southern donor': beyond hierarchy and national interests in development cooperation? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, v. 25 n. 4, 2013 p. 507-534.
- IZIQUÉ, Claudia. O PAC da Embrapa. *Pesquisa PAPESP*, v. 144, 2008, p. 33-35.
- JOINT STATEMENT. 2013. Leaked copy of the Master Plan for the ProSAVANA programme in Northern Mozambique confirms the worst. Civil society groups warn secretive plan paves the way for a massive land grab. April 29, 2013. Disponível em: < www.grain.org. Acesso em 7 jun, 2016.
- LEITE, Iara C.; SUYAMA, Bianca; WAISBICH, Laura T.; POMEROY, Melissa; CONSTANTINE, Jennifer; NAVAS-ALEMÁN, Lizbeth, SHANKLAND, Alex; YOUNIS, Musab. Rising Powers in International Development. IDS – Institute for Development Studies. Evidence Report n. 59. 2014.
- MODI, Renu. Introduction in MODI, Renu (ed.) *South-South Cooperation: Africa on the Centre Stage*,. Palgrave MacMillan: Houndmills, 2011. Cap. 1, p. 1-17.
- MELLO, Patrícia C. Mozambique oferece terra á Soja Brasileira. *Folha*, 14 aug 2011. Disponível em: < www1.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/mercado/me1408201102.htm. Acesso em 15 fev., 2016.
- MENDONÇA, Wilson Júnior; DE FARIA, Carlos Aurélio Pimenta. A cooperação técnica do Brasil com a África: comparando os governos Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995–2002) e Lula da Silva (2003–2010). *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, v. 58, n. 1, 2015 p. 5-22.
- MILGROOM, Jessica.. Policy processes of a land grab: at the interface of politics 'in the air' and politics 'on the ground' in Massingir, Mozambique. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, v. 42, n. 3-4, 2015, p. 585–606.
- MILHORANCE, Carolina. A política de cooperação do Brasil com a África Subsaariana no setor rural: transferência e inovação na difusão de políticas públicas. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, v. 56 n. 2 2013, p. 5-22.
- MILHORANCE, Carolina; GABAS, Jean-Jaques. Reframing Development from the South? A Debate on the Internationalisation of Brazil's Rural Policies. International Conference of Public Policy, Milan, 1-4 July 2015. Disponível em: < <http://www.icpublicpolicy.org/conference/file/reponse/1434294554.pdf> Acesso em 2 fev., 2016.
- MUGGAH, Robert. What is Brazil really doing in Africa? *The Huffington Post*, 04 jan 2015. Disponível em: < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-muggah/what-is-brazil-really-doing_b_6413568.html > . Acesso em: 12 fev, 2016.





- MUKWEREZA, Langton..Zimbabwe-Brazil Cooperation through the More Food Africa Programme. China and Brazil in Africa Agriculture (CBAA), Future Agricultures working paper 116, Brighton, 2015. Disponível em: < <http://www.future-agricultures.org/publications> > . Acesso em: 5 dez.
- NAIDU, Sanusha. Civil Society in Africa: Perspectives on the Expanding Engagement with Southern Partners in MODI, Renu (ed.) South-South Cooperation: Africa on the Centre Stage. Palgrave McMillian: Houndmills, 2011. Cap.12, p. 203-219.
- NEL, Philip & TAYLOR, Ian..Bugger thy Neighbour? Ibsa and South-South Solidarity. Third World Quarterly, v. 34, n. 6. 2013, p. 1091-1110.
- PATRIOTA, Thomas C. & PIERRI Francesco M. 2013. Brazil's Cooperation in Africa's Agricultural Development and Food Security in MODI, Renu, and Cheru, FANTU, (eds.) Africa Now: Agricultural Development and Food Security in Africa: The Impact of Chinese, Indian and Brazilian Investments. London: Zed Books. Cap. 7, p. 125-144.
- PINO, Bruno Ayllón. Brazil's contributions to international development: emerging coalitions and South-South cooperation Revista CIDOB d'afers internacionals, n. 97-98, 2012, p. 189-204.
- REUTERS. 2016.Mozambique agriculture plan could displace 100,000 farmers – activists. Reuters Bureau, 25 abr. Disponível em: < <http://www.reuters.com/article/mozambique-land-food-idUSL5N0YC35120150525> > . Acesso em 15 fev, 2016.
- RENZIO, Paulo de; SEIFERT, Jurek; GOMES, Geovanna Z.; ASSUNÇÃO, M. Solidarity among Brothers? Brazil in Africa: Trade, Investment and Cooperation. BRICS Policy Center, Policy Brief v. 4, n. 65. 2014, p. 9-16.
- RODRIGUES, Diego de Freitas. Cooperação horizontal Sul-Sul: arranjos de concertação política entre a Índia, o Brasil e a África do Sul. Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional. v. 53 n. 1 p. 45-66, 2010.
- ROSARIO, Domingos M. From Negligence to Populism: An analysis of Mozambique's Agricultural Political Economy. FAC Political Economy of Agricultural Policy in Africa (PEAPA). Brighton, 2012. Southern Agricultures working paper 034. Disponível em: < <http://www.future-agricultures.org/publications> > . Acesso em: 3 fev. 2016.
- SANTOS, Roberta, F.; CERQUEIRA. Mateus, R.. Cooperação Sul-Sul: experiências brasileiras na América do Sul e na África. História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos, Rio de Janeiro, v. 22, n. 1, 2015 p. 23-47.
- SARAIVA, José F. S. The new Africa and Brazil in the Lula era: the rebirth of Brazilian Atlantic Policy. Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional. Special edition, 2010, p. 169-182.
- SCHLESINGER, Sergio. Cooperação e investimento do Brasil na África: O Caso do ProSavanah em Mozambique. FASE – Federação de Órgãos para Assistência Social e Educacional & Oxfam, Maputo, 2013, p. 5-55.





- SIMPLÍCIO, Francisco. South-South development cooperation: a contemporary perspective, in MODI, Renu (ed.) South-South Cooperation: Africa on the Centre Stage. Palgrave McMillian: Houndmills. Cap. 2 2011, p. 18-41.
- STOLTE, Christina.. Brazil in Africa: Just another BRICS Country seeking Recourses? Africa Programme and Americas Programme, Chatham House Briefing Paper, Royal Institute of International Affairs, AFP/AMP BP. 2012, p. 1-20.
- STUENKEL, Oliver. O Brasil na África: uma ponte sobre o Atlântico? Política Externa, v. 23, n. 2. 2014, p. 1-7.
- SUZETE, Izaura. Parar com ProSavana e redefinir políticas agrícolas inclusivas e sustentáveis – exigem os povos de Moçambique, Japão e Brasil. Movimento de Mulheres Camponesas. 2014, Disponível em: < <http://www.mmcbrazil.com.br/site/node/193>. Acesso em 16 fev, 2016.
- THALOR, Kai. 2013. Brazil, Biofuels and Food Security in Mozambique, in Africa Now: Agricultural Development and Food Security in Africa: The Impact of Chinese, Indian and Brazilian Investments. London: Zed Books, 2013, Cap. 8, p. 145-158.
- UNAC. 2012. União Nacional de Camponeses. *Pronunciamento sobre o Programa ProSavana*. 02 oct. Disponível em: < <http://www.unac.org.mz/index.php/7-blog/39-pronunciamento-da-unac-sobre-o-programa-prosavana>. Acesso em 08 fev. 2016.
- UNDP. United Nations Development Programme. United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation. What is South-South Cooperation? 2016 Disponível em http://ssc.undp.org/content/ssc/about/what_is_ssc.html, Acesso em 19 mar 2016.
- VAZ, Alcides C. International drivers of Brazilian agricultural cooperation in Africa in the post-2008 economic crisis. Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional, v. 58 n. 1. 2015. p. 164-190.
- WOERTZ, Eckart; KEULERTZ, Martin. Conference summary: Tropical Agriculture as ‘Last Frontier’? Food Import Needs of the Middle East and North Africa, Ecological Risks and New Dimensions of South-South Cooperation with Africa, Latin America and South-East Asia. International Journal of Water Resources Development, v. 31, n. 4, 2015, p. 785–789.

