Future Agricultures

CBAA Working Paper

South-South Cooperation in Context: Perspectives from Africa

Kojo Sebastian Amanor

This paper was produced as part of the China and Brazil in African Agriculture (CBAA) Project work stream

China and Brazil in African Agriculture (CBAA) project Working Paper series

The **ESRC (UK Economic and Social Research Council - ES/J018317/)** funded CBAA project is exploring the new development cooperation engagements in agriculture across four African countries. The project is examining the politics of aid and investment policy in China and Brazil, exploring how understandings of agricultural development are translated in aid and investment projects.

The project is being carried out as part of the Future Agricultures Consortium, connecting researchers from institutions in the UK and Africa with colleagues from China and Brazil. The research involves a mapping phase that is generating a geo-referenced database of Chinese and Brazilian agricultural development cooperation projects in Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. In addition, in-depth case studies of a sample of these projects, are examining the ways in which experience and expertise from China and Brazil engage with the realities of African agriculture and the perspectives of African scientists and farmers.

Comparative analysis across projects, countries and types of intervention are addressing the question of whether a "new paradigm" of development cooperation is emerging, and assessing the implications for the future of agricultural aid and investment policy.

The CBAA Working Paper series publishes work in progress by CBAA team members. All papers are technical research papers which have been peer reviewed, and are available in open access format. Please consult the project web pages at http://www.future-agricultures.org/research/cbaa or be in touch with the author(s) for further information.

Introduction

In recent years South-South development cooperation has come to the fore. This coincides with the global economic recession and the growing focus on Africa as not only a favourable source of raw materials, but also as a new frontier for financial investments – particularly in large-scale agriculture. Currently there is a sharp divide in perceptions of the expansion of investment in Africa by emergent powers. Detractors argue that emergent nations are pursuing a strategy of placing commercial interests above policy reform and good governance in a framework of market liberalisation. This is countered by arguments that the investments of BRICS countries create new, diversified opportunities based on a system of symmetrical relations or 'soft power', as opposed to a coercive one rooted in past colonial rule

This paper examines how liberal economic reforms that permeated and transformed economies during the 1980s and 1990s, both in the emerging BRICS powers themselves as well as in Africa, mediate and influence the relationships between emergent powers and African nations. It investigates the impact of South-South relations on the nature of development and technical cooperation, aid and investment, as well as in the configuration of relations between states, farmers and the private sector. It then examines the extent to which the experiences of China and Brazil in developing their agriculture result in qualitatively new paradigms for agricultural development which create opportunities for a redefinition of the development of policy and practice. Alternatively, it looks at how South-South development cooperation may merely reinforce the drive to capital accumulation unleashed by global economic liberalisation, and reflect strategies by emergent powers to acquire new markets for agricultural technology, inputs, services and new sources of raw materials. Finally, the paper questions the extent to which alternative paradigms can be created within the institutional framework created by neoliberal reform.

Dominant paradigms in agricultural development

Advocates of South-South cooperation tend to present it as distinct from previous development paradigms in that it is free from the vestiges of colonial rule, and only involves nations who have each struggled under such domination. However, the current dominant paradigms of agricultural development in Africa are not based on the heritage of colonialism either. A major, perhaps underestimated, influence lies in initiatives led by the USA in the late 1940s and 1950s to create new paradigms for development outside of colonial structures and within constructs of free markets. The framework for this was Point Four of the Truman declaration – the inaugural speech given by President Truman on 20 January 1949. In this address, Point Three was an overt military strategy – a call for a collective defence arrangement to counter the rise of communism which gave birth to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Point Four, on the other hand, was based on an effort to spread American influence through the transfer of technology and western democratic ideals.

> More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas…. The United States is preeminent among the nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques…. I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And in cooperation with the other nations, we shall foster capital investment in areas needing development….The old imperialism – exploitation for foreign profit – has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of democratic fair dealing… Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge (Truman 1949).

During the 1950s and early 1960s the US built a programme of technical cooperation delivered through the International Development Advisory Board (which later evolved into United States Agency for International Development), as well as the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations (Perkin 1997; Arnove 1982). These three organisations were instrumental in organising an international institutional framework for agricultural research to contain the three perceived threats of famine, overpopulation and communism. The work of these three agencies resulted in the building of new scientific and technical institutions within African countries, the education of an epistemic community of African scientists and technicians ingrained with western liberal values, and the creation of new international agricultural research structures that expanded plant breeding and agricultural technology innovations developed within the US for wider applications throughout the developing world. This formed the institutional infrastructure for the creation of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) system and the architecture through which the Green Revolution was initiated.

Within African countries new technical and research institutions were funded, and international agricultural research facilities such as IITA (the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture, established with headquarters in Nigeria as part of the CGIAR) were created to support adaptive research within national institutions and create new directions for agricultural research. Such new institutions and facilities were shaped on the basis of US institutions and institutional values.

Under colonial rule, the creation of an African scientific and technical cadre had been given low priority. Indeed, it was not until the 1950s that the colonial authorities began to build a network of national agricultural research and experimentation stations, and hire a small group of expatriate scientific and technical staff (Hodge 2007). As a consequence, African nations attained national sovereignty with a very rudimentary agricultural research infrastructure that was seriously understaffed.

The building of technical capacity involved overseas training programmes. The US provided programmes and scholarships for Africans to gain a technical, scientific and social science education within US institutions. Through these training programmes the US was able to build influence within the evolving development institutions of developing countries. Assessing these developments Papanek (1968: 183) comments:

> As a result of progress towards a professional consensus, foreign economists working in many less developed countries have immediate and national allies in their national colleagues, who share their professional language and often their goals. The differences between foreign and national economists are disappearing. The universities' future training, research and institutional involvement in the less developed world needs to take this development into account.

Similarly, Gouldner argues that the overseas training programmes co-opted third world leaders into an 'international occupation of experts and technicians who constitute a specific status group with status interests they wish to protect and advance' (quoted in Arnove 1982: 318). These programmes were initiated alongside programmes of learning about doing development, which also drew the social sciences into international development, including rural sociology, and anthropology.

This led to the development of African Studies and Development Studies departments in American universities. Open learning was complemented with covert learning, with US university researchers in Africa and Peace Corps volunteers providing lucrative potentials for espionage in the context of the Cold War.

The US foundations, such as Rockefeller and Ford, supported the creation of networks to build the leadership capacities of African researchers and experts to recognise, understand and solve development problems. They fostered relations and exchange between an African cross-national intelligentsia and intellectuals within the US, and created a series of mutually supporting linkages among national organisations to meet national development objectives. These US foundations tended to define and shape the research and development objectives of such networks to foster US interests rather than utilise them to open up new areas of research and understanding outside of US concerns. For instance, much of the research on what came to be dependency theory in Latin America was funded by the Ford Foundation. The independence of these foundations from the US government enabled them to initiate research in areas wary of US geopolitical ambitions and bring them into US circles of debate, by appealing to a nebulous concept of global development free of political interest (Arnove 1982).

During the 1950s and 1960s much of the rhetoric of US commitment to international development in Africa took place in the context of opening up the continent to free markets and new influences – strategies that are now referred to as 'soft power'. Unlike in South America, there was no previous history of US colonialism or imperial control, with the exception of Liberia. However, this was marred by the rapid escalation of the Cold War, which led US geopolitical interference to gain spheres of influence, just as with the Korean War, the Vietnamese War, and US support for coup d'etats across the world to topple leaders that opposed US interests.

US development programmes were initiated in the context of the Cold War. Soviet support for the anti-colonial struggle and its participation in the Second World War had won it many friends within Africa. This led to a divide in the bid to build African unity in the 1960s between the Casablanca Group made up of Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Egypt, Algeria and Morocco, committed to radical socialist programmes and linkages with the Soviet Union, and the Monrovia group of more conservative states wishing to remain within the ambit of the colonial powers and US influence. Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia eventually negotiated a compromise between the two networks, resulting in the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity headquarters in Addis Ababa in 1963.

Competing interests

As a result of these competing geopolitical interests, international development has never been hegemonic, but always a contested site of political conflict. While the US was able to shape the overriding architecture of international development, many African countries had a technical cadre trained in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China, and implemented mixed development plans combining elements of state planning, co-operatives and state farms, with US models of rural development, community development and the land grant system of agricultural extension.

Many of the more radical African governments attempted to steer a more autonomous course, becoming members of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which itself originally arose as an initiative of Yugoslavia, following its disagreements with the Soviet Union. The main advocates of the Non-Aligned Movement in the early 1960s included Presidents Tito of Yugoslavia, Nasser of Egypt, Nkrumah of Ghana, Sukarno of Indonesia, and Prime Minister Nehru of India. The main principles informing the Non-Aligned Movement included respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states, relations based on equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence. Many of these values are echoed in the articulation of principles for South-South relations. Such principles were initially developed in the context of early diplomatic relations between India and China, and the latter has continued to build upon these in its dealings with developing countries.

During the 1970s many African governments became disillusioned with international development and sought alternative visions (Arrighi 2002). During this era dependency theory was in vogue. The Non-Aligned Movement was instrumental in launching the Declaration for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO), which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1974. The NIEO was a forum for promoting dialogue on restructuring unequal trade relations between developed and developing countries. With the collapse of the Soviet Bloc and the end to the Cold War, and the hegemony of the US in international relations, the influence of the Non-Aligned Movement and the NIEO has declined. However, these principles have still influenced the rhetoric of South-South cooperation, even though it occurs in contexts that are quite different from the original conception of North-South unequal relations and Southern solidarity based on self-sufficiency.

The world economic recession of the 1970s resulted in the collapse of the Soviet Bloc and the bankruptcy of many African nations, who were forced to apply to the IMF for support. With the decline of a bipolar world competing for spheres of influence, African states were forced to adopt a set of conditionalities made up of austerity macro-policy measures and neoliberal reforms that opened up the economies to global markets forces, and good governance institutional reforms. Within western international development circles, the crisis of the late 1970s was a result of internal constraints: bad policies that undermined agricultural production. According to Bates (1981) African governments used the powerful instruments of state control and trade monopsonies to benefit a narrow circle of urban elites and party functionaries at the expense of farmers. The solution was to dismantle state control over the agricultural sector and enable farmers to take advantage of market opportunities. This thesis was elaborated by the World Bank into a theory of good governance, in which it was believed that the implementation of a series of institutional reforms leading to sound policies would result in widespread support for policy reform (World Bank 1989). In spite of the implementation of reform processes, the African economies continued to lag behind during the 1980s and 1990s as an increasing differentiation began to appear within the former colonies, with rapid rates of growth in some southeast Asian economies. GNP of African states declined an average of five percent between 1960 and 1975, and 47 percent between 1960 and 1999 (Arrighi 2002).

Economic crises, reform agendas and the struggle over resources

Arrighi (2002) argues that the world economic crisis of the 1970s resulted in a crisis of profitability that intensified global competition. The US responded to this crisis by competing aggressively for capital worldwide to finance a growing trade and current account deficit on its own balance of payments, which resulted in an increase of interests worldwide and major reversals in the direction of global capital flows. In the period 1965–69, US balance of payments recorded a surplus of US$12 billion. By 1975–79 this had turned into a deficit of US$7.4 billion and escalated to US$912.4 billion in 1995–99 (Arrighi 2000 based on IMF figures). By 2005 the US was running a deficit of US$700 billion, but receiving credits of US$900 as foreigners bought up government and mortgage bonds (Roberts 2009). This enabled the US to create an expanding demand for imports controlled by US manufacturers of products that were no longer profitable to manufacture in the US, but which could be commissioned or produced by US companies by relocating manufacturing plants elsewhere. Harvey (2005: 93) suggests that:

> The real secret of the US success, however, was that it was now able to pump high rates of return into the country from its financial and corporate operations (both direct and portfolio investments) in the rest of the world. It was now the flow of tribute from the rest of the world that founded much of the affluence achieved by the US in the 1990s.

Arrighi (2002) argues that these developments resulted in the rising expansion of wealth in the US and the bifurcation of fortunes within the developing world. On the one hand countries with large pools of cheap labour and dynamic entrepreneurial networks (largely in southeast Asia) were able to take advantage of these developments to participate in manufacturing for export markets. On the other hand, those that had largely depended upon export of natural resources and state organisation of manufacturing sectors enterprises, suffered from the downturn in primary commodity prices during the 1980s, lack of capital markets, high costs of borrowing, and a lack of industrial labour. As a consequence, whilst east Asian nations were able to mobilise labour supply for capital accumulation within manufacturing, the economies of Sub-Saharan Africa sharply contracted and were forced to accept structural adjustment programmes.

Adherence to the structural adjustment programme was not associated with an improvement, but with a further deterioration in the economic performance of African states during the 1990s (Arrighi 2002). It was not until the 2000s that growth rates began to improve in Sub-Saharan Africa to an average of five percent, thanks to the rise of commodity prices – a result of increasing world demand for raw materials fuelled by the industrialisation of newly emergent nations. The economic recession in Europe and North America linked to a financial and mortgaging crisis, and a crisis of profitability and faltering economic growth, has resulted in new financial investments in Africa – particularly in the petroleum, mining, natural resource and agricultural sectors. Africa is now perceived to be a continent favourable to investment, with higher returns than any other developing region, and a rapid growth of middle-class consumers and discretionary income (McKinsey Global Institute 2010).

Following the 2006–2008 world food crisis there has been increasing interest in development and investment in African agriculture. This includes staple food production for both the domestic market and exports, as well as debates about the relative merits of supporting large-scale or small-scale agriculture linked into agribusiness food chains through contractual relations. Prior to this, there had been some development in new horticultural exports in Africa, complementing traditional export commodities. This was developed within a food value chain governance system determined by supermarket chains, brand manufacturers and governments, based on notions of certification (such as Euro Gap and Global Gap), standards, quality control and systems of tracking produce to their original points of production. US and European investments in the agricultural sector during the 1990s and 2000s has often been less than enthusiastic, demanding institutional and governance reform, land reform, privatisation and government investment in infrastructure as a precondition to investment. For instance, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) requires governments to meet seventeen different 'independent' and 'transparent' policy requirements to be eligible for support. US investors have often chosen to invest in other regions rather than Africa, and promising innovations in agricultural production have often suffered from intensified competition from other regions. Nevertheless, recent initiatives such as the creation of an Alliance for Green Revolution in African (AGRA) under the auspices of the Gates Foundation, the support of the MCC for agricultural development, and the Millennium Villages Project reflect a renewed interest in agriculture and agricultural commercialisation within Africa.

The Rising Powers in Africa

In recent years, new investors including China and Brazil have rapidly moved into the African market. Between 2000 and 2008 China's trade with Africa grew by 33.5 percent, and in 2009 China overtook the US as Africa's largest trading partner with the value of trade reaching over US$160 billion in 2011 (Africa Research Institute 2012). Although much less, Brazilian trade with Africa has also grown by 400 percent between 2002 and 2010, when it reached US$20.6 million.

China in Africa

The rapid expansion of the Chinese economy and manufacturing industry has led to its increasing dependence on exports and the US market. Exports of goods and services in China account for over 40 percent of GDP, with a the majority of this destined for the US market. However, the economic downturn in the US, and the possibility of a trade war between the US and China (as the US aggressively seeks to regenerate its manufacturing base), has created much concern in China about its dependence on US markets. This has lead to attempts to diversify Chinese trade and stimulate domestic demands. The rapid expansion of the Chinese economy has also created demands for raw materials, energy, and food, and China has increasingly looked for new markets in Africa to meet these demands. This in turn has led to a rapid expansion of trade and investment with African countries, in which China is rapidly emerging as the continent's dominant trading partner. Chinese interests in Africa are reflected in inter-governmental cooperation, government sponsored projects, investments by State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and private enterprises, the large volume of trade manufacturers carried by both African and Chinese traders, and the movement of Chinese labour and small-scale investors and traders into Africa.

Although much of the growth in China has been stimulated by neoliberal reforms and the opening of new markets, this has been implemented outside of the tenets of neoliberalism and democratic governance reforms. Moreover, many of the reforms that have been foisted onto southeast Asian nations by the US and international multilateral organisations, in the wake of the Asian crisis, have been problematic. Those nations that have fared best have been those that have resisted further opening of their economies and retrenchment of the state (Harvey 2005; Stiglitz 2002; Bullard and Bello 1998). Within southeast Asia, the Chinese government has been instrumental in fostering a critical multilateral appraisal of neoliberalism and promoting South-South dialogue (Wu and Lansdowne 2008).

This notion of South-South cooperation has also been extended into diplomatic, technical and development cooperation relations with African nations. China has sought to develop the Forum for China Africa Cooperation, an intergovernmental forum through which various high-level Chinese and African leaders meet to define the parameters and scope of China and African developmental ties (Buckley 2013). The China Africa Development Fund (CADFund) has opened four regional offices on the African continent and provides funding for projects within Africa, and a bridge to encourage and facilitate investments of Chinese companies within the continent. The main areas of technical cooperation and investment are concerned with infrastructure development, communications, construction, dam and energy production, natural resource sectors, petroleum, mining and agriculture. China has established over 40 agricultural demonstration centres in African countries. It provides agricultural assistance that combines infrastructural development, such as in dam construction with technical training, input provisioning and storage facilities, and facilitating linkages between agricultural ministries and communities. With funding of US$1 billion in its first phase and US$2 billion in its second, CADFund has made significant contributions to FDI in Africa.

Although China's presence in Africa has expanded in recent years, China has a long history of ties in development cooperation within Africa from the 1960s onwards. For example, during the 1980s Chinese development assistance to Africa increased with numerous development projects in many countries. Indeed, China's recent expansion in Africa has been preceded by a long history and experience of diplomatic and technical co-operation linkages, and participation in several multilateral forums (Guttal 2008).

Brazil in Africa

In contrast with China, Brazil is a relatively new player in Africa. Its policy of promoting South-South cooperation grows out of its regional policy in South America. Its movement into development in Africa is very recent, originating from the mid 2000s, with the visit of President Lula to 26 African Countries in the early 2000s, the expansion of embassies with African Countries, the organisation of the Brazil-Africa Forum, and the setting up of technical cooperation programmes, credits, and joint Chambers of Commerce for African countries (Cabral and Shankland 2013; Patriota and Pierri 2013). As with China, Brazil has been suspicious of multilateral and US neoliberal reform prescriptions in the wake of the Mexican and Argentinean crisis, and has propounded a development framework built on South-South cooperation.

This is reflected in a diverse portfolio of export partners in which 55 percent of the value of exports are with Latin America, 15 percent North America, six percent Central America, eight percent Europe, seven percent Asia, and five percent with Africa (Aulakh 2006:100). In contrast with China, Brazil has oriented its exports much more towards South American markets rather than the US. Within South America, Brazil has been instrumental in opposing attempts to set up the Free Trade Area of the Americas, without the elimination of US agricultural subsidies – guarantees of measures to ensure access to US markets, and changes to US policy on patents. Brazil has actively supported the development of Mercorsur, a common market or free trade zone whose full members include Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela, and has become a strong advocate of South-South cooperation as a central tenet of its development policy based on economic cooperation between South American and African nations.

This notion is based on establishing joint economic investments to promote technical cooperation. Like Chinese notions of South-South cooperation this is based on non-interference, no preconditions attached to aid, and symmetrical relations in which technical cooperation develops out of expressed mutual interests. The Brazilian framework of South-South cooperation in Africa stresses the similarities of the Brazilian and African environments, the recent technical and research successes that Brazil has achieved in this environment, and the transferability of these technologies to Africa (Cabral and Shankland 2013; World Bank and IPEA 2011).

Brazilian South-South cooperation also stresses its commitment to social inclusion and the eradication of poverty, and the successes that it has achieved in implementing its *BolsaFamilia* (family allowance) programme, which provides conditional financial support and school feeding programmes to ensure that children from poor families attend school (Patriota and Pierri 2013; World Bank and IPEA 2011; McCann 2008). In 2005 the Brazilian government – through its Ministry of Social Development (MDS) – began disseminating the precepts of the *BolsaFamilia* or Conditional Cash Transfer programme, as it came to be known internationally, to South Africa, Nigeria and the British Department for International Development. In 2006 delegates from Ghana, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Africa and Zambia made a study tour to Brazil. In 2007 the Ghanaian government implemented a version of the *BolsaFamilia* known as the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) Programme, likewise Benin is currently implementing its own version (Stolte 2012). In 2008 the Brazilian Ministry of Social Development (MDS), in collaboration with the (DFID) and the International Poverty Center for Inclusive Growth (IPC-IG), launched the Africa Brazil Programme on Social Development, based on technical cooperation, study tours, and distance learning. The *BolsaFamilia* has grown into a trilateral programme, with both DFID and the World Bank supporting its dissemination in Africa (World Bank and IPEA 2011; Lindert 2006).

The Brazilian government has also signed a cooperation agreement with the FAO to extend its Zero Hunger Programme to Africa. This works through expanding public procurement of food produced by smallholders for school feeding programmes, and by supporting family farm production through the More Food Programme. The More Food Programme in Brazil seeks to raise the productivity of Brazil's smallholder family farms by providing them with credit under preferential terms to acquire subsidised farm equipment and machinery and technical assistance. This has resulted in a dramatic increase in productivity of 89 percent by area, and increase of income by 30 percent. It also creates new markets for Brazilian agricultural technology in which 60 percent of Brazil's tractor sales and 41 percent of its agricultural machinery workforce derived from the More Food Programme (Patriota and Pierri 2013). Five African countries have currently signed agreements for the extension of this programme into their rural settings, including Ghana, Zimbabwe, Senegal, Kenya and Mozambique. The expansion of this programme into Africa seeks to enhance rural food security, increase productivity, address technology capacity issues, and create an expanded market for Brazilian technology. However, whether the African More Food Programme will create technologies for small and medium farmers, or lead to the provision of subsidised technologies for rich farmers, remains to be seen in the implementation of the programme. Certainly within the African agrarian economy, smallholders cultivate much smaller areas than would make tractor ownership economically viable.

South-South cooperation has formed a major framework in which Brazil has rapidly expanded its investments in Africa during the 2000s in construction, energy, public health, agriculture, and social protection. In building South-South cooperation in Africa, Brazil tends to stress its cultural similarities with Africa: the existence of a large African diaspora in Brazil; of communities within West Africa that repatriated from Brazil in the nineteenth century; and the similarity of the African physical environment with that of Brazil. However, cultural ties remain poorly developed and superficial, with few student and tourist cultural exchanges taking place, nor many joint social studies research programmes being undertaken. Likewise, communications between Brazil and Sub-Saharan Africa remain poor, with no direct flights (excepting South Africa), and significant language barriers outside of the former Portuguese colonies.

Brazil has pursued a policy of opening up the economy to international market forces and investments and privatising SOEs following the 1982 Latin American debt crisis. However, state regulations and support for local capital has enabled the rapid emergence of Brazilian multinational companies, particularly around natural resources, energy, construction and agribusiness. Many of these companies have expanded into regional South American markets and are now moving into Africa (Shneider 2009).

Agriculture accounts for three quarters of commodity exports from Brazil, of which the major products include soy products, sugar and ethanol, chicken, beef, coffee tobacco, and orange juice. Brazil is the fourth largest agricultural exporter in the world, and many of its agribusiness firms are now establishing plants in foreign countries. The largest agribusiness companies are in meat processing. The three major meat processors and exporters are JBS, which became the largest beef processor in the world in 2007 following a number of aggressive takeovers, with revenues of over US$7 billion in that year, and Sadia and Perdigão, which in 2008 both had revenues of nearly US$5 billion. Sadia also specialises in processed and frozen foods and Perdigão in dairy products (Shneider 2009). Ethanol also is a major product, originating in attempts to create energy self-sufficiency during the period of import-substitution. In contrast with China, Brazilian companies tend to depend upon employing local staff rather than Brazilians, and Brazilian economic interests are much less marked by movements of Brazilians into Africa. Brazilian companies in Africa tend to be a select few large private sector companies rather than the blend of SOEs and mixed scale of private companies that characterise Chinese investments in Africa.

Conclusion

Although South-South cooperation appears to be a recent concept in international development, it is the culmination of a much longer historical processes. It reflects a particular trajectory of development in which import substitution industrialisation was replaced by export-oriented growth, but one in which the successful rising powers have been able to nurture and protect their own industries and make them competitive within a global economy. In particular, the state has played a major role in facilitating the growth of national capital, and in creating an enabling environment for the growth of both national capital and international investments by national industries. This has facilitated the emergence of increasing economic efficiency and companies that can compete successfully within a global economy. Although these economic reforms have resulted in the adoption of market liberalisation, this has been combined with a resistance to and critique of some policies advocated by the US and multilateral organisations, similar to that which has been carried by China into Asian regional forums and by Brazil into South American regional forums. South-South cooperation in Africa reflects a further extension of this critique into increasing competition for resources and markets with western transnational companies (Amanor 2013). South-South cooperation critiques the conditionalities that western nations have attempted to impose on Africa, Southeast Asia and South America, and develops an alternative framework of technical assistance based on non-intervention, respect for national sovereignty and national interests. Western conditionalities are seen by both the Chinese and Brazilian governments and policymakers as imposing policies on Africa that do not necessarily meet African needs. The framework of South-South cooperation draws upon earlier frameworks of a new international economic order and non-alignment, although these are now framed within the concept of a market-driven economy. South-South cooperation thus reflects an economic order based on private and public sector partnerships that responds to the market, and is willing to both (a) make large investments within African countries, and (b) make provisions for infrastructural development to facilitate the emergence of a modern economy. It extends the competition between US multinational companies and the new multinationals agribusiness companies that have emerged in southeast Asia and Brazil onto the African continent. Whilst US companies neglected Africa to invest in the emergent economies of China and Brazil (which were considered to have more potential), the companies that have since issued from these areas now see Africa as the new frontier for investment. This opens up African economies to rapid investment, and transforms Africa from a marginalised entity of exception into a frontier for future industrial and agri-industrial potential.

In contrast with western donors, these new interventions set up a synergy between infrastructure development, technical cooperation and capital accumulation, which creates new demands and markets. They do not make capital investment conditional upon the creation of an enabling environment. Rather than focusing on institutional reform as a pre-condition for investment, they set up a process of transformation and capital accumulation that generates the material conditions for institutional change. South-South cooperation sets up a framework of diplomatic ties to assist trade, based on notions of symmetrical exchange (soft power), and the building of intergovernmental forums and forums to promote investments and business exchange. It facilitates change pragmatically based on existing economic opportunities and interests in investment and accumulation. It does not attempt to pre-define and manage change by moralising about the nature of change. However, in many respects these developments have been made possible by the conditionalities that have opened up African economies to external investment and by institutional reforms that connect various networks through training and professional connections within the UN and CGIAR systems and which themselves have contributed towards the development of science, technology and investment within the rising powers. Although these developments compete with northern capital, they also embody alliances with fractions of northern capital to open up new markets within Africa and international markets for African products (Amanor 2013). Thus South-South cooperation builds upon pre-existing forms of international development, adding new variants of statecraft to facilitate capital accumulation and new forms of market socialisation, such as notions of social inclusion, based on a mixture of market and state interventions.

References

Africa Research Institute (2012) Between Extremes: China and Africa, Briefing Note 1202, October, London: Africa Research Institute. Source: http://www.africaresearchinstitute.org/files/briefing-notes/docs/Between-extremes-China-and-Africa-P2E56236DQ.pdf. Accessed 3 December 2012.

Amanor, K.S. (2013) Chinese and Brazilian Cooperation with African Agriculture: The Case of Ghana. Future Agricultures Consortium Working Paper 52, Brighton, Sussex: IDS

Arnove, R.F. (1982) 'Foundations and the Transfer of knowledge' in Arnove, R. F. (ed.), Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism, Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press.

Arrighi, G. (2002) 'The African Crisis: World Systemic and Regional Aspects' New Left Review, 15: 5-36.

Aulack, P.S. (2006) 'Global strategies of Brazilian firms in an era of economic liberalization' in Jain, S. C. (ed.), Emerging Economies and the Transformation of International Business, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Bates, R.H. (1981) Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Buckley, L. (2013). Narratives of China-Africa Cooperation for Agricultural Development: New Paradigms? Future Agricultures Consortium Working Paper 53, Brighton, Sussex: IDS

Bullard, N. and Bello, W. (1998) 'Taming the Tigers: The IMF and the Asian Crisis' in Jomo, K. S. (ed.), Tigers in Trouble: Financial governance, liberalisation and crises in East Asia, London: Zed Books.

Cabral, L. and Shankland, A. (2013) Narratives of Brazil-Africa Cooperation for Agricultural Development: New Paradigms? Future Agricultures Consortium Working Paper 51, Brighton, Sussex: IDS

Gouldner, A.W. (1982) The Dialectics of Ideology and Technology: The Origins, and Future of Ideology, New York: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005) A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hodge, J.M. (2007) Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian doctrines of development and the legacies of British colonialism, Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Lindert, K.(2006) 'Brazil: BolsaFamilia Program: Scaling up cash transfers for the poor' in MFDR Managing for Development Principles in Action: Sourcebook on Emerging Good Practices, First Edition. Source http://www.mfdr.org/Sourcebook/1stEdition/6-1Brazil-BolsaFamilia.pdf. Accessed 12 January 2013.

McCann, B. (2008) The Throes of Democracy: Brazil since 1989, Halifax: Fenwood Publishing and London: Zed Books.

McKinsey Global Institute (2010) Lions on the Move: The Progress and Potential of African Economies, Washington: McKinsey Global Institute. Source: http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/mgi/research/productivity_competitiveness_and_growth/lions_on_the_move. Accessed 3 December 2012.

Papanek, G (1969) 'Training Economists for Service in Developing Countries' in Bienviste, G. and Ilchman, W. F. (eds.), Agents of Change: Professionals in developing countries, New York Washington, London: Praeger Publishers.

Patriota, T.C. and Pierri, F.M. (2013) 'Brazil's Cooperation for Agriculture Development and Food Security in Africa: Assessing the Technology, Finance, and Knowledge Platforms', in Cheru, F. and Modi, R. (eds.), Agricultural Development and Food Security in Africa: The impact of Chinese, Indian and Brazilian Investments, London: Zed Books.

Perkin, J. H. (1997) Geopolitics and the Green Revolution: Wheat, Genes, and the Cold War, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, M. (2009) The Great recession: Profit Cycles, Economic Crisis. A Marxist View. Printed by Amazon.co.uk, Marston Gate.

Shneider, B. R. (2009) 'Big Business in Brazil: Leveraging Natural Endowments and State Support for International Expansion', in Brainard, L. and Martinex-Daiz, L. (eds.) Brazil as an Economic Superpower: Understanding Brazil's Changing Role in the Global Economy, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Steiglitz, J. (2002) Globalization and its Discontents, London: Penguin Books.

Stolte, C. (2012) Brazil in Africa: Just Another BRICS Country Seeking Resources? Briefing paper AFP/AMP BP 2012/01, Chatham House, London.

Truman, H. (1949) Inaugural Address, 20 January 20. Source: http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres53.html. Accessed 28 November 2012.

World Bank (1989) Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth, Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank and IPEA (2011) Bridging the Atlantic. Brazil and Sub-Saharan Africa: South-South Partnering for Growth. Source: http://go.worldbank.org/6ZZHQK4MO. Accessed 3 December 2012.

Wu, G. and Lansdowne, H. (2008) 'International multilateralism with Chinese characteristics: Attitude change, policy imperatives, and regional impacts', in Wu, G. and Lansdowne, H. (eds.), China Turns to Multilateralism: Foreign policy and regional security, London and New York: Routledge.

Future Agricultures

This **Working Paper** was written by **Kojo Sebastian Amanor** for the **Future Agricultures Consortium**. The series editors are **Amy Thompson** and **Beatrice Ouma**. Further information about this series of Working Papers at: **www. future-agricultures.org**

The Future Agricultures Consortium aims to encourage critical debate and policy dialogue on the future of agriculture in Africa. The Consortium is a partnership between research-based organisations across Africa and in the UK. Future Agricultures Consortium Secretariat at the University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RE UK **T** +44 (0) 1273 915670 **E** info@future-agricultures.org

E·S·R·C ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

FAC appreciates the support of the UK Economic and Social Research Council and UK Department for International Development (DfID)

UKaid from the British people