

The strategic partnership between Brazil and the European Union and the dialogues in Human Rights: a case of policy transfer?

Miriam Gomes Saraiva

Jessica Luciano Gomes

Draft do not quote

Abstract

This chapter analyses the role of the dialogues between the European Union and Brazil in human rights, in the grounds of the strategic partnership between both actors. Its main focus is to identify to what extent the interactions on human rights issues were a case of policy transfer, presenting the areas of progress and limitations. The chapter demonstrates the first results of the strategic partnership during the Lula da Silva government and it subsequently shifts the focus to the Dilma Rousseff government. Next, we analyse the Sector Dialogues that are a part of the Brazil-EU strategic partnership, as well as the main objective of this research, which is to question the role of the dialogue about human rights in the perspective of policy transfer, in the grounds of the strategic partnership. In the final section, we conclude with a few considerations about the advances and the limits of EU norms diffusion to such a special case, as it is the Brazilian one.

Diplomatic relations between Brazil and the European Community date back to 1960. Throughout the 1980s, these relations were strengthened politically and in terms of cooperation, and in 1992 a framework cooperation agreement was signed, classified as a third-generation agreement. This agreement encompassed a variety of areas and gave rise to some sector dialogues between Brazil and the European Union (EU). In 2007, a strategic partnership was established between Brazil and the EU. This formally included a reinforcement of multilateralism and a quest for joint actions in several fields, including

human rights, poverty, environmental issues, energy, MERCOSUR (Common Market of the South) and stability in Latin America. The drivers behind this initiative were multiple. On the European side were the active role Brazil was playing in international affairs, especially the Doha Round; the European bid to set up partnerships with emerging countries; the perception that Brazil could be a potential partner in multilateral forums; and the stalemate reached in EU-MERCOSUR political dialogue. On the Brazilian side, the reasons that motivated the country's policymakers to negotiate were the possibility that a partnership with the EU would be as instrumental for strengthening Brazil's international recognition and standing, and also as a way of getting Brazil closer to European countries that it considered more important. Brazil's expectation that this would lead to increased investments, and technology and innovation transfers also favoured the signing of the agreement.

Since this European perspective, the normative impulse of norms diffusion of EU's foreign policy is embodied by the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as an element that identifies the European external behaviour, which can be understood as a general pattern¹. This pattern is completed with the goal of promoting and exporting policy lessons and practicing policy transfer², and it is considered by this article as a premise because there is a consolidated literature about it. These factors together have contributed for the externalization of European foreign behaviour values, such as peace and security, democracy and human rights. In its latest Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy, the EU has put much emphasis on the idea of resilience, understood as the “the ability of states and societies to reform, thus withstanding and recovering from internal and external crises”³.

However, the norms diffusion process also requires a recipient, or the establishment of a linkage between the norm-maker and the norm-taker (Domínguez, 2011). In the inter or transnational cases, a government, a group of countries in a regional initiative or even a governmental agency can act with the purpose of diffusing certain ideas, values or policies beyond its borders, as well as to prompt external actors to a constant innovation and adaptability of the function of social and political systems. In the receptor end, bureaucracy must be willing to understand the external experiences, as well as the ability to use and accumulate knowledge and experience in the process of political change (Borrás, 2011, p.726). In other words, the learning process requires not only the willingness to receive

¹ About the normative power of the European Union, see Manners (2002).

² About the definition of policy transfer, see Stone (1999).

³ See Global Strategy, available at https://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf [accessed on November 2nd 2016].

innovations by the public actors but it also takes the form of social learning, when it involves different communities of social actors (idem, p.729).

In global politics, the diffusion of practices and values has been organized through foreign policy networks⁴. Among them, advocacy networks are the foreign policy networks between parts connected by mutual interests of global politics. Beyond its convergence interests, some advocacy networks share norms and values, such as democracy and human rights. Its member-states are connected by a shared sentiment that is reinforced by socialization processes, that occur as sub products of its continued collaboration. The EU Global Strategy demonstrates that it aims to build networks. Thus, interregionalism becomes an important element in the EU foreign policy, as it is being guided towards other group of countries. Interregionalism is here understood as a “state and non-state actor-driven process of bridging regions both institutionally and socially” (Ribeiro Hoffmann, 2015, p. 601). The importance of a mutual policy-learning is highlighted in the EU-CELAC Action Plan⁵.

Therefore, this chapter focuses on the Brazilian perspective of the ruler-taker role regarding the interactions in the human rights agenda. It examines how the dialogue with the EU in this area has progressed from Lula da Silva to Dilma Rousseff and what explanation it might reveal for the limits of learning process, when faced with the policy-transfer intentions from the EU. The role of the EU in the international arena concerning human rights is guided by the Strategic Framework on Human Rights and Democracy, which has generated two Action Plans: one that was implemented in 2012 through 2014, and another that was released in 2015 and will be executed until 2019. Its main guidelines include peace and stability promotion through local actors (institutions and civil society) and the implementation of the protection of human rights in its foreign policy (by dialogues with other countries)⁶. This topic is urgent, particularly now with the drastic situation of refugees in the continent.

The main argument presented here is that in the multilateral dimension, which involves exchange with diplomats in international institutions, the convergence in human rights is not as noticeable. As an example of this evidence, the Brazilian votes in the United Nations Human Rights Council have shown more alignment with Global South countries than with European countries. When we consider the bilateral dimension, which has since 2011

⁴ See Flemes and Saraiva (2014).

⁵ “The Action Plan identifies instruments and activities which, if properly implemented should lead to concrete results guaranteeing ownership and capacity building in the following key areas”. The EU-CELAC Action Plan is available at http://www.eeas.europa.eu/la/summits/docs/2013_santiago_summit_eu-celac_action_plan_en.pdf. [accessed on September 23rd 2016].

⁶ More details on the Action Plan can be found at the *EU Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World in 2015*, available at http://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/qc0216616enn_002.pdf [accessed on November 1st, 2016]

received more attention on the strategic partnership with the EU, we can identify traces of policy transfer. The bilateral dialogues, an arena in which human rights issues receive more attention, is carried through technical channels, with special calls for projects to receive funding for specific initiatives within the areas covered by the respective sector dialogue, and for promoting the exchange of ideas and cooperation between both sides⁷. Support for these initiatives seems to have grown since President Rousseff took over.

Initially, this chapter presents the first results of the strategic partnership during the Lula da Silva government and it subsequently shifts the focus to the Dilma Rousseff government. Next, we analyse the Sector Dialogues that are a part of the Brazil-EU strategic partnership, as well as the main objective of this research, which is to question the role of the dialogue about human rights in the perspective of policy transfer, in the grounds of the strategic partnership. In the final section, we conclude with a few considerations about the advances and the limits of EU norms diffusion to such a special case, as it is the Brazilian one.

1.The Strategic Partnership between Brazil and the EU – first results

When Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva came to power, in 2003, the autonomous notion of Brazil's role in the international arena gained strength as the foreign policy motto. Brazil reoriented its external actions to assure greater autonomy by reinforcing its universalism through south-south cooperation and multilateral institutional forums, while playing a stronger, more proactive role in global politics. At a time of fragmentation of the world order, Brazil was keen to support anti-hegemonic, multipolar positions (Gratius, 2011) and to play a leading role in South America. In order to achieve these goals, the strategy implemented was to defend the reorganisation of international institutions on the basis of more inclusive criteria. With a view to implementing these plans, Brazilian diplomats have taken action in multiple fields and with different kinds of partners. Lula assumed a strong presidential diplomatic stance so as to project the image of Brazil in new scenarios.

⁷ These special calls were created with a specific funding in the Strategic Partnership.

In this new context, Brazil's perception of the EU shifted. Nonetheless, the idea conceived during the Cardoso administration that the EU and its member states could be major allies in a review of the world order remained. The consolidated perception of the Brazilian diplomatic corps was that the EU and Brazil shared common values in areas like development, democracy and international peace and also when it came to the defence of multilateralism in global politics. Accordingly, if it wanted to become a global player, getting proximity to Europe made sense, as closer ties with the United States were out of the question.⁸

The Strategic Partnership between Brazil and the EU was signed in 2007, after a few setbacks regarding the G20 negotiations under Brazilian leadership and after the MERCOSUR-EU agreement came to a halt. The partnership formally included a reinforcement of multilateralism and the pursuit of joint actions on human rights, poverty, environmental issues, energy, MERCOSUR and Latin American stability. According to Telò (2014), the partnership paved the way for the construction of a shared view on multilateralism on a regional, inter-regional and international level.

The first Joint Action Plan was signed in 2008 and annual summits were initiated with a view to improving interactions between the diplomatic corps on both sides. In the plan, a number of sector dialogues were established and the dialogues that had been set up during President Lula's first term were also reinstated⁹. A point mentioned in the Joint Action Plan was cooperation in inter-regionalism, but by the end of the Lula administration the concrete results of the strategic partnership were still limited. The joint statements at the 2008, 2009 and 2010 summits stressed multilateral topics connected with the defence of principles like democracy, the rule of law and human rights, and the importance of working together to resolve global issues, especially climate change, sustainable development and energy security (Lazarou & Fonseca, 2013). On Brazil's insistence, the effort to push for a reform of the United Nations and the global financial system were also featured in these statements.

Despite the EU's initial expectations of joint action and Brazil's hopes to see its interests and preferences being advocated in the global arena (Ferreira-Pereira, 2015), it proved hard to align the two parties' interests. Basically, it became clear to the Brazilian diplomats that the two sides' conceptions did not coincide a great deal. The fact that in a

⁸ According to Ayllon Pino (2006), Europe saw the Brazilian government as a "strategic ally in order to stop the hegemonic unilateralism of the US".

⁹ There are currently 33 areas covered by the Sector Dialogues, which are available at <http://sectordialogues.org/en>, retrieved on 25 December, 2015

fragmented political world order, the EU was keen to build bridges with the US and countries from the global south prevented it from working more closely with Brazil for a review of the world order. Meanwhile, Brazil's interest in partnering with other countries from the global south and dialogue forums like IBSA, BASIC, the G20 and the BRICS meant the EU was pushed down Brazil's list of foreign policy priorities (Ferreira-Pereira, 2015)¹⁰.

2. The strategic partnership in the Rousseff administration

The foreign policy adopted by Lula was not continued by his successor, Dilma Rousseff, who became president in 2011. Although President Rousseff's discourse initially seemed to indicate that the strategies inherited from her predecessor would be maintained, in practice in both terms the Rousseff administration has effected progressive change and retraction in its foreign affairs. When it comes to foreign policymaking, presidential diplomacy and the role of the president in incentivizing and weighing up different foreign policy views – typical of President Lula – have been abandoned. President Rousseff has clearly demonstrated a preference for resolving domestic issues and little interest in foreign affairs, especially ones only capable of yielding sporadic and symbolic gains, intangible in the short term.

A few factors have conspired to make maintaining previous patterns of behaviour harder. The Rousseff government has certainly faced more arid national and international scenarios than when Lula was in power. Since the beginning of the first term, the economic crisis facing the established powers has given way to economic recovery in the US, while the Euro Zone crisis has gradually been reined in. This change has put the G7 firmly back centre stage and reduced the room for manoeuvre for emerging countries. The Doha Round made no progress and talks have started for the formation of large free-trade blocs, which has made it harder for Brazil to find its place in the international economy. The rise of the Chinese economy has again tipped the economic balance, and the country now enjoys a north-south style of relationship with Brazil. The boom times of high prices for Brazil's export commodities have passed. Politically speaking, although traditional Western multilateralism has been challenged, the world's emerging countries have failed to set a new agenda for global politics.

¹⁰ India, Brazil, South Africa (IBSA), Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS).

The Brazilian economy was shaken by the international financial crisis and some misguided economic decisions taken after 2008. Average GDP growth has steadily slowed until in 2015 it entered negative territory. Brazil's plans to support infrastructure developments (using funds from the Brazilian Development Bank) have been impacted by the economic difficulties and a number of projects have been left incomplete. The state of the economy has had a knock-on effect on the political field. To sum up, the second term began with an economic crisis, a political crisis and an institutional crisis as some members of the coalition government in congress defected to the opposition.

The strategic partnership with the EU has not borne any significant fruit in international multilateral agenda during the Rousseff years. It is clear in Brazilian diplomatic circles that the conceptions held by the two sides no longer coincide in many areas (Saraiva, 2014). Meanwhile, Brazil's erstwhile plans to boost its global projection, which first inspired Europe to propose the partnership, have waned. Its participation in international politics has visibly lost any proactive drive.

The shift away from strategies to boost Brazil's global projection seen under the Rousseff presidency has had an impact on the strategic partnership. No summit was held in 2012, then the sixth and seventh were held in 2013 and 2014. The statements from the last two summits have focused primarily on economic issues – short-term gains – and sustainable development. Multilateral security issues like the Syrian case and security problems in Africa are no longer foregrounded in the statements. In 2014, IT was highlighted, and mention was made of the 3rd Joint Action Plan, to be executed between 2015 and 2017. The political and institutional crisis in 2015 took up much of the government's time and energy, so whatever was not a priority in foreign policy terms was put on hold. There was no 2015 summit and the 3rd Joint Action Plan has not yet been confirmed.

At the beginning of Dilma Rousseff's second term in office, the political crisis and the clashes between her and Congress put a few foreign policy topics on the political debate. However, the inward-looking view of some domestic political players has gradually gained ground, triggering criticisms of the country's foreign policy and its investments abroad. Legal proceedings to investigate corruption in large Brazilian civil construction companies with major overseas business interests, which were important players in Brazil's foreign policy in South America, have put the infrastructure investments made by some of these companies in the region, using money from the Brazilian Development Bank, firmly on the political agenda. Finally, in 2016 president Rousseff was removed from the presidency.

2.2 The Sector Dialogues between Brazil and the EU

Since the establishment of the Strategic Partnership, two Joint Action Plans have been introduced and a third has already been negotiated and drafted but has yet to be implemented. Under the framework of the partnership, the Sector Dialogues initiatives have been set up in different areas involving a diversity of actors¹¹. Some of those dialogues refer to issues regarding international politics, which are discussed by diplomats and whose interaction and impact can be seen in Brazilian and European actions in multilateral forums, here defined as multilateral dialogues. But most of those dialogues are focused on bilateral cooperation issues, mostly on technical terms, whose results are linked to the Brazilian domestic dimension - here defined as bilateral dialogues. Despite these developments, the results of this partnership after eight years since it was established have fallen short of the initial expectations.

The Sector Dialogues are defined as a “new form of cooperation dynamics between the European Union (EU) and emerging countries [...] based on the principles of reciprocity and complementarity, aiming to foster the exchange of know-how and experiences in areas of mutual interest”¹². The Brazilian Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management and the Delegation of the European Union to Brazil are responsible for organizing and supporting the initiatives. Specialists, non-governmental organizations, agencies and governmental institutions are eligible to participate. Throughout 2009 and 2011, more than sixty projects were implemented in many areas.¹³

There are currently thirty-three initiatives being promoted by the Sector Dialogues. One of them is a high-level dialogue, in which secretaries of Foreign Relations and diplomats participate, and the other ones are technically oriented actions. The initiatives promoted by the

¹¹ The dialogues began with the 1992 framework cooperation agreement. They are overseen by the Joint Committee created in the agreement. However, it was with the signing of the strategic partnership that the dialogues really have grown into new sectors and gained a new impetus. The creation of the European External Action Service and subsequently a European delegation in Brazil granted the dialogues more substance (especially in the bilateral ambit).

¹² This information can be found at <http://sectordialogues.org/en/pagina-estatica/project/presentation> [accessed on August 15th, 2016].

¹³ The Strategic Dialogues promote actions in such areas: agriculture and rural development; air transport; civil society; civil spatial cooperation; climate change; competition issues; cultural policies; disaster risk reduction; education, youth and sports; energy policy; environmental dimension of sustainable development; financial services; human rights; industrial and regulatory issues; information society; intellectual property rights; promoting triangular cooperation; public sector governance; regional policy; sanitary and phytosanitary issues; science and technology; small and medium enterprises; social cohesion and employment; urban mobility. All of these information can be found at <http://sectordialogues.org/en/pagina-estatica/actions-supported/presentation-actions-supported> [accessed on August 15th, 2016].

Sector Dialogues are funded by the European Union, and in 2016 the investments are estimated in two million Euros¹⁴.

One of the main aspects of the Strategic Dialogues is its prowess to engage in civil society through seminars, workshops, studies and publications. It is thus safe to say that the Sector Dialogues are mostly knowledge and awareness oriented. Its main accomplishment has been the promotion of critical thinking about the major issues that Brazil faces. It is a process of policy diffusion which aims to lead to policy learning.

2.3 The Brazil-EU relations concerning human rights: a case of policy transfer?

Ever since the establishment of the first Joint Action Plan (2008-2011), the question of human rights has been a part of the Brazil-EU agenda. The document declared that “Brazil and the EU are firmly committed to promoting and protecting all human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development and to strive for the full protection and promotion in all our countries of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights for all”¹⁵. It also urged the creation of high level consultations, in bilateral agreements and also in the United Nations, as well as at subnational level, mostly by civil society and non-governmental actors.

It is possible to analyse the evolution of human rights discussions between Brazil and the European Union on two levels: in the national dimension, through the Sector Dialogues, and in the multilateral dimension, through the voting patterns in the Human Rights Council.

Nationally, the discussion about human rights has taken place, on one hand, in annual summits promoted by the Delegation of the EU to Brazil and the Secretariat of Human Rights of the Brazilian government. On the other hand, and more frequently, the debate takes place through seminars, conferences and publications endorsed by the Sector Dialogues, with the participation of specialists and civil society which characterize the two types of important actors in a policy learning process. From 2010 to 2015, fifteen projects regarding human rights were approved (see table 1). Many areas were contemplated, particularly those related to homophobia, the protection of homeless people and the prevention of torture. Those actions

¹⁴ Information provided by the Delegation of the European Union to Brazil, in a telephone interview on June 30th, 2016.

¹⁵ The document is available at http://eeas.europa.eu/brazil/docs/2008_joint_action_plan_en.pdf, [accessed on August 2nd 2016].

were promoted, primarily, by governmental institutions, such as the Brazilian Secretary of Human Rights and the European External Action Service and the Delegation of the European Union to Brazil.

Table 1: initiatives promoted by Brazil and the European Union in human rights, on the grounds of the Sector Dialogues

Year	Initiative	Brazilian institution	European institution
2010	Seminar: “Human rights dialogues in Brazil and in the European Union: public institutions and civil society”		
2011 2012	Seminar on of the National Programme for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders	Secretariat of Human Rights	European External Action Service
2012 2013	Fight against homophobic violence	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
2012 2013	EU-Brazil Civil Society II Seminar on Human Rights	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
2012 2013	Promotion and protection of the rights of the homeless population	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
2013 2015	Seminar Brazil-European Union on Human Rights defenders	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil

2013 2015	EU – Brazil project on Human Rights, Education and Sport	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
2013 2015	EU – Brazil Civil Society III Seminar on Human Rights	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
2013 2015	Brazil-EU meetings on human rights defenders in Belo Horizonte, Salvador, Rio de Janeiro and Vitoria	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
2013 2015	Brasil-European Union meeting on the 10 years of the Programme to Protect human rights defenders	Secretariat of Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union to Brazil
Ongoing	Exchange Program Brazil-European Union on the Assistance to Victims and Witnesses	Secretariat of Human Rights	European External Action Service
Ongoing	Dialogue Brazil-European Union on the protection and self-protection to human rights defenders	Secretariat of Human Rights	European External Action Service
Ongoing	Dialogue Brazil-European Union on Human rights defenders, public security and justice system operators	Secretariat of Human Rights	European External Action Service
Ongoing	Mission Brazil-European Union: strenghtening human rights defenders	Secretariat of Human Rights	European External Action Service
Ongoing	Brazil Human Rights EU Technical Visit - Prevention and Fight Against Torture	Secretariat of Human Rights	European External Action Service

Created by the authors, with information provided by the Delegation of the European Union to Brazil.

In this sense, the influence of the European Union in Brazil, when it comes to human rights, is established by knowledge and information diffusion of social causes and social movements, especially on the grounds of the Sector Dialogues. This is an interesting

mechanism to bring society closer to questions that are being debated on high-level institutions. In this regard, the financial support that originates from the European Union is applied in actions in Brazil. Therefore, the activities promoted by the Sector Dialogues are not a bilateral exchange nor a policy transfer case; they could be defined as an employment of activities in Brazil with EU funding, as the cooperation comes from a more economically developed partner. This is justified by the context of human rights protection in Brazil, that is much more severe than the one in Europe, notably in the matters of incarceration and police brutality.

The EU demonstrates that human rights are an important part of its foreign policy agenda, since all of its agreements with third-part countries have a human rights clause and a sanctions implementation policy. And the Sector Dialogues could create an auspicious environment, prone to the formulation of social policies by the Brazilian government. It is important to assess, however, the impact of such actions. They are usually destined to a limited number of people and, thus, to a restricted audience. Discussing human rights topics is important because it brings awareness and a desire for change. Nevertheless, it is necessary for policymakers of Brazil and of the EU to take a step further and to create initiatives that could help change the current scenario. For example, the intensification of the human rights clauses in EU trade deals with Brazil.

The interaction between Brazil and the EU regarding human rights also takes place at multilateral institutions. The main arena is the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC). We compiled the votes of Brazil and of EU countries in the UNHRC as a comparative exercise, with the purpose of verifying if there is a convergence between both actors (see table 2).

The voting records at the UNHRC show that underdeveloped and developing countries tend to vote in agreement, especially on issues regarding social and economic development and foreign debt. The Lula da Silva government, for instance, attempted to associate human rights with development, while EU countries showed a preference for speaking out against specific countries for their political and civil rights violations¹⁶. A degree of tension can be noted between Brazil's respect for certain human rights principles and its respect for the sovereignty of states in its multilateral approach towards crisis situations.

But the same voting pattern can be seen with countries from Europe and from the European Union, which also tend to vote in agreement, generally, on issues regarding

¹⁶ Brantner and Gowan (2008) provide some reflexions on this topic.

homophobia, religious intolerance and crises in Syria, Palestine, Iran, Sudan and North Korea. The representations of Brazil and of European countries at the UNHRC voted similarly on a number of resolutions (see table 2), which could suggest a similar perception on the importance of dealing with such matters. Yet, the data available is not enough to prove that a joint-partnership between Brazil and EU countries occurs at the UNHRC. The voting records show, above anything else, that they share a common concern about the problems faced by the international community.

Table 2: United Nations Human Rights Council resolutions in which Brazil and European Union countries voted favourably (2007-2014)

The time frame for the analysis of the voting records at the UNHRC was from 2007 to 2014, since the strategic partnership was established in 2007. In 2012, Brazil was not a part of the organization, because a country can only have two consecutive three-year mandates. Among the EU countries that were a part of the UNHRC on that period are included Belgium, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and the United Kingdom¹⁷. The table shows the resolutions in which Brazil and EU countries voted in favour. It is possible to notice the predominance of themes related to the eradication of intolerance and discrimination, and of the legal dispute of territories. Brazil and UE countries also voted in favour of resolutions based on principles of self-determination, as well as of the protection of human rights in places like Iran, Sudan and Syria.

Resolution	Year	Topics
A/HRC/6/37	2007	Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief
A/HRC/7/11	2008	The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights

¹⁷ This information is available at the UNHRC website, at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/PastMembers.aspx>. [accessed on September 23rd, 2016].

A/HRC/10/25	2009	Discrimination based on religion or belief and its impact on the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights.
A/HRC/7/15	2008	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea * Brazil abstained and EU countries voted favourably
A/HRC/13/14	2010	
A/HRC/16/8	2011	
A/HRC/25/25	2014	
A/HRC/10/16*	2009	
A/HRC/7/18	2008	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan * Resolution only concerning the settlements in Golan; Brazil voted favourably and the EU countries abstained.
A/HRC/10/18	2009	
A/HRC/13/7	2010	
A/HRC/16/31	2011	
A/HRC/22/26	2013	
A/HRC/26/28	2014	
A/HRC/7/30*	2008	
A/HRC/10/24	2009	Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: the role and responsibility of medical and other health personnel
A/HRC/11/10	2009	Situation of human rights in the Sudan
A/HRC/15/27	2010	
A/HRC/13/6	2010	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination
A/HRC/16/30	2011	
A/HRC/22/27	2013	
A/HRC/25/27	2014	
A/HRC/15/25	2010	The right to development * United Kingdom abstained.
A/HRC/24/4	2013	
A/HRC/27/2*	2014	
A/HRC/16/9	2011	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/22/23	2013	
A/HRC/25/24	2014	

A/HRC/16/20	2011	Follow-up to the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the incident of the humanitarian flotilla
A/HRC/17/10	2011	
A/HRC/17/19	2011	Human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity
A/HRC/27/32	2014	
A/HRC/17/24	2011	Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/23/15	2013	
A/HRC/26/25	2014	
A/HRC/22/1	2013	Promoting reconciliation and accountability in Sri Lanka
A/HRC/25/1	2014	
A/HRC/22/24	2013	Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/23/1	2013	
A/HRC/23/16	2014	
A/HRC/24/22	2014	
A/HRC/25/33	2014	
A/HRC/26/23	2014	
A/HRC/27/16	2014	
A/HRC/22/25	2013	Follow-up to the report of the United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict
A/HRC/25/30	2014	
A/HRC/22/28	2013	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/25/29	2014	
A/HRC/22/29	2013	Follow-up to the report of the independent international fact-finding mission to investigate the implications of Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/22/34	2013	Education as a tool to prevent racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/24/24	2013	Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights

A/HRC/24/35	2013	Impact of arms transfers on human rights in armed conflicts
A/HRC/25/38	2014	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests
A/HRC/26/2	2014	The question of the death penalty.
A/HRC/26/16	2014	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms.

Created by the authors, with information available at United Nations Human Rights Council. Documents and resolutions. Available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/Documents.aspx>. [accessed on June 30th, 2016].

3. Final remarks

As this chapter has argued, it is clear that the European Union has a commitment to diffuse its norms to a Western country such as Brazil. This endeavour is branched between the effort to transfer its practices to the Brazilian internal dynamics, and to seek in Brazil a partner that could share the same values in international institutions. The Brazilian legislation in human rights has progressed significantly, and the Brazilian society is aware of the importance of the norms and values defended by the European Union. In this sense, Brazil acts as a norm-taker. But at the same time, the Brazilian governments sustains an international approach based on respect for other states' sovereignty, while accepting different ideologies and political regimes and defending a diplomatic policy to build coalitions at international institutions. It also forges ties with other emerging countries, some of which have non-liberal models. To the Brazilian diplomacy, this external behaviour is important because it serves to leverage its positions in international politics. Finally, while Brazil does share values with the EU and does follow Western patterns internally, diplomatically speaking it does not recognise the EU as a normative power in the international order. Although still diffused and difficult to quantify, the European effort to transfer policies in human rights issues through the form of social learning could remain as a viable option to the European Union.

References

Ayllón Pino, Bruno. “Querer y no poder”: las relaciones de Brasil con la Unión Europea durante el gobierno Lula. *Carta Internacional* v.1, n.1. March/2006. p.22-33.

Borrás, Susana. Policy learning and organizational capacities in innovation policies, *Science and Public Policy* v.39 n.8, November/2011, p.225-234.

Brantner and Gowan. ‘A missed opportunity? The EU and the reform of the UN human rights architecture’, in Z. Laïde (ed.), *EU Foreign Policy in a globalized world*, London, Routledge, 2008, 83-102.

Council of the European Union. *EU-CELAC Action Plan 2013-2015*. Available at http://www.eeas.europa.eu/la/summits/docs/2013_santiago_summit_eu-celac_action_plan_en.pdf [accessed on September 23rd, 2016].

Council of the European Union. *EU Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World in 2015*, available at http://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/qc0216616enn_002.pdf [accessed on November 1st, 2016].

Domínguez, Roberto. *The Limits and Contributions of the EU to Democracy in Latin America: The Cases of Mexico, Venezuela and Honduras*. Paper be presented at the XXXI International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association Washington DC, May 29-June 1ST11, 2013.

European External Action Service. *Brazil-European Union Strategic Partnership Joint Action Plan*. Available at http://eeas.europa.eu/brazil/docs/2008_joint_action_plan_en.pdf. [accessed on August 2nd, 2016].

Ferreira-Pereira, Laura. The European Union’s partnership policy towards Brazil: more than meets the eye, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, DOI:10.1080/09557571.2015.1103973, 2015.

Flemes, Daniel & Saraiva, Miriam G. Potências emergentes na ordem de redes: o caso do Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* v.57 no.2, 2014, p.214-232 (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201400312>)

Gratius, Susanne. “Brasil y Europa hacia 2015”. *Policy Brief* n.49 (February/2011).

Hurrell, Andrew. Brazil: What kind of rising state in what kind of institutional order?, in A.S.Alexandroff and A.F.Cooper (eds.), *Rising states, rising institutions. Challenges for global governance*. Washington DC, Brookings Institution Press, 2010, 128-150.

Lazarou, Elena & Fonseca, Elena. O Brasil e a União Europeia: a Parceria Estratégica em busca de significado, in A.C.Lessa and H.Altemani (orgs) *Parcerias Estratégicas do Brasil: os significados e as experiências tradicionais* v.1. Belo Horizonte, Fino Traço, 2013, p.91-117.

Manners, Ian. Normative power Europe. A contradiction in terms?, *Journal of Common Market Studies* v.4 no.2 2002, p.235-258.

Ribeiro Hoffmann, Andrea. Inter and transregionalism, in T.Börzel and T.Risse (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015, p.600-618.

Saraiva, Miriam G. Os limites da parceria estratégica Brasil-União Europeia nos planos inter-regional e multilateral, *Anuario de la Integración Regional de América Latina y el Caribe* n.10, 2014, p.399-420.

Sector Dialogues. *Presentation*, available at <http://sectordialogues.org/en/pagina-estatica/project/presentation> and *Support for more than 60 cooperation initiatives between the European Union and Brazil*, available at <http://sectordialogues.org/en/pagina-estatica/actions-supported/presentation-actions-supported> [both accessed on August 17th, 2016].

Stone, Diane. Learning lessons and transferring policy across time, space and disciplines. *Politics*, v.19 no.1, 1999, p.51-59.

Telò, Mario. UE-Brasil: conceitos e abordagens convergentes/divergentes ao multilateralismo. A visão da UE para um novo multilateralismo é um parceiro confiável? in *Temas de uma agenda estratégica entre Brasil e União Europeia*, Rio de Janeiro, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, 2014, p.17-48 (Série Relações Brasil-Europa 3).

United Nations Human Rights Council. *Documents and resolutions*, available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/Documents.aspx> and *List of past members of the Human Rights Council*, available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/PastMembers.aspx> [accessed on June 30th, 2016 and September 23rd, 2016].