MONÇÕES
REVISTA DE RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS DA UFGD

DOI: 10.30612/rmufgd.v11i21.15621

Mimicry and ambivalence in the concept of sovereignty: a Brazilian contribution to the discipline of International Relations

Mimetismo e ambivalência do conceito de soberania: uma contribuição brasileira para a disciplina de Relações Internacionais

Mimetismo y ambivalencia del concepto de soberanía: una contribución brasileña a la disciplina de las Relaciones Internacionales

Alice Castelani de Oliveira
Mestra em Segurança Internacional e Defesa pela Escola Superior de Guerra (ESG).
Analista de compras da Secretaria Municipal de Saúde de Belo Horizonte (SMSA/PBH).
E-mail: alicecastelani@gmail.com
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2143-656X

Abstract: In this article, we analyze the concept of sovereignty embodied in the four most-cited authors of the first generation of International Relations (IR) in Brazil, namely: Amado Cervo, Hélio Jaguaribe, José Flávio Sombra Saraiva and Maria Regina Soares de Lima. We evaluate the concept of sovereignty from the perspective of the Brazilian authors mentioned in contrapuntal to the view of this concept in the works of the American author Stephen Krasner. This study is developed in dialogue with the Global International Relations (Global IR) research agenda, which explores new perspectives in the IR discipline, encouraging its diversification. It is essential to explain that, to carry out this analysis, we adopted as a theoretical-methodological framework the concepts of mimicry and ambivalence, both theorized by Homi Bhabha as well as Edward Said's contrapuntal reading. This way, we seek to establish bridges between different knowledge and discuss the Brazilian view

of a fundamental IR concept: sovereignty. We verify that a national thought in IR approaching sovereignty is relatively different from what we observed in Krasner, whose work mostly represents the discipline's mainstream. We conclude that this difference results from how national ideas of development and autonomy are articulated together with the concept of sovereignty.

Keywords: Global IR; Brazil; Sovereignty.

Resumo: Neste artigo, analisamos como os quatro autores mais citados da primeira geração das Relações Internacionais (RI) do Brasil utilizam o conceito de soberania, a saber: Amado Cervo, Hélio Jaguaribe, José Flávio Sombra Saraiva e Maria Regina Soares de Lima. Inicialmente, esclarecemos que este estudo se desenvolve em diálogo com a agenda de pesquisa denominada Relações Internacionais Globais (RI Globais), a qual promove um espaço para exploração de novas perspectivas na disciplina das RIs, incentivando a sua diversificação. Dessa maneira, avaliamos o conceito de soberania na perspectiva dos autores brasileiros mencionados em contraponto a maneira que o conceito é empregado nas obras do autor americano Stephen Krasner. É fundamental explicar que adotamos como referencial teórico-metodológico os conceitos de mimetismo e ambivalência, teorizados por Homi Bhabha, e a leitura contrapontual de Edward Said. Desse modo, buscamos estabelecer pontes entre diferentes conhecimentos e procuramos agregar à Teoria de Relações Internacionais (TRI) uma visão brasileira acerca do conceito fundamental de soberania, contribuindo, assim, para sua diversificação. Com essa análise, verificamos que existe um pensamento nacional em RI que aborda soberania de forma relativamente diferente do que se observa em Krasner, cujo trabalho pode ser tomado como referencial mainstream. Essa diferença resulta da articulação das ideias nacionais de desenvolvimento e autonomia ao conceito de soberania.

Palavras-chave: RI Globais; Brasil; Soberania.

Resumen: En este artículo analizamos como el concepto de soberanía fue incorporado por los cuatro autores más citados de la primera generación de Relaciones Internacionales (RI) en Brasil, a saber: Amado Cervo, Hélio Jaguaribe, José Flávio Sombra Saraiva y Maria Regina Soares de Lima. Evaluamos el concepto de soberanía desde la perspectiva de los autores brasileños mencionados en contrapunto a la visión de este concepto en las obras del autor estadounidense Stephen Krasner. Este estudio se desarrolla en diálogo con la agenda de investigación denominada Relaciones Internacionales Globales (RI Globales), que explora nuevas perspectivas en la disciplina de las RI, fomentando su diversificación. Es fundamental explicar que, para realizar este análisis, adoptamos como marco teórico-metodológico los conceptos de mimetismo y ambivalencia, teorizados por Homi Bhabha, y la lectura contrapuntística de Edward Said. De esta manera, buscamos establecer puentes entre diferentes saberes y buscamos sumar a la Teoría de las Relaciones Internacionales (TRI) una visión brasileña del concepto fundamental de soberanía. Con este análisis, comprobamos que hay un pensamiento nacional en las RI que se acerca a la soberanía de una manera relativamente diferente a lo que se

observa en Krasner, cuyo trabajo representa mucho de la corriente principal de la disciplina. Concluimos que esta diferencia resulta de cómo se articulan las ideas nacionales de desarrollo y autonomía con el concepto de soberanía.

Palabras clave: RI globales; Brasil; Soberanía.

Recebido em:
02/02/2022

Aceito em:
24/08/2022

INTRODUCTION

The concept of sovereignty arises and evolves with the advent of the modern state in Western Europe around the 16th century. This category expresses the most important political articulation of all the spatio-temporal relations of modernity, establishing a sharp separation between internal and external polities (WALKER, 1990). As a political/legal category, sovereignty establishes basic norms and principles enforced today within international relations, such as non-interference, self-determination, and territorial autonomy. In its original definition, sovereignty articulates the existence of a single legitimate authority within the territorial borders of the nation-state, indicating where it is possible to guarantee peace and security: within the state (WALKER, 1990). Therefore, the elements articulated by this concept are fundamental for the disciplines of Political Science (PS) and International Relations (IR).

In this article, sovereignty is the category of analysis. We sought to assess this concept from a Brazilian perspective through the analysis of the four most-cited authors of the first generation of IR in Brazil, as identified by Mariana Kalil (2017), namely: Amado Cervo, Hélio Jaguaribe, José Flávio Sombra Saraiva and Maria Regina Soares de Lima. Kalil (2017) points out that, in Brazilian IR literature, the concept of sovereignty is commonly addressed through a debate on autonomy, indicating that the concept of sovereignty may have been rearticulated differently in the national thinking of IR. In this sense, we investigate whether there is one national concept of sovereignty in Brazil and if it expresses relatively different aspects than the mainstream perspective[1].

We clarify that the dialogue with the Global International Relations (Global IR) agenda is transversal to the development of this research, which aims to encourage IR scholars, especially from the Global South[2], to think about the international from other perspectives, investigating and exploring local knowledge (ACHARYA, 2014). It promotes an opening within the IR discipline that makes it possible to think about categories related to international politics from new perspectives and historical experiences beyond the mainstream.

1 In this research, we consider as mainstream the Realist IR literature produced in the Global North, specifically by researchers in the United States of America (USA).

2 In the scope of this study, we use the definition of the Global South in terms elaborated by Kalil (2020). She proposes to approach this category as a subject — or many — rather than an object. In this sense, Kalil (2020, n. p.) explains "This proposition goes beyond territorially based or identity-based definitions of the Global South. It is the Global South as a condition, one of exile. A condition whose common traits are denouncing one's own marginalization in the discipline's social structure and creating thoughts deemed more capable of dealing with the reality that matters to most people around the world".

CC BY NC SA

As Pinar Bilgin (2016) argues, several scholars in Western Europe since the 1980s — such as Steve Smith (1985); Knud E. Jorgensen (2000); and Wæver (1998) — began to demonstrate the limitation of IR theories from Europe to the rest of the world, pointing out that theories are marked by interests, values and standards of certain regions, in the same sense as Robert Cox (1981). In the Global South, several studies also point to the limitation of IR theories outside the Western center, such as Ayoob (2002); Herz (2002); Tickner (2003); Cervo (2008b); Saraiva (2009); Acharya, (2017); and Kalil (2017, 2020), to name a few.

That said, we aim with this undertaking to verify the existence of a national thinking in IR, with the specific aim of analyzing how the category of sovereignty was incorporated into great part of the national IR literature, particularly evaluating its possible meanings constructed within Brazilian scholarship. In this sense, we seek to contribute to the diversification of perspectives in IR theory, creating a bridge between the mainstream literature and Brazilian thinking, thus contributing to the country's insertion in the Global IR debate.

To carry out this proposed investigation, we anchored our analysis on a theoretical-methodological approach derived from Homi Bhabha's theory of ambivalent mimetic process as well as Edward Said's contrapuntal reading method. Contrapuntal reading allows us to analyze, superimposedly, different perspectives about the same concept, in our case, sovereignty. Conversely, the ambivalent mimetic process theory enables us to understand the localization process[3] of a norm with a focus on national strategies of resistance and the particular interests of each nation. In this sense, mimicry expresses the process through which a society locates originally external conceptions, projecting its own experiences, interests and values onto these conceptions. As a result, an ambivalent discourse emerges. It presents itself as something new and different — "almost the same, but not quite" (BHABHA, 1984, p. 126). This ambivalence repeatedly swings from a difference that is almost none to a difference that can even threaten the hegemonic ideas. Moreover, this threat is the dual vision that characterizes postcolonial society: at the same time, it mimics and creates underlying strategies of resistance.

Anchored in this theoretical-methodological focus, we point out that this research consisted of two fundamental stages of analysis. First, we turn to the mainstream concept of sovereignty highlighted in the works of Stephen Krasner. Second, as a contrapuntal to his view,

3 The concept of localization seeks to express the process through which norms spread across the world, describing "[…] complex process and outcome by which norm-takers build congruence between transnational norms (including previously institutionalized norms in a region) and local beliefs and practices" (ACHARYA, 2004, p. 241). We emphasize that Acharya (2004) thinks about the localization process from a constructivist perspective. Otherwise, in this research, we assume that localization occurs via the ambivalent mimetic process, theorized by Homi Bhabha (1984, 1994).

CC BY NC SA

we evaluated how the main first-generation Brazilian IR scholars worked with sovereignty. We clarify that, in this article, Krasner's choice as a representative of the mainstream occurred considering: (1) that the author is American, that is, he is one of the representatives of the group that still dominates the production of knowledge in IR, namely, the academia from the Global North, mainly from the USA, Great Britain and Australia (HERZ, 2002)[4]; (2) the relevance of the work produced by the author about the concept of sovereignty, which systematizes the hegemonic vision within the IRT, representing and building this vision. We emphasize that this systematization is constitutive of the hegemonic vision and allows the concept to have applicability, in addition to presenting characteristics that allow us to perform analyzes in a comparative way; and (3) that his ideas are widely reproduced.

We clarify that in Bhabha's understanding, colonized countries produce politics based on mimicry. This way, Brazil becomes an interesting case to be analyzed from a mimicry perspective, as it is a former colony. Furthermore, it is also a relevant case for the Global IR agenda, as Brazil is particularly little explored in this literature. It is often subsumed to part of Latin America and, as an emerging country, it has received less scholarly attention than India and China (KRISTENSEN, 2020). In this sense, Kristensen (2020) highlights that Latin American international thought is an interesting and alternative case for exploring the West/non-West[5] relationship, presenting different imaginaries and problems from those pointed out by European, American and Asian scholars. Furthermore, we highlight that the concept of sovereignty is fundamental for IR, so examining its elaboration in Brazil, a colonized country, is crucial for building a bridge between North and South IR literature.

It is still important to clarify that this analysis is based on the study of Brazilian authors who focused on the role of political elites forming the state. As a consequence, the perspective of sovereignty investigated here, more precisely, reflects a thought of the national elite. In addition, we emphasize that the discussion of sovereignty that we carry out in this article reflects a Brazilian perspective (not the only one) on this concept. In short, we do not conduct an analysis here about the internal disputes around the meaning of sovereignty, an effort that would require a different research endeavor.

4 Great Britain and Australia are also important IR hubs. Herz (2002, p. 9, our translation) points out that, in these countries, the so-called English School was developed, which "[...] incorporates sociological, historical and philosophical aspects and introduces a key idea in the debate on International Relations: the concept of international society".

5 Kristensen (2020, p. 18) says: "Compared to cultural-civilizational conceptions of "West" and "non-West" (which are sometimes, but of course not always, deployed in ways that suggest radical difference), the Brazilian scholars interviewed did not conceive Brazil's distinctiveness in terms of cultural or civilizational difference. Rather, the Southern locus of enunciation comparatively stresses imperial and political economic entanglements, "peripheral" concerns, and "tropical" problems such as autonomy, development, and insertion into the core".

CC BY NC SA

Finally, this article is organized into four sections, including this introduction and the conclusion. In the first section, we discuss the concept of sovereignty in Krasner's works and explain the theoretical-methodological focus in the second section. Then, in the third section, we analyze the concept of sovereignty in each Brazilian IR author, namely, Cervo, Jaguaribe, Saraiva and Lima. Finally, we present our results.

1. A LITERATURE REVIEW IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY IN THE WORK OF STEPHEN KRASNER

Stanley Hoffmann (1977) explains that IR evolved into a discipline in the United States of America reflecting three main factors: intellectual predispositions, political circumstances and institutional opportunities. The development of this discipline in the USA is often marked by the belief that most problems could be solved by applying the scientific method, resulting in continuous progress. However, in this author's analysis, the growth of this field cannot be dissociated from the central role Americans began to play in international politics from 1945 onwards. Therefore, Hoffmann (1977) argues that this US-centric IR discipline creates problems for a discipline that calls itself international.

Today, American academia still dominates the production of knowledge in IR (HERZ, 2002). Although the field has grown worldwide, this growth has not been proportionally reflected in a greater diversity of perspectives (ACHARYA, 2017). In this sense, Amitav Acharya (2017) points out that IR is an increasingly globalized subject in teaching and research because more courses are taught in an increasing number of countries and more universities. However, this growth has not necessarily resulted in a genuinely global discipline. The Global IR agenda gives spotlight to this issue and discusses ways to promote plurality in the field.

Interestingly, traditional or mainstream IR was defined as a discipline in the Anglo-Saxon world after World War II. As Monica Herz (2002) explains, the ideas of an anarchic system and the concept of sovereignty followed the history of this discipline. The recognition of this basic fact and the various theoretical and practical issues that resulted from this recognition gave the discipline of IR a discursive identity. Considering, then, the centrality of the concept of sovereignty in the field of IR and the predominance of knowledge production by the American academia, this section proposes to analyze the concept of sovereignty in the work of the Ame-

CC BY NC SA

rican academic Stephen Krasner, who discusses and systematizes this concept. His work on sovereignty is constitutive of the hegemonic vision of IR and is widely reproduced, becoming a fundamental mainstream reference for the discussion of this concept.

Initially, it is essential to point out that in the period understood as modernity, the advent of absolutist states in Western Europe represented the first facet of a new political and socio-economic structure that emerged. In this context, classical authors such as Bodin (2011 [1576]) and Hobbes (2020 [1651]), were fundamental in the systematization of the concept of sovereignty. These authors were concerned with domestic sovereignty in the context of religious wars in Europe, seeking to furnish the philosophical basis for a stable system of authority (KRASNER, 2001a).

With the French Revolution, the promises of modernity came to be related to the universal political aspirations of citizenship. In this scenario, the nation-state established itself as a specific form of the modern state, at the same time universal and particular, establishing its legitimacy on the conception of sovereignty through the construction of a homogeneous nation founded on the idea of popular sovereignty (CHATTERJEE, 2004).[6] It was Rousseau (2011 [1762]) who developed this conception of popular sovereignty, which originates and must remain with the people, who exercise the general will.

Using these classical authors as a conceptual starting point, sovereignty can be described as an original, absolute, perpetual, inalienable, imprescriptible and indivisible power. However, this vision was never a practical reality, as the structures of state authority took different forms throughout history, and the sovereign state model was persistently contested (KRASNER, 2001a). Reflecting on this issue, Krasner (1995, 1999, 2001a, 2001b) makes a contemporary reading of this concept.

This author argues that the international system has its own rules and actors. In the organizational scheme, states are the primary actors; their territorial units enjoy legal independence and are not subject to any external authority (KRASNER, 1999). However, this system has limited influence and is subject to challenge. Therefore, the logical contradictions, the absence of an institutional arrangement with authority to resolve conflicts and the asymmetries of power lead to a scenario of continuous contestation of this order.

6 According to Chatterjee (2004), the ideas of people as the original *locus* of sovereignty and that, all human beings are holders of rights identify the universal character. Then, once the rights of the citizen were enshrined in a state made up of a particular people, the nation-state became the common form of the modern state.

CC BY NC SA

Krasner's (1995, 1999, 2001a, 2001b) central argument is that in the international system, presumed to be anarchic, there is a predominance of the logic of consequences and not of appropriateness[7]. As a result, the various functions of the head of state or any other representative imply conflicting rules in practice, as international norms can be contradictory, such as non-intervention and guarantee of human rights. At the same time, there is no structure with authority to make decisions in disputed cases. Thus, he starts from the premise that the international system is complex and poorly institutionalized, with no hierarchical authorities. Therefore, anarchy characterizes the nature of this system. As an effect of this, norms are inconsistent, and power is asymmetric, indicating that no rule or norm is capable of covering all situations all the time. Based on this understanding, Krasner (1995) contends that the Westphalian model does not determine the behavior of actors, instead, material interests, the need for security and national ideals guide policymakers.

With that in mind, Krasner (2001b) argues that, in practice, there are different ways to use the concept of sovereignty, which, although widely understood, has often been violated. These violations have been common throughout history, including in issues concerning human rights, minority rights, democracy, communism, fiscal responsibility and international security. Therefore, he (2001a) argues that this concept takes on four different meanings in current practice: (1) interdependence sovereignty, (2) domestic sovereignty, (3) Westphalian sovereignty, and (4) international legal sovereignty.

The first sense expresses the state's ability to control its borders, while the second refers to the domestic authority structure and its ability to control behavior within the limits of its territory. From the Westphalian sense comes the understanding that the state is the only authority monopolizing decision-making within its territory. Here, territorial autonomy implies that no external actor enjoys authority within the national borders of other countries. From this third sense, the ideas of self-determination and non-interference derive. Finally, the fourth meaning implies the existence of mutual recognition legally granted between states.

In his analysis, there was never a period in which all or even the majority of political entities accepted all the characteristics related to sovereignty, namely: (1) territory; (2) control; (3) recognition; and (4) autonomy. As there is no established hierarchical authority structure,

7 Krasner (1999) points out that the logic of consequences implies that political action and results — which include institutions — are a product of the rational and calculated behavior of states — e.g., classical game theory and neoclassical economics. The logic of appropriateness, on the other hand, sees politics as the result of rules, roles and identities that stipulate the appropriate behavior in certain situations. The central point of this logic is that who I am implies how I must act, and not the desire to maximize interests. Sociological approaches exemplify this logic.

CC BY NC SA

coercion and imposition are always viable options for stronger states to deploy against weaker ones. Therefore, Krasner (2001b) explains that the normative structures were dissociated from real behavior. Consequently, the sovereign state model can only be described as a norm of "organized hypocrisy". This hypocrisy arises precisely when norms are dissociated from actions: actors say one thing and do another. So, the author argues that the formula of organized hypocrisy is inevitable for governments operating in this international environment marked by competing norms, the absence of universal authority structures and power asymmetries. As a result, political leaders are constantly confronted with situations in which the norms they endorse are inconsistent with their own actions.

Assessing the author's view, we emphasize two main issues pertinent to our analysis. First, we emphasize that Krasner's understanding of sovereignty rests on two premises: (1) the anarchic nature of the international system and (2) the predominance of the logic of consequences in that system, which implies that political action and results are a product of the rational and calculated behavior of states. Second, we understand that the notion of autonomy is embedded in the Westphalian sense of sovereignty. It is associated with the principles of non-intervention and self-determination, which indicate that the state holds a monopoly of authority within its borders and that external interference is not legitimate. In this sense, we understand that the ideas of sovereignty and autonomy are not necessarily excluding and that, to some extent, they interact. These questions will be essential to understand the similarities and differences in the way Brazilian authors approach this concept.

2. THEORETICAL-METHODOLOGICAL NOTES: DISCUSSING HOMI BHABHA'S IDEAS OF MIMICRY AND AMBIVALENCE AND EDWARD SAID'S CONTRAPUNTAL READING

In this section, we will discuss the theoretical-methodological framework that guides the development of this proposed analysis. The adopted framework is based on Homi Bhabha's theory of the ambivalent mimetic process, from which concepts of mimicry and ambivalence derive, and on the contrapuntal reading[8] of Edward Said. This framework allows us to expand

8 About contrapuntal reading, see more: Pinar Bilgin (2016) e Geeta Chowdhry (2007).

CC BY NC SA

the overlapping field of cultural experiences of various societies, allowing the observation of different cultures in a contrapuntal way. Complementarily, it provides a tool to understand hybridization in the process of the constitution of elements from the observation of contact between different cultures. Thus, this approach helps us to understand the concept of sovereignty from a Brazilian perspective of IR.

When discussing contrapuntal reading, Said (1994) argues that it is essential to pay attention to overlapping experiences when trying to understand the world, highlighting the relevance of considering the existence of several power asymmetries. With this, the author highlights that his contrapuntal reading is a useful methodological tool to explore hybrid construction spaces because it allows us to understand the relationship between different cultures that, in the interaction process, overlap. This method is commonly used to explore signifiers or identities concerning other meanings, identities and cultural understandings, allowing the researcher to understand the creation of meaning based on three basic steps: selection of texts, identification of discourse and examination of discursive interaction (THOMAS, 2017). According to Thomas (2017), from a contrapuntal point of view, meanings, identities and culture are created, reified and transformed through negotiation or dialogue.

Considering the objectives of this article, Said's contrapuntal reading emerges as a valuable methodological tool. Complementing this method, Bhabha's theory of the ambivalent mimetic process provides a basis for understanding how negotiation[9] or dialogue processes develop. Bhabha (1994) argues that spaces of overlap and displacement arise in the interstices in which cultural values, within the scope of nations, are negotiated. From these spaces, the possibility of elaborating subjective and singular strategies emerges, which allows the construction of new signs based on local identities, being, thus, innovative in defining society itself. He explains the construction of these signs through the idea of an ambivalent mimetic process, indicating how different societies project their own experiences, interests and values onto exogenous ideas while simultaneously projecting underlying strategies of resistance.[10]

From the discussion on ambivalence, Bhabha (1994) presents his theory of the ambivalent mimetic process. This concept consists of a strategy of surveillance and exercise of power through the production of knowledge. The author clarifies that this process creates authoriza-

9 Regarding this idea of negotiation, Bhabha (1994, p. 26) clarifies that: "By negotiation, I attempt to draw attention to the structure of *iteration* which informs political movements that attempt to articulate antagonistic and oppositional elements without the redemptive rationality of sublation or transcendence".

10 It is essential to emphasize that this difference should not be understood as a mere reflection of pre-established cultural or ethnic traits. The social articulation of difference, of the minority position, is a complex negotiation always in progress, which seeks to give authority to cultural hybridisms.

CC BY NC SA

tion strategies for producing knowledge about the Other — colonized, subordinate, marginalized — which are evaluated antithetically and stereotyped. This process is expressed through a discourse constructed by a bifurcated language, producing texts rich in the traditions of irony, mimicry and repetition (BHABHA, 1984).

Bhabha (1984, p. 126) says that the mimetic process emerges as "[...] one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" and that mimicry represents a certain ironic commitment since it emerges as the representation of a difference that is, at the same time, a process of negation. Mimicry results from the desire for a recognizable and reformed Other. However, simultaneously, it produces a subject marked by a difference, which presents itself as "almost the same but not quite" (BHABHA, 1984, p. 126). That occurs because speech is marked by indeterminacy. So, mimicry is,

> […] thus, the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation, and discipline, which "appropriates" the Other as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an immanent threat to both "normalized" knowledges and disciplinary powers. (BHABHA, 1984, p. 126).

From the point of view of cultural authority, "[t]he success of colonial appropriation depends on a proliferation of inappropriate objects that ensure its strategic failure, so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace" (BHABHA, 1984, p. 127). However, this process is marked by ambiguity and mimicry, so it implies, at the same time, similarity and threat. That is because there is a dual vision characterizing postcolonial societies: at the same time, they mimic, they create underlying strategies of resistance. In this way, the discourse is built around an ambivalence that continually produces slippage, excess and difference, resulting in an uncertainty that fixes the colonial subject in a partial, incomplete or virtual presence, nevertheless creating, underlyingly, conditions for disruption.

Bhabha (1984, p. 131) points out that this "[…] ambivalence of colonial authority repeatedly turns from mimicry — a difference that is almost nothing but not quite — to menace — a difference that is almost total but not quite" (BHABHA, 1984, p. 132). In other words, due to the mimetic process, an ambivalent discourse emerges that presents itself as something new and different. This ambivalence repeatedly swings from a difference that is almost none to a difference that can even threaten. As already mentioned, this threat means that societies mimic while creating strategies of resistance. Moreover, this mimetic character is always produced at the place of prohibition. It is a form of discourse built at the crossroads of what is

CC BY NC SA

allowed and known and, between the lines, against and/or within the rules. The ambivalence of this mimicry makes it possible to understand colonial culture as potentially (and strategically) an insurgent counter resource.

Finally, we emphasize that this theory of the ambivalent mimetic process allows us to understand how a society locates originally external conceptions. This theoretical lens directs the focus of the analysis to what is projected on external embodied conceptions, evidenced as different experiences, interests, and national values modify signs. It should be noted that this process allows for the development of a space for the underlying creation of strategies to resist dominant powers and/or coercive structures.

3. DISCUSSION: A BRAZILIAN PERSPECTIVE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ON THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY IN LIGHT OF THE IDEAS OF MIMICRY AND AMBIVALENCE

According to Kalil (2017), the notion of sovereignty is often addressed in Brazilian IR literature through a debate on autonomy. It is important to explain that in her understanding, in Brazil, the development of theories, methodologies and ontologies derives from at least one paradigm: national-developmentalism. One of the consequences of this paradigm is the different form of rationalism that developed in the country — rationalism in exile[11]. Although this rationalism comes from a political-economic paradigm, the author elucidates that there is also a struggle with philosophical questions about the notions of security, war, peace and sovereignty. Regarding sovereignty, she argues that this norm is often addressed in Brazilian IR literature through a debate on autonomy because, as an effect of rationalism, the state would not conceive of survival as its primary objective, but autonomy.

Therefore, Kalil (2017) emphasizes that the national-developmentalism paradigm led to the emergence of a type of rationalism of its own. Thus, ontologically, the State would have replaced the sovereignty/non-intervention dichotomy with the autonomy/dependence dichotomy. That is because, due to the idea of dependence, national thinking would understand

11 The rationalism in exile is described by the author as an "[...] epistemology underlying Brazil's first-generation IR intellectuals' contribution to IRT" (KALIL, 2020, n. p.). Kalil (2017) argues that rationalism would bring Brazilian IR closer to Western ones, however, as a result of the country's exile position, national thought brings different perspectives. This difference is a result of the marginalization in relation to the mainstream debate.

CC BY NC SA

that it is not possible to be a sovereign state, and, as a logical consequence, the maintenance of autonomy gains significant weight as the only viable alternative. This formulation would be related to the influence of the national-developmentalism present in the works of Hélio Jaguaribe. Although we understand that Kalil's argument seems coherent, taking into account the centrality that the autonomist debate historically assumes in national thought, we identified a problem. The Westphalian dimension of sovereignty encompasses the notion of autonomy in territorial terms[12].

Krasner (2001b, p. 18) explains, "the sovereign state model is a system of political authority based on territory, mutual recognition, autonomy and control". Understanding that sovereignty and autonomy are not mutually exclusive and that the Westphalian conception of sovereignty somehow encompasses the idea of autonomy, we ask ourselves what the difference between the categories of sovereignty and autonomy in Brazilian scholarship is. Kalil (2017) indicated that there is a substitution but does not discuss how these categories are conceptualized.

With that in mind, we analyze how Jaguaribe, Cervo, Saraiva and Lima approach the concept of sovereignty in the subsections below. This analysis is conducted through a contrapuntal reading that confronts the perspective of these authors with Krasner's view of sovereignty, exposed in the first section of this article. We emphasize that Bhabha's ideas of mimicry and ambivalence discussed above help us understand the concept of sovereignty in Brazilian works.

Before proceeding, we emphasize that these Brazilian authors discuss the centrality of the role of elites in the formation of the state. In this sense, the sovereignty perspective investigated here, more precisely, reflects the thinking of the national elite. In addition, we emphasize that the discussion of sovereignty that we carry out in this article reflects a Brazilian perspective on this concept – we do not conduct an analysis here about the internal disputes around the meaning of sovereignty. This effort would require another research endeavor and design.

12 We emphasize that the notion of territoriality that Krasner points out implies that political authority is exercised over a given geographic space and not over people. From this perspective, Krasner (2001b, p. 18) emphasizes that "Autonomy means that no external actor enjoys authority within the borders of the state".

CC BY NC SA

3.1. A contrapuntal reading of the concept of sovereignty in Hélio Jaguaribe

By analyzing Jaguaribe's thinking (1979; 2002), we identified that the author assumes the premise that the international system is hierarchical, unlike Krasner. He argues that states are positioned at different levels, conditioned by their capacity for self-determination.[13] In an elaboration similar to Krasner's, Jaguaribe (2012) argues that the structure of the international system preserves some aspects of sovereignty. However, economic, financial, technological, political, cultural and military constraints can violate sovereignty among states. Therefore, we realize that the author recognizes the predominance of the logic of consequences in the international in Krasner's terms but rejects the idea of anarchy.

Due to this idea of hierarchy, the concept of self-determination, a principle derivating from the Westphalian dimension of sovereignty, is articulated by the author as an expression of states' positions in the international arena. Outlined this structure, Jaguaribe (1979) says that national development would be a strategy to achieve greater autonomy and self-determination. In other words, a strategy to expand a country's degree of autonomy and sovereignty internationally. In this sense, it is clear that sovereignty, like autonomy, is not understood as a stable condition, as it is conditioned to different levels of stratification and, thus, can be conquered or lost. This formulation does not make evident a substitution of the idea of sovereignty, as Kalil (2017) points out, but that autonomy and sovereignty are two categories that can coexist.

It is worth noting that, in the author's view, sovereignty, autonomy and socio-economic development are interconnected conceptions, a formulation that Krasner does not evidence. This original articulation allows Jaguaribe to express Brazil's position in the international system, elaborate sovereignty claims and point out mechanisms of resistance to the instruments of coercion. Through this, the author goes beyond Krasner's ideas, pointing to the political dimension of sovereignty, which results from the re-articulation of the idea of self-determination as a variable that indicates states' positions in the international arena. That marks the limits of Krasner's concept for thinking, analyzing and formulating Brazilian politics. This question would justify and/or explain the non-conceptualization of sovereignty and the less central position that this category occupies in Jaguaribe's works.

13 The hierarchical structure of the international system is differentiated by the author into four levels that express the states' capacity for self-determination, from the highest to the lowest degree: General Primacy, Regional Primacy, Autonomy and Dependence (JAGUARIBE, 1979).

CC BY NC SA

From this analysis, we identified that Jaguaribe's sovereignty is not objectively defined, allowing the ambiguous use of the term, thus facilitating its articulation with the notion of a hierarchical international system and with the ideas of autonomy and development. The concept of sovereignty mimicked in Jaguaribe is relational and not absolute. This understanding allows us to infer that these countries (1) are always subject to the questioning of their sovereign status; (2) can claim sovereignty and resist violations of that norm; and (3) can resist the norm itself. That indicates that the difference in the approaches to the concept may be almost none in Bhabha's terms. However, it may threaten hegemonic structures because it opens up an underlying space for resistance.

We verify, therefore, that the sovereignty mimicked in Jaguaribe is "almost the same, but not quite". The author recognizes Krasner's analysis of this concept as valid because it allows him to point out violations of the Westphalian model. However, his concern is to think of the international from the Brazilian perspective, projecting on it the strategies of resistance to coercive mechanisms that limit or violate national sovereignty and identifying what keeps the country in an unfavorable condition in a hierarchical international system marked by asymmetries and inequality. This attitude leads the author to project and articulate the concept of sovereignty with national ideas of development and autonomy.

3.2. A contrapuntal reading of the concept of sovereignty in Amado Cervo

The discussion led by Amado Cervo is driven by the need to think about national concepts capable of reflecting the Brazilian experience and being proper instruments for building the country. The author argues that IR theory has a limited explanatory capacity. However, it is equally relevant to appropriate the knowledge derived from them, as well as unveil the pitfalls they promote (CERVO, 2008a). In our understanding, when developing his formulation, Cervo indicates the possibility of the mimetic process — hybridization — occurring, pointing out those mainstream theories are partially relevant, but that they should be taken with caution, recognizing their limitations derived from the national interests and values they carry.

Here it is important to highlight that Cervo (2008a; 2008b) takes a position of rejection of hegemonic theories, seeking to build Brazilian concepts. Nevertheless, Luciano Munõz and Raphael Spode (2019) argue that Cervo does not adopt a decolonizing approach in his discussion and, despite rejecting hegemonic theories, maintains Eurocentric tendencies, evidenced, for example, by the lack of criticism of the linear view of History. In this regard, we emphasize that

CC BY NC SA

Cervo maintains a certain dialogue with hegemonic theories, in the sense presented by Munõz and Spode (2019), but it is possible in our analysis to identify different formulations that oppose partially these viewpoints, evidencing an ambivalent character in the author's thinking.

We identified that Cervo (2008b) lists nine components of the country's diplomacy that result from his assessment of national foreign policy throughout history, namely: (1) self-determination, non-intervention and peaceful settlement of disputes; (2) legalism; (3) normative multilateralism; (4) cooperative and non-confrontational external action; (5) strategic partnerships; (6) realism and pragmatism; (7) official cordiality in dealing with neighbors; (8) development as a vector; and (9) independence from international insertion.

We state that the first two categories, expressed in the ideas of self-determination, non--intervention and legalism, are in dialogue with Krasner's concept of sovereignty in its international legal and Westphalian dimensions. These components reinforce the notion that the state holds a monopoly of authority within its national territory and emphasizes the importance of mutual recognition legally granted between states at the international level. Pointing out the existence of these axes, the author indicates that there is an incorporation of the concept of sovereignty and not necessarily a replacement of this concept, as Kalil (2017) argues.

For the author, strategic partnerships and normative multilateralism indicate the country's international insertion strategy. This insertion establishes international cooperation as a mechanism to face the established global governance structure. In this sense, Cervo understands the ideas of cooperative and non-confrontationist action and official cordiality in dealing with neighbors as axiomatic guidelines for national foreign policy. In his view, decision-making autonomy is the ideological substrate that drives this policy.

In his analysis, realism, pragmatism, development as a vector and an independent international insertion characterize the conduct of Brazilian foreign policy. These last two being the ideological substrate for all other guidelines. Cervo (2008b, p. 31, our translation) writes, "[...] the independence of the insertion pattern presupposes a worldview, autonomy of the decision-making process[14] and its own formulation of foreign policy" and continues to explain that

14 According to Saraiva (2014), decision-making autonomy in Cervo's works is closer to the Brazilian thinking on IR than to the duality of the center/periphery of the thinking of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). This way, a cooperative worldview emerges that works as a master path in national thinking applied to IR.

CC BY NC SA

> [...] the autonomy of insertion figures as a standard for Brazilian diplomacy because it imposes itself over the long term, and makes the national character prevail in the symbiosis between internal and external. It does not eliminate external conditioning, but suggests mastering them to your advantage, submitting to luck and circumstances, and commanding fate, rather than just suffering its effects. (CERVO, 2008b, p. 31, our translation).

In this passage, it is possible to observe that the category of autonomy can interact both with the Westphalian perspective and with the idea of a hierarchy that appears in Cervo and in the other authors analyzed here, because this category is not conceptualized, thus expressing an ambiguous character. In Cervo (2008b), we see that autonomous international insertion is essential to make national interests prevail. The author does not conceptualize sovereignty either, but, like Jaguaribe, the principles of self-determination and non-interference are highlighted as fundamental axes. That indicates that sovereignty and autonomy coexist as an axiomatic character of this policy. Therefore, both are central to the strengthening of the Brazilian state. Therefore, autonomy in Cervo (2008b) can be understood as an objective, as in Jaguaribe's terms, but it can also be a means of international insertion. This use reflects the ambiguous character of the concept of autonomy.

In Cervo (2008b), we see that autonomous international insertion is essential to make national interests prevail. The author does not conceptualize sovereignty either, but, like Jaguaribe, the principles of self-determination and non-interference are highlighted as fundamental axes. That indicates that sovereignty and autonomy coexist as an axiomatic character of this policy. Therefore, both are central to the strengthening of the Brazilian state. Therefore, autonomy in Cervo (2008b) can be understood as an objective, as in Jaguaribe's terms, but it can also be a means of international insertion. This use reflects the ambiguous character of the concept of autonomy.

Lastly, we emphasize that this ambiguous character of Cervo's work was also identified in the research carried out by Jéssica Máximo (2014). She shows that Cervo intends to create a new epistemology, seeking emancipation from the mainstream thought in IR, by articulating the conceptual approach as a form of innovation in this discipline. However, despite this objective, Cervo shares certain assumptions of the mainstream explicit, for example, in his promotion of the idea of national interest, a central concept for classical realist theories. It can be argued, than, that the author promotes a distortion of mainstream thought, resulting in a discourse "[...] that reiterates the realistic ontology, corrupts and resignifies its original" (MÁXIMO, 2014, p. 71). Máximo thus corroborates our evaluation of the concept of sovereignty in Cervo's work, highlighting its ambiguous character. In a nutshell, he rejects the mainstream thought while incorporating its grammar to resignify it.

CC BY NC SA

3.3. A contrapuntal reading of the concept of sovereignty in José Flávio Sombra Saraiva

In 2014, Saraiva published an article in which he proposed to discuss the historical formation of the concept of autonomy in light of Brazil's foreign policy evolution. In this text, he argues the concept is historically formed through the performance of the country's foreign policy and the theoretical contribution of national thinkers. Saraiva (2014, p. 9, our translation) explains that the idea of decision-making autonomy constitutes the "[...] internal link of the state in its inflection towards the conformation of the international system". Furthermore, he points out that this concept was the least painful intellectual and political path for the imperial elites in operationalizing the state. This issue also appears in Cervo e Lima, as discussed in the next section.

Right in the first lines of his article, Saraiva (2014) emphasizes that there is a tradition in IR that deals with debates regarding internal-external connections, however, this debate is not of his interest. Two issues are important concerning his choice of methodological delimitation. The first point is that he analyses the particular sphere of foreign policy to think about autonomy, indicating he is not necessarily analyzing the category of national autonomy. The second point is that he is not discussing the internal-external connections, which indicates that there is no debate about a category that would replace sovereignty since it is exactly this connection that the concept of sovereignty articulates.

In fact, the author points to autonomy in foreign policy as a means of strengthening the autonomous and non-sovereign state. This formulation could indicate a substitution, as argued by Kalil (2017). However, it is not easy to sustain this because Saraiva does not conceptualize national autonomy. This would have been necessary to understand its local conceptualization and its difference from the category of sovereignty, which in the Westphalian sense encompasses the notion of national autonomy. Furthermore, the idea of decision-making autonomy described by the author is not enough to point out that there is substitution because this category is effectively described as a strategy. In other words, this category appears to be a means to achieve something, not an end.

In this sense, we observe that Saraiva neither conceptualizes nor discusses sovereignty. This question may have been interpreted by Kalil (2017) as an effect of replacing the sovereignty/non-interference dichotomy with the autonomy/dependence dichotomy. However, this is not clear for our analysis because, for the most part, the concept of autonomy appears as a strategy of Brazilian foreign policy, and, at this point, there is no space to say that there is

CC BY NC SA

a substitution of the category of sovereignty. In another formulation, this concept appears as national autonomy, which is not conceptualized, so, consequently, it can or not be the same as sovereignty, indicating the ambivalent character of the concept. Thus, in our analysis, that reflects, once again, the mimicry of the concept of sovereignty in the national IR literature.

Finally, it should be noted that Saraiva's contribution to this debate is minor compared to the other authors analyzed here because his work lacks conceptual precision, which would allow a more nuanced analysis of his thought. Therefore, our analysis is based solely on operationalizing the concepts throughout his texts and not on the meanings that he attributes to the categories of sovereignty and autonomy.

3.4. A contrapuntal reading of the concept of sovereignty in Maria Regina Soares de Lima

Like Saraiva, the autonomy debate is more evident for Lima, whereas sovereignty hardly appears. We see that the categories of self-determination and non-interference are not debated centrally, as in Jaguaribe and Cervo. In her work, Lima (2005b) explains that, in Brazil, the field of foreign policy was marked by two central points: economic development and political autonomy. She says that Brazil's stable geopolitical position generated a peculiar feeling among the country's political elites, from which external threats were perceived as a consequence of economic vulnerabilities and not security-derived, in Westphalian terms.

In her view, currently, elites in Brazil are ideologically divided between two alternatives in foreign policy: the search for credibility and the search for autonomy (LIMA, 2005a). The first alternative understands that national autonomy is derived from the ability to cooperate internationally to create norms and institutions. Conversely, the autonomist current argues for the need of a national project to overcome internal imbalances. From this perspective, a sovereigntist view leads to reluctance towards multilateral arrangements that result in the delegation of authority (LIMA, 2005a).

Analyzing the works of Lima (2005a, 2005b), we observe that, as in Saraiva (2014), the author neither conceptualizes nor discusses sovereignty. Kalil (2017) may have interpreted that as an effect of replacing the sovereignty/non-interference dichotomy with the autonomy/dependence dichotomy. However, as we mentioned in the previous subsection, this is not clear for our analysis because, at various times, the indicated autonomy appears as a means, as a strategy for the country's foreign policy, and, in this sense, there is no space to say that there is a replacement for the category of sovereignty.

CC BY NC SA

We note that Lima (2005a, 2005b) and Saraiva (2014) study the conformation of foreign policy and how it has contributed and/or can contribute to the development of the autonomous state, as through this policy, it would be possible to contribute to the development of capacities in the country. In this sense, the authors are analyzing the concept of autonomy in the particular area of Brazilian foreign policy. However, the idea of national autonomy *per se* is not conceptualized or discussed, just indicated as the goal of this policy, an issue that points to the mimicry of the concept and the ambivalent use of the autonomy.

Lima (2005a, 2005b) does not examine how the ideas of autonomy and sovereignty could be related in the scope of this debate. So, the idea of national autonomy can be the same thing as sovereignty — or not. It would be the same if the author indicated that foreign policy autonomy contributes to strengthening national autonomy in the Westphalian sense — this way, autonomy would result in a greater capacity for self-determination. Otherwise, it would be different if national autonomy were conceptualized in such a way as to project the construction of an alternative to the Westphalian model of international relations. What appears to us is that these two perspectives coexist among the national thinkers analyzed and are expressed in the ambiguous use of the sense of autonomy, an effect of the mimicry that results from the incorporation of the concept of sovereignty nationally.

We also emphasize that during the event Autonomía sitiada: *¿Cómo pensamos las políticas exteriores de América Latina en el siglo XXI?*, organized by the Estudios Europeos Program in 2020, Lima explains that the idea of autonomy in the country took on three distinct aspects or meanings: (1) situational autonomy; (2) autonomy as a determined end; and (3) behavioral autonomy. In Jaguaribe, the idea of autonomy is born as a determined end, aiming to overcome the condition of dependence. In this case, we could see a condition for replacing the category of sovereignty with the idea of autonomy. However, Lima points out that the interpretation of autonomy as a means ended up becoming hegemonic within the national thought.

At this point, it is worth noting that, in 2018, Lima and Letícia Pinheiro published an article where they deepened the debate on the concept of autonomy. In this context, they point to the problem of discussing autonomy as a means or objective, emphasizing that the original meaning as an objective has been lost, losing, also, its analytical capacity. Furthermore, the authors emphasize that autonomy and sovereignty would not be the same because, initially, the search for more autonomy does not imply achieving self-sufficiency.

Therefore, they explain that the interpretation of autonomy as a means was nationally hegemonic, which led to the understanding that autonomy results in the search for self-sufficiency. On the one hand, this interpretation indicates that, for the most part, there is no

CC BY NC SA

substitution of the category of sovereignty in the national thought and that, in addition to development, autonomy in international insertion would also function as a strategy to achieve sovereignty. However, on the other hand, it also indicates the conception of autonomy as an end, pointing to a projection of a different worldview, which interacts more with the idea of a hierarchical international. In our analysis, these two categories coexist in national thought and reflect a tension between different perspectives on the international.

4. RESULTS: MIMICRY AND AMBIVALENCE OF THE CONCEPTS OF SOVEREIGNTY AND AUTONOMY IN BRAZILIAN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Analyzing Cervo, Jaguaribe, Saraiva and Lima, we identified that sovereignty is not objectively conceptualized. In the case of Jaguaribe and Cervo, we infer how this concept is incorporated from the ideas of self-determination and non-intervention. Conversely, in Lima and Saraiva, this incorporation hardly appears and is more highlighted by the mention of the idea of national autonomy as the end of the autonomous insertion of the state in the international system. Sovereignty is not under debate in Lima and Saraiva, who are focused on discussing the conformation of foreign policy. As such, it is more difficult to infer how they grasp of sovereignty. However, both have a conversation with the works of Jaguaribe and Cervo, indicating that the understanding could be similar. The absence of concern with the conceptualization of sovereignty and autonomy points to this.

We verified that these authors understand sovereignty as a category that allows us to understand the constitution of the international based on this norm and, in this way, articulate self-determination as a structuring axis of the international. Of course, the authors can highlight the asymmetries and inequalities between states. However, in doing so, they reveal another perspective on the nature of the international system. Based on that, they project national interests, expressed in the ideas of development and autonomy. This movement results in the idea of a hierarchical order with autonomous agents. That is particularly highlighted in the works of Cervo and Jaguaribe.

So, we observe that the mimicry of the concept of sovereignty led to a focus on discussing the concept of autonomy in these studies. That is because the concept of autonomy interacts with both Krasner's perspective on the international system and the national perspective

CC BY NC SA

on this system. In this way, the idea of autonomy, incorporated into the Westphalian sense of sovereignty for the authors, expresses two views about the permanent international tension. Through this formulation, strategies emerge that aim at building an autonomous state with greater capacity for sovereign projection in the international system. This ambivalence of the notion of autonomy is mostly evident in Saraiva and Lima.

Sovereignty is related to the different capacities for self-determination and national development that are outlined as a strategy to achieve autonomy and to guarantee greater capacity for self-determination, that is, greater capacity for sovereign projection in the international system. Thus, we identified that sovereignty and autonomy are understood as objectives. Nevertheless, it is necessary to emphasize that autonomy as a means, which often appears in discussions about the shaping of foreign policy, can also function as a strategy to expand the capacity for self-determination. In this way, we understand that sovereignty interacts with the ideas of development and autonomy.

We found that, by taking the international system as a hierarchy, the authors can project the country's sovereignty claims while exposing their discontent with Brazil's position in that order. Furthermore, they present a way to build a condition of resistance to the mechanisms of coercion derived from this order. Not conceptualizing sovereignty in Krasner's mold allows the projection of these claims, as well as the mechanisms of resistance against the hegemonic powers, giving a new political meaning to their understanding of sovereignty.

This articulation points to the moment when it is possible to identify the ambivalence of the notion of sovereignty since, at the same time that Krasner's vision is incorporated, the ideas of national development and autonomy are projected in this concept. The latter can be an objective concurrent with sovereignty, indicating another perspective of the international, as it can express the same thing as the meaning of Westphalian sovereignty. That is possible because these Brazilian authors develop their studies thinking about their position in the international arena. The result is an open and uncertain conceptualization of sovereignty.

In our study, we note that there is a dynamic of incorporation and rejection of the Westphalian model as a result of mimicking the concept of sovereignty. This norm becomes relativized, and the issue of autonomy is highlighted, but, at the same time, the ideas of non-interference and self-determination that derive from the Westphalian model are still incorporated. One of the reasons for this movement is that national elites tend to agree that the sovereigntist discourse can make the Brazilian insertion into the international sphere more difficult. In this sense, both in foreign policy and in the more general plan of national politics, the autonomist debate gains centrality as a discursive resource.

CC BY NC SA

The centrality of this debate does not imply the non-incorporation of the idea of sovereignty into national thinking. However, it highlights one of the strategies of resistance designed by the country against the dominant powers. More than that, it also points to the construction of a space for the projection of one's own national perspective on what the international is and how one imagines or expects to build the international, an issue evidenced by the projection of the ideas of a hierarchical international system and autonomous entities.

Thus, we observe that the works discussed here seem to reflect the ambivalence that would mark the formation of thought outside the center. That is because the authors analyze the world order as it imposes itself, highlighting its problems and limits, the difficulties of effectively building a sovereign state in this context, and the many insertion strategies. Nevertheless, they think of alternatives to this order that can be observed through a hierarchical world made up of autonomous entities.

On the one hand, the result of this process is the partial incorporation of the category of sovereignty, expressed mainly from the acceptance of the principles of non-interference and self-determination and the perception, in terms of Krasner's ideas, that the predominance of the logic of consequences leads to violation of these principles. On the other hand, the understanding of sovereignty is not entirely reproduced in his terms within the Brazilian authors. Sovereignty is relativized to express countries' position in an international structure that is hierarchical. This concept politically keeps political coherence for Brazil to understand its position vis-à-vis the dominant powers and project its claims supported by a discourse that aims at an autonomous state.

Through this analysis, we observe that the centrality of autonomy expresses the ambivalence that results from the mimicry of the concept of sovereignty in the national thought. That is because the idea of autonomy may be the same as what is inferred from the Westphalian sense. However, it may also express how the Brazilian IR scholarity views the international system. This issue indicates a space in which national demands and strategies of resistance are projected onto Krasner's sense of sovereignty, that is, an interstice point where cultural values can be negotiated in terms of Bhabha.

We conclude then that the idea of sovereignty embodied in national thought is expressed "between the lines", not entirely rejecting it, but represents a strategy for projecting national claims on this category. By approaching sovereignty in this way, Brazilian IR scholarship creates a strategy that allows the country to project its interests, claim its sovereignty and achieve a better position in the international system, but also allows a space to imagine and project another logic of the international, based on ideas of hierarchy and autonomy.

CC BY NC SA

In a nutshell, when Brazilian authors analyze the international system and the capacity of states for self-determination — in other words, to guarantee their sovereignty — they also project their own worldview, interests and values. As a result, the notion of sovereignty is mimicked — "almost the same, but not quite" — and appears elusive. Taking this into account, they understand that, through national development, it is possible to create strategies that increase the capacity for national autonomy and the degree of self-determination, a moment in which they project their perspective of the world onto the idea of sovereignty.

Thus, hypocrisy is not enough to express the national vision of sovereignty because it does not capture this global vision. This difference in understanding the world expresses Brazil's position in the international system, and as a result of this different perception, the ideas of development and autonomy gain strength in the works of Jaguaribe and Cervo, Saraiva and Lima. This centrality is also observed in Kalil's work. From the perspective of these authors, states have different degrees of sovereignty and autonomy depending on their stage of development. Therefore, it seems correct to state that Kalil's (2017) study partially captures how sovereignty is approached in national thought. However, it would not be possible to say that the notion of autonomy replaces the idea of sovereignty but that such concepts coexist in national thought.

CONCLUSION

With the discussion conducted, we observe that the authors studied here agree with Krasner's assumption regarding the hypocrisy inherent in the organization of the international system. That is, they recognize the predominance of the logic of consequences in the international system since, based on this formulation, it is possible to derive perennial hypotheses of violations of sovereignty — above all, the sovereignty of states that amalgamate small or medium relative power in the international scenario. However, this relativization of the organization of the international has profound impacts on the ontology of the international system.

In this sense, these authors differ from Krasner regarding the presumed nature of the international system. That is because, in their view, this system is ranked according to the different self-determination capacities of each state. Therefore, in a hierarchical international system, sovereignty becomes relativized as an effect of the asymmetry between states, a condition understood as inherent to the system. Through this perspective, the authors begin

CC BY NC SA

to discuss the notion of sovereignty, highlighting its political dimension, where it is possible to project different expectations, such as claims of territorial inviolability and strategies to resist mechanisms of coercion.

Given this difference, we identified that it is in the process of incorporating the idea of territorial integrity — or autonomy — derived from Krasner's Westphalian dimension of sovereignty that the projection of the ideas of development and autonomy takes place. Thus, we observe that the centrality of the discussion of autonomy in Brazil's national thought can be, at least in part, explained as a result of the mimicry of the concept of sovereignty, given that autonomy interacts with both the Westphalian perspective of the international system and the perspective of a hierarchical system of national authors. In other words, the hybridization of the concept of sovereignty can be seen in the negotiation or dispute for a sense of autonomy.

From this, we conclude that the Brazilian authors studied partially agree with the mainstream grasp of sovereignty while presuming a hierarchical international system, which, in its turn, underlies the relativization of the concept due to the unequal structure of this order. Based on this view, the authors show awareness about the Brazilian sovereignty's status and limitations. Given this, we identified that the concept of autonomy represents the Brazilian resistance concerning the localization of the concept of sovereignty. Furthermore, we see that the projection of national concepts of autonomy, understood as an objective and of concept of sovereignty as a mean, takes place. Therefore, in this literature, the concept of autonomy represents Brazilian resistance to the location of the concept of sovereignty. In other words, autonomy gives rise to ambivalence towards the concept of sovereignty in Brazil's IR thought.

Finally, we emphasize that the theoretical-methodological approach adopted proved to be a useful instrument to undertake efforts to map and recognize other views about the international. With this tool, it was possible to explore how a fundamental concept for IR — sovereignty — can be approached differently and rearticulated with other perspectives about the international system, so it allows us to verify national variants of thought and their interaction or not with standardized knowledge.

Therefore, we conclude that when evaluating the category of sovereignty, searching for bases in the production of knowledge in mainstream and national IR knowledge, we bring attention to the limit of Krasner's concept, whose idea of sovereignty as hypocrisy does not capture the political strategies of resistance. Those are, we claim, articulated into the Brazilian thought. Thus, through the present analysis, we established a dialogue with the Global IR agenda, which seeking how concepts are adapted and used outside the Global North.

CC BY NC SA

REFERENCES

ACHARYA, Amitav. Global International Relations (IR) and regional worlds: a new agenda for international studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, [*S. l.*], vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 647-659, Dec. 2014.

ACHARYA, Amitav. How ideas spread: whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism. *International Organization*, [*S. l.*], vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 239-275, May 2004.

ACHARYA, Amitav. Towards a Global IR? *In*: MCGLINCHEY, Stephen; SCHEINPFLUG, Christian; WALTERS, Rosie (Eds.). *International Relations Theory*. Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing, 2017. pp. 76-82.

AUTONOMÍA Sitiada: ¿Cómo pensamos las políticas exteriores de América Latina en el siglo XXI. *Program of Estudios Europeas de la Udec*, [*S. l.*], 13 Nov. 2020. 1 video (1:57:50). Published by Estudios Europeos Program channel. Available in: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8P-DXHQnCiI&t=2815s. Access on: 05 June 2021.

BHABHA, Homi. Of mimicry and man: the ambivalence of colonial discourse. *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*, [*S. l.*], vol. 28, pp. 125-133, Oct. 1984.

BHABHA, Homi. *The location of culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

BILGIN, Pinar. “Contrapuntal reading” as a method, an ethos, and a metaphor for Global IR. *International Studies Review*, [*S. l.*], vol. 0, pp. 1-13, Feb. 2016.

BODIN, Jean. *Os Seis Livros da República:* Livro Primeiro. Translation: José Carlos Orsi Morel. São Paulo: Ícone Editora, 2011.

CANCLINI, Néstor García. *Culturas híbridas*: estratégias para entrar e sair da modernidade. Translation: Ana Regina Lessa e Heloísa Pezza Cintrão; Introduction translation: Gênese Andrade. 4. ed. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2008.

CERVO, Amado Luiz. Conceitos em Relações Internacionais*. Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, Brasília, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 8-25, 2008a.

CERVO, Amado Luiz. *Inserção internacional*: formação dos conceitos brasileiros. São Paulo: Editora Saraiva, 2008b.

CHATTERJEE, Partha. *Colonialismo, modernidade e política*. Translation: Fábio Baqueiro Figueiredo e Valdemir Zamporoni. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2004.

CHOWDHRY, Geeta. Edward Said and contrapuntal reading: implications for critical interventions in international relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, [*S. l.*], vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 101-116, Dec. 2007.

COX, Robert. Social forces, states and world orders: beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, [*S. l.*], vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 126-155, 1981.

HERZ, Monica. O crescimento da área de Relações Internacionais no Brasil. *Contexto Internacional*, Rio de Janeiro, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 7-40, Jan./June 2002.

HOBBES, Thomas. *Leviatã:* ou matéria forma e poder de um Estado eclesiástico e civil. Translation: Eleonora Magalhães de Gusmão. Santa Catarina: Clube de Autores, 2020 [1651].

HOFFMANN, Stanley. An American Social Science: International Relations. *Daedalus*, [*S. l.*], vol. 106, no. 3, pp. 41-60, 1977.

JAGUARIBE, Hélio. Autonomia periferiea y hegemonia céntrica. *Estudios Internacionales*, Chile, vol. 12, no. 49, pp. 91-130, Apr./May 1979.

JAGUARIBE, Hélio. MERCOSUL e a nova ordem mundial. *Centro Brasileiro de Relações Internacionais (CEBRI)*, [*S. l.*], vol. 1, year 1, pp. 3-9, 2002.

JAGUARIBE, Hélio. O Brasil ante o século XXI. *Instituto de Estudos Avançados da Universidade de São Paulo (IEAUSP)*, São Paulo, 2012. Available in: http://www.iea.usp.br/publicacoes/textos/jaguaribeseculo21.pdf/view. Access on: 17 Sept. 2020.

KALIL, Mariana Alves da Cunha. The Global South is in Exile. *E-International Relations*, [*S. l.*], 17 May 2020. Available in: https://www.e-ir.info/2020/05/17/the-global-south-is-in-exile/. Access on: 22 July 2020.

KALIL, Mariana Alves da Cunha. *Thinking Past the Latin American Hybrid:* Rationalism in Exile — a Brazilian contribution to the theory of International Relations. 2017, 304 pp. Thesis (PhD in International Relations) — Instituto de Relações Internacionais, Universidade de Brasília (UnB), Brasília, 2017.

KRASNER, Stephen. Abiding sovereignty. *International Political Science Review*, [*S. l.*], vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 229-251, July 2001a.

KRASNER, Stephen. Compromising Westphalia. *International Security*, [*S. l.*], vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 115- 151, Dec./Feb. 1995.

KRASNER, Stephen. Rethinking the sovereign state model. *Review of International Studies*, [*S. l.*], vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 17-42, Dec. 2001b.

KRASNER, Stephen. *Sovereignty:* organized hypocrisy. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999.

KRISTENSEN, Peter Marcus. The South in "Global IR": worlding beyond the "Non-West" in the case of Brazil. *International Studies Perspectives*, [*S. l.*], vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 1-22, Mar. 2020.

LIMA, Maria Regina Soares. A política externa brasileira e os desafios da cooperação Sul-Sul. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, Brasília, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 24-59, 2005a.

LIMA, Maria Regina Soares. Aspiração internacional e Política Externa. *Revista Brasileira de Comércio Exterior,* [*S. l.*], year XIX, no. 82*,* Jan./Mar. 2005b.

MÁXIMO, Jéssica Cristina Resende. *Historiografia(s) das Relações Internacionais:* uma análise pós-colonial das histórias e dos saberes da área de RI de Brasil, China e Índia. 2014, 138 pp. Dissertation (MSc in International Relations) — a Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, 2014.

MUÑOZ, Luciano da Rosa; SPODE, Raphael. Pensamento com teoria: alternativas para o campo de Relações Internacionais no Brasil e na Índia. *Monções: Revista de Relações Internacionais da UFGD*, Dourados, vol. 8. no. 15, pp. 336-365, Jan./June 2019.

CC BY NC SA

PINHEIRO, Letícia; LIMA, Maria Regina Soares de. Between autonomy and dependency: the place of agency in Brazilian foreign policy. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, São Paulo, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1-22, 2018.

ROUSSEAU, Jean-Jacques. *Do contrato social:* ou princípios do direito político. Translation: Eduardo Brandão. São Paulo: Companhia das letras, 2011 [1762].

SAID, Edward Wadie. *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

SAID, Edward Wadie. *Reflections on exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

SARAIVA, José Flávio Sombra. Autonomia na inserção internacional do Brasil: um caminho histórico próprio. *Contexto Internacional*, Rio de Janeiro, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 9-41, Jan./June 2014.

THOMAS, Lindsey. Contrapuntal analysis. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, [*S. l.*], 7 Nov. 2017. Available in: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0269. Access on: 27 Mar. 2020.

WALKER, R. B. J. Security, sovereignty, and the challenge of world politics. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, [*S. l.*], vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 3-27, Jan. 1990.

CC BY NC SA