

# MEXICO AND BRAZIL – FORGING THE REGIONAL PLAYER’S ROLE

Ivan Kovac <sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

The prospects of an eventual Mexico’s or Brazil’s leadership in Latin American region stem from at least two kinds of aspects – constant and variable ones. Constant factors such as the geographic allocation or the area make it easier for Brazil to achieve the leading position in South America, whereas Mexico has to cope with the role of a country stuck in between two blocks with conflicting interests. Its NAFTA membership had become a watershed event and made the country play two games at once, which partially led to abandonment of a purely Latin American dimension of Mexico’s foreign policy. Besides this fact, Mexico’s reputation in Latin America had been seriously harmed by a series of disputes with regional partners during the tenure of previous president Vicente Fox (2000-2006). Thus, Mexico has lost the prospect to become the uncontested leader of the region, but still has a way to take. Its future depends on the ability to position itself into the role of a connector being able to understand the interests of its own community vis-à-vis the US and to act as a facilitator in the mutual interaction of the North and the South of the hemisphere.

On the other hand, Brazil is an uncontested leader of South America and was able to find an effective *modus vivendi* with the most complicated regimes of the region. If it retains a high level of co-operation with Chávez’s regime, there will be no obstacles to achieve its vision of a more stable and secure South America. Brazil’s desire to unite South America by means of various forms of integration and co-operation demonstrates its bold ambitions and helps gain prestige in the global context as well. However, taking into account that Brazil’s activities are almost exclusively concentrated in South America, an impediment comes up on the way to achieve the desired position of the leader of the entire region.

The future of Latin America is in no way that of a clash between Mexico and Brazil to usurp the role of the leader. By contrast, the key for brighter perspectives rests in their co-operation. The leadership of Latin America is no more attainable for Mexico, since its

---

<sup>1</sup> Mgr. Ivan Kovac (born 1985); researcher on Latin America, PhD. candidate of international relations; Faculty of Political Science and International Relations of Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia. Researcher on Mexico; Research Center of the Association for International Affairs, Prague, Czech rep.  
email: ivan.kovac@umb.sk

geopolitical position in between North America and Latin America and, above all, a very specific internal problem (security challenges stemming from exacerbated drug cartels conflict) pose a serious impediment for country's foreign policy and paralyze the political elite of the country. On the other hand, Brazil under the leadership of new president Dilma Rousseff faces the challenge of upholding and vitalizing the valuable legacy of her predecessor Lula da Silva, who set Brazil clearly on the way to lead the region and to assume global ambitions in the current system of international relations.

## INTRODUCTION

The region of Latin America can recently be characterized by great political and economic contrasts among respective states. Positive development of the past decades allowed states to overcome the political power of authoritarianism and lead up to the path of democracy. Recently, almost all countries of the region function as parliamentary democracies, with major and minor distinctions in its effective application. Despite these facts, the quality of democracy in several states remains incomparable with the classic notion of Western democracy and the excessive role of the Presidents in the political systems evokes the eternal presence of a firm hand approach when governing the country. The economic reforms that followed the period known as "the lost decade" of the 1980s resulted in the recovery of economic relations with the outside world. On the other hand, the reforms also led to the deepening of social gaps between respective segments of the society. Controversial economic development thus caused major crisis in the economy of regional leaders – Mexico, Brazil and mainly Argentina.

The issue of regional integration has been spurred by the *open regionalism* approach of the 1990s which enabled a great progress toward effective regional integration schemes.<sup>2</sup> More recently, a new method of integration based on the *new regionalism* approach makes countries face other challenges and widens the dimension of cooperation from purely economic to a multidimensional one. Initiatives of some states in the field of regional integration emphasizing the importance of energy or military issues may lead to a positive response in the future as well.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Rýsová, Lucia - Kosír, Igor - Terem, Peter. 2008. *Integration Processes*. Banská Bystrica : University of Matej Bel, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations. ISBN 978-80-8083-632-0.

<sup>3</sup> Terem, Peter. 2004. *Energetic Perspectives of the World in the 21st Century*. In: Conference book - International researcher's conference: Baar, V. (ed.) *Geography and the Transformations of Spatial Reality*. Faculty of Natural Science, University of Ostrava, Ostrava, Czech rep.; 30.-31 8. 2004.

Despite these facts, the recent image of Latin America is that of an immensely fragmented region. Besides economic and internal political fragmentation that manifests itself in distinct economic development and political system structure, there is one more issue that draws the attention – the fragmentation of foreign policies in the region. Latin American region has been characterized by sharp contradictions in foreign policy principles, even amongst the major actors. The role of a historical divisive factor played by the US with its controversial foreign policy has manifested itself mainly after the Bush's neo-conservative offensive in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The reaction of Latin American states showed a picture of fundamental heterogeneity of their foreign policies, whereby the principles and ideas of one state were often in contradiction with those of the others. In the economic sphere, the regional fragmentation demonstrates itself mostly in the different approaches to the role of state in economy and in a distinct understanding of globalization and its effects by the principal regional actors.

The aim of my paper is to analyze the leadership vacuum that has recently been formed in the region of Latin America as a result of a high level of its fragmentation. Throughout my paper, I seek the answer to a question whether it is possible, under recent circumstances, for a certain state to achieve the position of regional leader or is it inevitable to acquiesce with the existence of more, often contradictory, concepts introduced by various power centers. My attention is drawn to the leadership potential of 2 countries from the region – Mexico and Brazil. Both countries have ambitions to become the leader as well as a set of specific characteristics that may provide various opportunities to the Latin American community. On the basis of the foreign policy analysis of these two actors, it is possible to come to a solution of the initial question.

## **MEXICO – A CONNECTOR OR A SCHIZOPHRENIC?**

### **The foreign policy of Calderón**

In the field of foreign policy, the initial position of President Calderón when taking office in December 2006 was a very complicated one. His predecessor Vicente Fox had left behind a series of complicated relations with many states of the region and the Wooden Horse of repetitive disputes with leftist governments of South America posed a significant threat to

the ambitions of the new Mexican President. That is why the slogan „responsible and active“<sup>4</sup> has become a subtitle of Calderón’s foreign policy. Unlike his predecessor, he identified himself with the notion that without assuming responsibility and acting prudently, there is no way to recover Mexico’s relevant position in the region. Thus, converting Mexico into the fourth biggest world economy by 2050 still remains his bold goal.

The outlines of a new relationship with the countries of the region were clearly defined by the President at the annual convention of Mexican ambassadors in January 2007. Calderón’s concept highlighted the aim of strengthening the relations with all Latin American states without any exception. His idea was that Mexico should become a bridge between them and the Northern part of the continent. The plea to „correct the mistakes“ was a clear reference to the effect of his predecessor’s foreign policy towards the region. Considering such comments, it became obvious that he desired to „delimit himself face to face his predecessor, whose policy in this region was distraught and chaotic and the disputes with Cuba and Venezuela an example of an unnecessarily adverse and irreverent foreign policy.“<sup>5</sup>

After having assumed the office, Calderón launched a diplomatic offensive to restore the bilateral relations with Venezuela. He succeeded to normalize the relations, even if Chavez’s frequent comments on the US and its policy in Latin America directly refer to Mexico as well. In September 2007 new ambassadors to both Mexico and Venezuela were appointed. However, the latent tension between both countries still persists as a result of a fundamentally different view of state’s role in the economy and of the US economic and political role within the region. Venezuela rejects major economic co-operation with the US and has opted for a state-controlled economical model, whereas Mexico directly depends on the US economy and strives for creating a pro-investment liberal economic environment at home. This tension manifested itself at the World Economic Forum in Davos, where Calderón presented Mexico as a suitable destination for foreign investors who, in his opinion, at this time have to face a lot of troubles in some countries, amongst which he also mentioned Venezuela.

Calderón also managed to recuperate the mutual dialogue with Cuba and decided to break the ice after more than four years of a frozen relationship. The situation on the island currently governed by Raúl Castro gives a hope for a change and Mexico knows it can play a

---

<sup>4</sup> Presidencia de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. 2007. *Primer informe de gobierno*. México, D.F.: Presidencia de la República, pp. 370. Accessible at [http://www.informe.gob.mx/pdf\\_excel/capitulo05/5\\_6/M370-378.pdf](http://www.informe.gob.mx/pdf_excel/capitulo05/5_6/M370-378.pdf) (23.2.2011)

<sup>5</sup> Cansino, César. 2007. „Más México en el mundo. *El Universal*, January 18, 2007, editorial. Accessible at: <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/editoriales/36540.html> (26.2.2011)

significant role and even profit from it. The distinct views on the human rights application and enforcement as well as on the relations with the US retreated because of Mexico's strategy to restore good relationships with all members of the Latin American community.

The overall foreign-policy approach of President Calderón towards the region is characterized by greater expertise and analysis of strategic priorities based on the evaluation of the real situation. General strategy outlines as well as specific strategies towards sub-regions are both present in the guiding concept of his administration, which can be understood as a response to the existing fragmentation of Latin American region.<sup>6</sup>

New approach towards Latin America puts Mexico partially back on track after having been expelled out of the game due to the setbacks of the Fox's era. The years of Calderón's administration thus might be characterized as a process of trust-building with all partners in the region. Its results, besides the mentioned normalization of relations with Venezuela, were the overcoming of tensions with the governments of Chile and Argentina.

### **Mexico's perspective in Latin America**

The position of Mexico within Latin America is determined by its geographical and geopolitical surroundings and the government's foreign policy. From the historical point of view, it is worth mentioning that „Mexico's dual geopolitical position as both the North of Latin America and the South of North America implicates troubles to find a place in the Latin American game and to integrate the vision of connector of both sides of the triangle.“<sup>7</sup> After the tenure of Fox, when the country witnessed weakening of its position in the region, the new times have come with Calderón in December 2006 which allow to hope for a formulation of Mexico's new strategy towards Latin America. In order to implement this new policy, it is inevitable to gain the trust of all relevant community members, something that Calderón partially succeeded in after having rebuilt the relationship with both Venezuela and Cuba. Clear definition of country's stance towards the US policy in the region remains another important aspect of success. The reason to do that is that the US has continuously been acting as a divisive actor in the region and the alleged nexus of Mexico to Washington is misused by anti-American regimes of Latin America as an argument to avoid the acceptance of Mexico's

---

<sup>6</sup> See e.g.: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores de México. 2007. *Primer informe de labores de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores*. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. pp. 82-132. Accessible at: [http://www.sre.gob.mx/eventos/docs/1er\\_inf\\_lab07.pdf](http://www.sre.gob.mx/eventos/docs/1er_inf_lab07.pdf) (28.2.2011)

<sup>7</sup> González González, Guadalupe. 2007. „México en América Latina. El difícil juego del equilibrista.“ *Foreign Affairs en Español* 7, no. 4. Accessible at: <http://www.foreignaffairs-esp.org/20071001faenespessay070405/guadalupe-gonzalez-gonzalez/mexico-en-america-latina-el-difícil-juego-del-equilibrista.html> (28.2.2011)

influence in the region. Thus the major failure of Fox's administration was the pursuing, if not copying, of the US policy towards the region, which would later cause not only a loss of autonomy in foreign-policy building but lead also to grave misunderstandings in relations with some states.

The future of possible Mexican leadership in the region is determined by current status of fragmentation of regional political spectrum and the resulting inability to find a common denominator among all members of the Latin American community. Constructive actions towards all countries of the region and the strengthening of bilateral political and economic contacts with region's key actors thus remain basic tasks for Mexico. Furthermore, speaking about challenges to Mexico's foreign policy, it appears inevitable to create a balance between the interests of the North and those of the South that intersect just in Mexico as well as to form a coherent and complementary foreign policy toward both poles of the continent. However, the chances for Mexico to restore its dignified position in the region can only grow under the conditions of absorbing its ambivalent position in the Americas and opting for the role of connector. Having said this, we still need to take into account that the current political and social environment in Mexico, mainly characterized by security challenges and threats posed by the drug cartels, forces the political elite of the country to focus almost entirely on the internal policy and security issues. Understandably, foreign policy concepts have become less important in recent years and with the number of victims of the cartel war growing extremely, we have to acknowledge that the crucial foreign policy linkage of Mexico these days is the one towards its northern neighbor – the United States.

## **BRAZIL –THE ENGINE OF SOUTH AMERICA**

Brazil is the most populous and the largest country of Latin America. As a giant, it has common borders with all South American countries except for Chile and Ecuador. These constant factors are a kind of predestination for Brazil to play a leading role in the Latin American region. The influence that the country has been continuously gaining makes it nowadays the most influential country in the region. Recent development inside the country characterized by relative stability of political scene and an explosive economic growth make it a potential big power. An important recognition is the fact that „in Brazil, unlike in many other countries in the region and particularly Mexico, the enormous differences in

development ...did not result in political polarization.<sup>8</sup> Pro-active policy of Lula da Silva's administration (2003-2010) put the country inside the game on the world's principal forums without having omitted or underestimated the region of South America as well as Latin America in general. Brazil is the player number one in military affairs in the entire Latin American region and its military capacities are incomparably better than those of any other state of the region.

The mandate that Brazil derives from its military superiority enables the country to lead the effort toward deepening of regional integration in military and security affairs using a bold pattern comparable to the one of the NATO in the Northern hemisphere. Economic relations of the country give an example of a highly diversified economic policy stretching from the US, through the EU as far as the Asian-Pacific region.<sup>9</sup>

This balanced economic orientation, which contrasts with Mexico's dependence on the US economy, makes it possible for Brazil to act effectively on international fore and thus easily gain the trust of other states. Mercosur's strong economic structure and Brazil's dominance therein enables it to play an uncontested leading role in the integration effort of South America. A prudent foreign policy with a high level of autonomy in decision-making process as well as non-conflicting actions make it possible for Brazil to pursue a proper strategy of relations with other countries of the region, which is furthermore fomented by strong economic linkages.

### **Lula's foreign policy**

The strategy of President Lula da Silva since his takeover in January of 2003 had stressed the need for diplomatic offense in South America as well as the maintenance of a multilateral approach in the global context. In this strategy, the South American area played a crucial role and can even be conceived as a major playground of up-to-date Brazilian diplomacy. This leads to an idea that the Brazilian foreign policy under Lula became *southamericanized*. The aim and priority had been „the construction of a politically stabile and prosperous united South America“<sup>10</sup> The major distinction between Lula and his

---

<sup>8</sup> Gratius, Susanne. 2006. *Lula de nuevo: ¿influencia regional sin liderazgo?* FRIDE Comentario, november 2006. Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior, pp. 1. Accessible at: <http://www.almendron.com/politica/pdf/2006/8868.pdf> (1.3.2011)

<sup>9</sup> Terem, Peter. 2005. *Political Geography of the macroregions of the world : Australia and Oceania*. Banská Bystrica : University of Matej Bel, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations.

<sup>10</sup> Amorim, Celso. 2005. „A política externa do governo Lula : dois anos.“ *Plenarium. Revista da Câmara dos Deputados* 2, n. 2, pp. 51.

predecessor Fernando Henrique Cardoso was the level of country's political and military engagement. The ancient notion of political neutrality and military non-engagement was terminated with shortly after Lula's takeover. The point was he realized how important these two factors are in the quest for an effective leadership that can not be achieved without making use of them. The UN Mission in Haiti, where Brazil is the commanding country, and an active political role in continuously unstable Andean region are a clear example of his new approach. Thus, the economic aspect of leadership had under Lula become intertwined with two other factor of the same importance, which has a positive effect on Brazil's position in the region.

In the global context, Brazil is back on track thanks to the co-operation with other emergent powers such as India and South Africa within the framework of IBSA or in the Group of 20. IBSA's co-operation with Russia and China in the form of BRIC opens the door for Brazil to the highest levels of world economy and policy, mainly on the grounds of an immense economic power these countries represent. Recently Brazil has shown itself read to assume new responsibilities and new tasks and thus to stimulate new coalitions with potential superpowers. Diplomatic offensive led to bold ambitions in international organizations, predominantly to the claim for the permanent seat in the UN SC which makes Brazil co-operate with three other countries in a group known as G4.

In the relation with the US, Brazil continues to play the role of regional economic and political counterbalance to offset the economic influence maintained by the US mainly in Central America and Mexico. Since the time of the FTAA talks, it has remained clear that Brazil and its South American partners that support it are aware of the fact that a higher autonomy and independence from the US influence in the region can only be achieved by means of deepening the regional co-operation under the auspices of Brazil. However, even if Brazil refuses US hegemonic and unilateral leadership, the bilateral relations are not of a conflicting nature. This can be attributed to the fact of Brazil's willingness to maintain a positive dialogue and a high level of co-operation with all partners, in particular with such a crucial actor as the US undisputedly is. Besides that, strong economic ties and country's military potential make Brazil an interesting object of Washington's strategy given the fact the White House is very much aware that if it is to maintain the last pieces of its influence in the region a strategic co-operation with Brazil is inevitable.



The concept of a united South America represents „a contra-project to North America (including Mexico and Central America) dominated by the US.“<sup>11</sup> Brazil as the leader of this sub-region advocates the principles of a consensual leadership based on co-operation which contrasts with US often used unilateralism. To reach the goal, which is the formation of a hemispheric counterbalance to the US, Brazil wants to use the instruments of economic co-operation amplified by a political consensus in bilateral relations. Since Lula's takeover, Brazil made huge efforts for the benefit of regional integration and engaged itself in the conflict resolution within some countries of the region. Its diplomatic intervention in Venezuela, Bolivia as well as an offer to mediate with ELN in Colombia support the idea that the factor of political leadership has been fully accepted as a *modus operandi* of Brazil's diplomacy.

Brazil's approach to the Latin American region is marked also by the project of UNASUR introduced by former President Cardoso. This scheme creates even more favorable environment for Brazil to attain its goal of managing the political and economic co-operation of all South American states. Positive side effects of the development of such integration framework are greater political and economic stability as well as a Brazil-run equilibrium of state interests in the region.

Widening the scope of integration has become the crucial aspect of Lula's approach to South America. Thanks to his initiatives, the region is now talking about two more integration areas – energetic and military co-operation. Both initiatives resulted from his good level of relations with Hugo Chávez which enabled him to pursue his goals much more effectively, mainly owing to the influence Chávez maintains over some countries of the region – most notably Ecuador, Bolivia and Nicaragua. Joint interest of Brazil and Venezuela can be found mainly behind the scenes of the desired regional energetic alliance. Advanced co-operation of both countries by means of state-run companies PETROBRAS and PDVSA creates a base for the onset of energetic integration process.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the events of the March 2008 Andean crisis showed how inevitable it is to establish a regional forum for military and security coordination and co-operation that lead to the formation of the South American Council of Security (Consejo Suramericano de Seguridad). This proposal received

---

<sup>11</sup> Gratius, Susanne. 2007. *Brasil en las Américas: ¿Una potencia regional pacificadora?* Working Paper n. 35/2007. Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior, pp. 23-24. Accessible at: <http://www.fride.org/publicacion/223/brasil-en-las-americas-una-potencia-regional-pacificadora> (2.3.2011)

<sup>12</sup> *El País*. 2008. „Brazil y Venezuela refuerzan su alianza energética.“ March 27, 2008. Accessible at: [http://www.elpais.com/articulo/internacional/Brasil/Venezuela/refuerzan/alianza/energetica/elpepuint/20080327/elpepuint\\_11/Tes](http://www.elpais.com/articulo/internacional/Brasil/Venezuela/refuerzan/alianza/energetica/elpepuint/20080327/elpepuint_11/Tes) (2.3.2011)

Venezuela's endorsement which again highlights the crucial role this country can play in the fulfillment of Brazil's ambitions.

### **Brazil's position in Latin America**

Recent position of Brazil in the Latin American region is closely tied with its role of the leader in South American area. This leadership, exercised in both political and economic means, manifests itself also in integration impulses the country has offered. Core of its strong position in the mentioned sub-region is the existence of a strategic concept and framework of action that has been present in its foreign policy doctrine over the long run. Since the creation of Mercosur, Brazil has continuously strived for a strong position by offering compromise and dialogue with all states of the region. The phenomena of active political and military engagement, introduced at the onset of Lula's era, together with regional economic dominance helped the country to build a counter-pole of US influence in the region.

Nowadays, Brazil is the main engine of South American integration at all its fronts – from Mercosur through UNASUR as far as energetic and military issues are concerned. Thanks to Lula's ability to find the modus vivendi with Venezuela, the country succeeded in hiring a player that represents the third power center in Latin America. Venezuela, unlike Brazil, is making use of petrodollar diplomacy and offers a political and ideological alternative in the fight with the US. Chávez's influence on some countries in the region and his active engagement in integration policy make him a valuable ally for Lula who knows that a good relationship with Venezuela is a basic precondition for the realization of Brazil's policy.

Country's added value is the good level of relations with all members of the Latin American community, mainly thanks to the conciliatory approach to political disputes and a tendency to opt for a compromise solution in the sense of a community spirit. Wide dimension of its policy and global ambitions of the country, that has better political and economic position in the international arena than any other country from the region, are another important factor legitimizing Brazil's ambition to lead the whole community. At the global level, Brazil has firmly assumed the leadership of the entire region by defending its interests in the international economic arena and is ready to continue doing so in the UN SC as well.

Widening the focus scope from primarily South-American oriented to make it more Latin-American still remains a challenge for the future. Undoubtedly, Brazil has succeeded to build a leading position in South America but in order to attain its ultimate goal, it seems

inevitable to enlarge the area of action by Central America as well as The Caribbean, where still a strong US and Mexican influence persists.

## CONCLUSION

Mexico's and Brazil's position in Latin American region is determined by a set of various factors. Those such as the geographic location or area give Brazil the leading position in South America, whereas Mexico has at the same time the task to adapt to a role of a country located between two blocks with conflicting interests. This fact, jointly with its NAFTA membership that bounds Mexico significantly towards the North, complicates the possibility of gaining eventual influence in the area behind the horizons of Central America. Mexico's NAFTA membership widened the scope of its foreign policy which led to a broader orientation in the hemispherical issues, partially to the detriment of the Latin American dimension of Mexico's foreign policy. Such an important change in geopolitical environment may weaken the country if there is neither previous experience nor the required political stability to handle it.<sup>13</sup> It seems obvious that Mexico has still not been able to absorb the new realities and the process of power recuperation is very slow in its progress to a final aim which should be to play a role of a bridge and communicator between the North and the South of the hemisphere. However, should Mexico succeed in achieving this role, it can become a unique part of hemispheric geo-political architecture having a crucial task in the development of further economic and political relations between the US and Latin America. The prospected position of a connector shall not be viewed as a harm to or a weakening of country's image, on the contrary, it seems inevitable for a successful progress of the entire hemisphere.

The existence of a long-term foreign policy concept and a strategic vision are Brazil's clear advantages in comparison to Mexico. Brazil's desire to unite South America by means of various forms of integration and a wide array of co-operation initiatives demonstrates clearly its ambitions in the region and helps gain prestige and power in the global context as well.

The future of Latin America will not be characterized by a contest between Mexico and Brazil to gain the role of the leader since the core of brighter future lies in their co-operation. Another reason is the existence of centers with different power and ambitions –

---

<sup>13</sup> Ištók, Rastislav - Terem, Peter - Čajka, Peter - Rýsová, Lucia. 2010. *Political Geography*. Banská Bystrica : University of Matej Bel, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations. ISBN 978-80-557-0013-7.

mainly Mexico and Brazil, the third and slightly less important one being Venezuela. None of them has the capacity for an overall leadership in the Latin American region. Mexico has lost the prospect to become the uncontested leader of the region, but has an option to play a role of a partner and to understand the interests of his own community vis-à-vis the US that would lead up to the role of facilitator in their mutual interaction. On the other hand, Brazil as an uncontested leader of South America will face fewer obstacles to achieve its vision of South America. Problem appears when taking into account that Brazil's activities are almost exclusively concentrated in South America which can be seen as an impediment to achieve the desired position of the leader of the entire region. Thus, both Mexico and Brazil should opt for mutual co-operation and interaction in their foreign policies which is the basic prerequisite to get Latin America on the right way once and for all.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amorim, Celso. 2005. „A política externa do governo Lula : dois anos.“ *Plenarium. Revista da Câmara dos Deputados* 2, n. 2.

Anaya Muñoz, Alejandro. 2007. „La política exterior de México durante el sexenio de Vicente Fox.“ Ciudad de México: Working Paper Universidad Iberoamericana de México, Departamento de Estudios Internacionales.

Cervo, Amado Luiz. 2002. “Relações Internacionais do Brasil: Um balanço da era Cardoso.” *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 45, n. 1.

Cervo, Amado Luiz. 2003. „A política exterior: de Cardoso a Lula.” *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 46, n. 1.

González González, Guadalupe. 2007. „México en América Latina. El difícil juego del equilibrista.“ *Foreign Affairs en Español* 7, n. 4.

González Manrique, Luis Esteban. 2006. *De la conquista a la globalización : estados, naciones y nacionalismos en América Latina*. Madrid: Biblioteca nueva.

Gratius, Susanne. 2007. *Brasil en las Américas: ¿Una potencia regional pacificadora?* Working Paper n. 35/2007. Madrid: Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior.

Grayson, George W. 2001. *Mexico: changing of the guard*. New York: Foreign policy association.

Ištók, Rastislav - Terem, Peter - Čajka, Peter - Rýsová, Lucia. 2010. *Political Geography*. Banská Bystrica : University of Matej Bel, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations. ISBN 978-80-557-0013-7.

Martins Gistelinck, Myriam. 2005. *The influence of Brazil's developmental projects on its positioning in the negotiation of regional and bi-regional trade agreements*. Leuven: KU Leuven Institute for international and European policy.

Moniz Bandeira, Luis Alberto. 2005. „Política exterior do Brasil – de FHC a Lula. *Plenarium. Revista da Câmara dos Deputados* 2, n. 2.

Pellicer, Olga, et al. 2004. *Las relaciones de México con el exterior. Diagnóstico y propuestas de acción*. Ciudad de México: Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales.

Rýsová, Lucia - Kosír, Igor - Terem, Peter. 2008. *Integration Processes*. Banská Bystrica : University of Matej Bel, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations. ISBN 978-80-8083-632-0.

Soriano, Juan Pablo. 2007. „*Brasil en la política exterior de México: la búsqueda de una relación más dinámica*.“ Madrid: Análisis Real Instituto Elcano n.94/2007.

Terem, Peter. 2004. *Energetic Perspectives of the World in the 21st Century*. In: Conference book - International researcher's conference: Baar, V. (ed.) *Geography and the Transformations of Spatial Reality*. Faculty of Natural Science, University of Ostrava, Ostrava, Czech rep.; 30.-31 8. 2004.

Terem, Peter. 2005. *Political Geography of the macroregions of the world : Australia and Oceania*. Banská Bystrica : University of Matej Bel, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations.

Vinod, Thomas. 2006. *From inside Brazil: development in a land of contrasts*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Viola, Eduardo. 2005. „Transformações na posição do Brasil no sistema internacional (1990-2005). *Plenarium. Revista da Câmara dos Deputados* 2, n. 2.

## **NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES**

El País, [www.elpais.com](http://www.elpais.com)

l Universal, [www.eluniversal.com.mx](http://www.eluniversal.com.mx)

Plenarium. Revista da Câmara dos Deputados

Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional

## **OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS**

Presidencia de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. 2007. *Primer informe de gobierno*. México, D.F.: Presidencia de la República.

Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores de México. 2007. *Primer informe de labores de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores*. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores.