

**Development Studies Association**  
**Rising Powers Study Group One Day Workshop - “Rising Powers in 2018”**  
**23 April 2018**  
Venue: G.01, 20 Kingsway, LSE

**Organisers:** Lidia Cabral (Institute of Development Studies, Sussex), Kathy Hochstetler (Department of International Development, LSE), Rory Horner (Global Development Institute, Manchester).

**Workshop Context:** In 2018, to what extent does it make sense to refer to ‘rising powers’?

The rising powers have attracted considerable attention this millennium, both in terms of their own development domestically as well as their influence abroad. Yet, rising power countries like those in the BRICS group – Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa – each have their own trajectories, nor are they all clearly rising.

At the same time, the influence of the rising powers is perhaps greater than ever before. Whether it be trade, finance, technology, knowledge, or people, flows between developing countries – South-South – are prominent in shaping development outcomes. Xi Jinping has recently announced that China will take a lead in global governance. While never equals, greater heterogeneity has emerged amongst countries in the global South with the growth and transformation of some of the rising powers while other countries and actors remain more marginal.

**Key questions:** This one-day workshop addresses topics and questions including, but not limited to:

- How are the rising powers transforming 21<sup>st</sup> century globalisation?
- How are rising powers shaping development across different domain areas?
- To what extent does it make sense to still talk of rising powers or of South-South cooperation?
- Are we entering a new era of polycentric flows of trade, ideas and power?

**Monday 23 April**

**11:00           Arrival & tea/coffee**

**11.00 – 11.15   Welcome and Introduction**

Lidia Cabral, Kathy Hochstetler and Rory Horner

**11.15 – 12.45   Session 1: Trade, intellectual property and investment**

Chair: Rory Horner, University of Manchester

**How Developing Countries Became Collateral Damage in a US-China Battle: The New Politics of Agricultural Subsidies at the WTO**

Kristen Hopewell, University of Edinburgh

**Quantitative analysis of governance and upgrading patterns in the relationship of Kenyan suppliers with Chinese and European buyers**

Giovanni Pasquali, University of Oxford

**The international political economy of intellectual property: mapping the asymmetries between countries and regions**

Jose Paulo Guedes, LSE

**Fiscal effects of South-South Cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa**

Magdalene Silberberger, Witten/Herdecke University

**12.45 – 1.30    Lunch**

**1.30 – 3.00     Session 2: Knowledge and framings on rising powers: time for a conceptual update?**

Chair: Lidia Cabral, IDS

**The decline of rising powers: State capture, Lava Jato and the future trajectory of Brazil and South Africa**

Kathy Hochstetler, LSE

**Stuck with 'rising powers'? Thoughts on the use of and alternatives to a dominant terminology**

Sebastian Haug, University of Cambridge

**Rising Powers and the 'Universal' Development Agenda: Opportunities and Obstacles for South-North Learning**

Jenny Constantine, King's College London and Alex Shankland, Institute of Development Studies

**Producing geography: China and international development knowledges**

Han Cheng, University of Cambridge

**3.00 – 3.30     Tea/coffee**

**3.30 – 5.00     Session 3: South-South cooperation**

Chair: Emma Mawdsley, University of Cambridge

**Anxieties of the emerging donor: The Korean development experience and the politics of international development cooperation**

Jamie Doucette, University of Manchester

**Negotiating accountability in South-South Cooperation: An initial mapping of emerging concurring narratives**

Laura Trajber-Waisbich, University of Cambridge

**The discursive construction of Brazilian SSC in agriculture and health: the political and apolitical effects in Mozambique**

Helena De-Moraes-Achcar, LSE

**Migrant development experts fleeing the void: the new champions of Brazil's internationalisation?**

Lídia Cabral, IDS and Carlos Aurélio de Faria, Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais, Brazil

**5.00-6.00     Final Roundtable: Rising Powers in 2018**

Chair: Kathy Hochstetler, LSE

**Emma Mawdsley**, University of Cambridge - South-South Cooperation in the decade ahead: the consequences of 'success' in reshaping narratives, (non-)interference and convergence

**Jing Gu**, Institute of Development Studies - China's New Role in Global Development and its Approaches to Development Cooperation

## **Abstracts in order of presentation**

### **How developing countries became collateral damage in a US-China battle: The new politics of agricultural subsidies at the WTO**

Kristen Hopewell, University of Edinburgh

This article shows how China's rise has radically altered the politics of one of the most prominent and controversial issues in the global trading system: agriculture subsidies. Agriculture subsidies depress global prices and undermine the competitiveness and livelihoods of poor farmers, and therefore have been long seen as a symbol of the injustice of the trading system. The issue has traditionally been understood in North-South terms, with developed countries seen as the perpetrators of harm and developing countries as innocent victims. In this article, however, I challenge this prevailing conception of the agricultural subsidies issue, arguing that it is now out of date and no longer corresponds with the emerging reality. A momentous but underappreciated change has taken place, largely beneath the radar of IPE scholarship: China has emerged as the world's largest subsidizer, profoundly transforming the global politics of agricultural subsidies. From a North-South battle, WTO negotiations on agricultural subsidies are now primarily centered on a conflict between the US and China. While reducing subsidies remains a pressing concern for developing countries, efforts to negotiate new and strengthened disciplines at the WTO have been thwarted by an impasse between the two dominant powers. Amid a clash between the US and China, the interests of developing countries have become collateral damage.

### **Quantitative analysis of governance and upgrading patterns in the relationship of Kenyan suppliers with Chinese and European buyers**

Giovanni Pasquali, University of Oxford

Drawing on disaggregated export transaction data over a 10-years period (2006-2015), this paper analyses the relationship between market trajectories, governance, and upgrading among Kenyan suppliers at all levels of the leather value chain.

This study represents a first attempt at quantifying governance relationships by assessing the dyadic stability of buyer-supplier exchanges. Moreover, using unit values as an indicator of product upgrading and HS coding as an indicator of functional upgrading, the correlation between market trajectories and upgrading is further assessed. Methodologically, this is achieved by means of a linear probability model combining between- and within-firm analysis through pooled OLS and Fixed Effect (FE) models. The impact of industrial policy on upgrading is further established through the adoption of a FE difference-in-differences model. Generalised ordered logit is used to establish the robustness of the outcome. Final results show how participation in South-North, South-South, and regional value chains display very different dynamics in terms of governance and upgrading. While suppliers involved in South-North value chains experience higher degrees of product upgrading, they fail to functionally upgrade. Conversely, regional and local value chains witness most of the value addition. Moreover, larger suppliers establish more stable and integrated governance ties with increasing access to mid-levels of processing. Yet, upgrading into manufacturing is characterised by smaller firms with less direct ties, usually embedded in South-South and regional value chains.

### **The international political economy of intellectual property: mapping the asymmetries between countries and regions**

Jose Paulo Guedes, LSE

Since the late 1980s, a group of countries has been able to impose an international standard of protection for intellectual property that directly benefits their business interests. After some initial resistance, several developing countries accepted the intellectual property rights as either part of a policy of economic modernization that would guarantee them an active insertion in the so-called "knowledge society", or a requirement for the country to enter the World Trade Organization (WTO). One of the results has been the exponential increase of flows derived from intellectual property rights in different countries and regions, part of which are recorded on their balance of payments. This research aims to elicit and organize these records in order to assess a key aspect of the insertion of several countries in the international division of labour in the 21st century, identifying the countries and regions that benefit the most from and those that are most harmed by these new international legal arrangements concerning intellectual property. In this talk, I will present the data collected and organized so far. The initial findings show that the majority of the flows derived from the use of Intellectual Property Rights are concentrated in the developed nations, with high income levels, and in the Northern America and Western Europe regions. The so-called "rising powers" still don't play a major role regarding these flows, despite their geographical and economic size, and despite their role in the trade flows with the world. The initial conclusions are that the IP-intensive industry leads to the concentration of the most creative activities and large (or dimeasured) amounts of wealth derived from this kind of "immaterial" production within the developed world. And also to the displacement of traditional industrial labour to dependent enterprises, many of them located in developing countries, including the so-called "rising powers".

### **Fiscal effects of South-South cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa**

Magdalene Silberberger, Witten/Herdecke University

Many developing countries, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, face the challenge to increase domestic revenue. Administrative weaknesses, corruption and small tax base and tax evasion are among the issues related to taxation. Strengthening fiscal management capacity is thus on the agenda of those countries as well as development agencies. At the same time, South-South cooperation, e.g. investment and aid by China, India and Brazil, has increased significantly. It is considered as complementary to North-South cooperation and possibly more beneficial since low-income countries are not merely recipients but partners and the similarity of countries enables them to form common development agendas, exchange knowledge, transfer technology and find collective solutions. Its role in Sub-Saharan Africa has increased throughout the years and China has become a major economic partner for many African countries. While the potential positive development impacts seem substantial, it has been widely accepted that there are certain requirements for South-South cooperation to be beneficial, most importantly strong leadership of all partners and engagement in horizontal partnership, much of which is lacking in many Sub-Saharan African countries and their partnerships with usually economically more powerful partners. This paper empirically addresses the question whether South-South cooperation supports fiscal capacity building. To investigate these issues we first conduct a panel study using tax data and different indicators to proxy for fiscal capacity for 36 SSA countries, trying to determine the impact of cooperation – both investment and aid – from 2000 onwards.

### **The decline of rising powers: State capture, Lava Jato and the future trajectory of Brazil and South Africa**

Kathy Hochstetler, LSE

The language of rising powers implies a steady upward trajectory. Yet two of the countries often called rising powers have spent much of the last years mired in corruption scandals with anaemic growth. In Brazil, a questionable impeachment process and the *Lava Jato* court cases have ensnared many

prominent politicians and economic actors, including some like former President Lula and the construction firm Odebrecht that were at the very centre of Brazilian aspirations for international leadership and economic expansion. In South Africa, well-documented claims of state capture, with tight interlinkages between leading SOEs, top bureaucrats, and then-President Jacob Zuma and his family have contributed to an anaemic economy that never matched national aspirations and needs. This presentation will present some of that evidence, focusing on the energy sector where I have recently been doing research. I will also try to address how these experiences might shape what we think an emerging power must be.

### **Stuck with 'rising powers'? Thoughts on the use of and alternatives to a dominant terminology**

Sebastian Haug, University of Cambridge

I want to address two issues in my contribution. First, I want to share my thoughts on the use of 'rising powers' terminology when studying the sphere of international/global development. I suggest that, while 'rising powers' terminology comes with some problematic baggage, it might still make sense to refer to 'rising powers' in at least three ways: (1) when we analyse references to 'rising powers' as empirical phenomena connected to specific texts, actors and spaces (e.g. state representatives that refer to their country as a 'rising power'); (2) when we refer to a body of academic and policy literature that has used 'rising powers' terminology to grasp – and shape – specific empirical phenomena (e.g. debates on the difference between 'traditional' and 'emerging' middle powers); and (3) when we reflexively use 'rising powers' as a strategic shorthand to refer to academic and policy discourses on actors and spaces that are said to be increasingly dominant/influential (e.g. by saying that our research focuses on so-called 'rising powers'). Second, I want to introduce a few conceptual ideas about how to go beyond the 'rising powers' terminology by sharing insights from my research on Mexico and Turkey. I suggest that conceptualising international/global development as a social field (following Bourdieu inspired accounts) allows us to analyse the positionalities of specific players in a structured social space. This provides the foundation for drawing on a range of different conceptual tools (in my case the concept of liminality) to investigate the roles and positions of actors and spaces that have been referred to as 'rising powers'. This, I argue, leads to a more nuanced picture of the 'polycentric' flows currently shaping world politics in general and international/global development in particular.

### **Rising powers and the 'universal' development agenda: Opportunities and obstacles for South-North learning**

Jenny Constantine (King's College London) and Alex Shankland (Institute of Development Studies)

There has long been acknowledgement from some thinkers within the field of Development Studies that countries of the Global North face their own challenges of 'development' and could and should benefit from experience in the South. The "development for everyone, everywhere" logic of the SDGs – albeit contested – has given this a new relevance, and ongoing geopolitical shifts have given it a new urgency, with Rising Powers becoming increasingly visible as sources of new knowledge flows as well as new capital flows and influence. However, despite increasingly frequent rhetorical mentions there is little sign that mutual, multi-directional or South-North learning processes are becoming a more central part of the global development cooperation agenda. This paper will outline the opportunities and potential impact of South-North learning processes, and also the obstacles that such processes face within the confines of 'international development'. It will draw on case studies of UK-Brazil exchanges in two key areas – food and nutrition security policy, and health system development – to discuss the role of institutional, material and ideational factors in enabling or constraining knowledge flows between Rising Powers and former colonial aid donor countries.

## **Producing geography: China and international development knowledges**

Han Cheng, University of Cambridge

My contribution addresses the growing production of Chinese international development knowledges. By development knowledges, I refer to both the means and ends of development, including the projection of international development, and also the practical approaches to development. These knowledges are not given, but rather deeply contested constructs. Historically, the production of Western (to simply) international development knowledges is significantly shaped by ideological, geopolitical, institutional, cultural, and other processes. Drawing on this theoretical framework, my contribution seeks to critically assess how a number of leading Chinese knowledge producers understand, frame and articulate international development. Under the current political leadership, China is explicitly expanding to produce its international development knowledges. A group of institutions and individuals have emerged as influential players through decade-long unique discourses in the Chinese landscape of (international) development. In particular, their knowledge production draws upon both its Chinese domestic experiences, and also dialogue and partnerships with the South and North. My paper focuses on the polycentric flows of development knowledges, and how they are assembled into play. The presentation will be a preliminary report of evidence from my current fieldwork in Beijing, which looks at the perception, negotiation, and appraisal of various development knowledges. In the paper, I will provide an account of empirical observation, and discuss how this may contribute to academic and wider understandings with regards to China's role in international development.

## **Anxieties of the emerging donor: The Korean development experience and the politics of international development cooperation**

Jamie Doucette, University of Manchester

This article examines recent knowledge sharing initiatives aimed at promoting South Korea's development experience as a 'development alternative', and questions the coherence of the narratives being shared. Through interviews with development practitioners and interrogation of policy narratives, I examine how South Korea's development cooperation initiatives occupy a 'zone of awkward engagement.' This is a zone that has been produced by pressures for Korea to *export* a version of the developmental state model, *extend* the overseas activities of domestic businesses, and *entertain* the ambitions of ruling political blocs. By examining how practitioners navigate these pressures and the anxieties it creates for them, the article highlights some of the limits and possibilities that shape the promotion of the developmental state as an alternative development model and questions discursive claims of emerging donors and South-South cooperation that privilege empathy and reciprocity as drivers of development cooperation.

## **Negotiating accountability in South-South Cooperation: An initial mapping of emerging concurring narratives**

Laura Trajber-Waisbich, University of Cambridge

Accountability is a major buzzword in international development cooperation (IDC) (Cornwall and Eade 2010; McGee 2013). Is also one of those ambiguous, open-ended and highly contested development concepts (Mosse 2005; Eyben and Ferguson 2004). Yet, *how* is accountability in/of SSC being conceived and negotiated, *what* mechanisms (formal and informal) are being put into practice, and *what* forms of accountability politics (Fox 2007) are playing out in SSC?

For long accountability remained a marginal concept within official narratives of SSC and domestic policy debates. Few scholars have taken on the challenge to analyse accountability politics in/of SSC. Not anymore. SSC providers are under mounting internal (from government agencies and domestic constituencies) and external (from development partners in the North and in the South, as well as from local and transnational civil society actors) pressure to justify policy choices, practices and outcomes. In this paper I argue that distinct forms of accountability politics are playing out in major SSC players, embedded in concurring narratives on what accountability in/of SSC is or should be. I also attempt to create an initial taxonomy of four coexisting narratives, namely: *Accountability as Horizontality*, *Accountability as Transparency*, *Accountability as Learning*, and *Accountability from Below*.

Drawing on critical development studies, critical international relations, and policy diffusion, I use the example of Brazil, China, India and the BRICS-led New Development Bank as to illustrate on-going domestic and global disputes over ideas, meanings and practices of accountability in/of SSC.

### **The discursive construction of Brazilian SSC in agriculture and health: the political and apolitical effects in Mozambique**

Helena De-Moraes-Achcar, LSE

In the 2000s, Brazil had signed two of its most important SSC projects with Mozambique: the ProSavana, which at least officially meant to address the country's food insecurity, and the ARV factory, a public health instrument to assure the treatment of HIV in a highly affected country. As part of a political project, SSC was meant to be "our response to an unequal and unjust social order incapable of resolving old problems" (Lula, 2010). After fieldwork in Brazil and Mozambique, my research aims to examine the discourse of the institutions responsible for the transfer of technology for the ProSavana and the ARV factory: Embrapa and Fiocruz, and asks whether their discourse contributed to the politicization of development. I argue that in the case of ProSavana, a hegemonic and depoliticized discourse found resistance from a seemingly counter-hegemonic narrative, while in the case of Fiocruz, despite a convergence with the official discourse and its political view of development, the complexities of an aid dependent country whose structure had long been shaped by the traditional donors offered resistance towards Fiocruz's original plans.

### **Migrant development experts fleeing the void: the new champions of Brazil's internationalisation?**

Lídia Cabral (Institute of Development Studies) and Carlos Aurélio de Faria (Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais)

This brief presentation will share some preliminary ideas for a new study on the internationalisation of Brazil (and Brazil-made development policy ideas) in the post-2015, a period marked by the virtual withdrawal of the Brazilian government and economic agents from the international sphere. The study will focus on a relatively new community of development experts and professionals that emerged during the 'golden age' of Brazil's international engagement (circa 2005-14). The economic downturn and political turbulence the country faced since about 2013-14 resulted, however, in the significant reduction of overseas ventures by government and the private sector, which meant that the new development experts were soon to lose the opportunity to exercise and expand on their newly acquired subject of expertise and, in some cases, lose their jobs. Facing an inhospitable political environment and the sudden void in relation to their expertise, many 'fled' the country in search for more stimulating opportunities overseas. We will consider in particular the migration of experts into the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). We will explore how (and why) the FAO has offered both as a channel

for maintaining the international flow of Brazilian recent policy experiences and ideas as well as a temporary exile for Brazil's development experts, awaiting the winds of change back home.

### **South-South Cooperation in the decade ahead: the consequences of 'success' in reshaping narratives, (non-)interference and convergence**

Emma Mawdsley (Cambridge)

Perhaps the most significant trend in international development over the last 10-15 years has been the remarkable expansion of South-South Cooperation (SSC). This paper takes stock of longer term and more recent trajectories to make the case that the *successes* of the expansionary phase of SSC are resulting in notable shifts in narratives, modalities and institutions. In the coming decade SSC will, I suggest, be more broadly inclined towards pragmatic, outcome-oriented narrative framing of economic diplomacy than at present; will find increasing difficulty in maintaining claims to non-interference; and Southern partners will show – on balance – less ideational and operational distinction from more 'established' development partners. The implications of these changes are varied. Some partners and programmes might contract, as is underway in Brazil. In other cases, they may underpin more 'effective' and managed development partnerships – although what this might mean in practice and in whose interests is a more open question. SSC institutions are likely to continue to evolve, consolidate and strengthen, allowing improved planning and monitoring, as well as giving SSC providers more confidence and experience in bilateral and multilateral negotiations. While certainly continuing to assert and practice a distinctive set of principles and practices, the successful expansion of SSC (by any yardstick) means that the decade ahead will not simply be more of the same.

### **China's new role in global development and its approaches to development cooperation**

Jing Gu, University of Sussex

In recent years, there has been intense debate about the nature of the contribution made by Chinese development cooperation, especially in Africa and Asia. In order to understand and interpret the Chinese discourse surrounding development cooperation, this presentation discusses the evolution of the Chinese approaches to development cooperation; the differences between Chinese and Western approaches to aid, including whether the two are converging or diverging, and outlines the primary institutions and policies that guide China's practices in development cooperation and South-South Cooperation.