

---

## PRESENTATION

# Dossier “Beyond the theoretical debate: limits and potentialities of the integration between foreign policy and public policy”

Rodrigo Barros de Albuquerque<sup>1</sup>   
Cairo Gabriel Borges Junqueira<sup>2</sup> 

DOI: 10.22478/ufpb.2525-5584.2020v5n2.54800

The Public Policy field is fast-growing in Brazil. Recently, the number of specific graduate programs in the field has exceeded the graduate programs in Political Science and International Relations, in the large area of Political Science and International Relations of the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (Capes). Among the many policy areas which are usually studied under the public policy umbrella, in the last 20 years research in Brazil has produced attempts to examine foreign policy through the same theoretical and analytical tools (Couto, 2004; Sanchez, et. al. 2006; Pasquarelli, 2010; Milani, & Pinheiro, 2013; 2016; Salomón, & Pinheiro, 2013; Sorgine, & Santos, 2018)

However, in Brazil the well-known literature review papers on public policy (Melo, 1999; Souza, 2006) ignore this approach, either because studies which unite both fields were few and still very recent at that time, or because it was difficult to establish a clear and unequivocal nexus between them, demonstrating the possibility of studying foreign policy as public policy. Recent reviews (Brasil, & Capella, 2016; Batista,

---

<sup>1</sup> International Relations Department, Federal University of Sergipe (UFS).  
E-mail: [albuquerque.rodrigo@academico.ufs.br](mailto:albuquerque.rodrigo@academico.ufs.br).

<sup>2</sup> International Relations Department, Federal University of Sergipe (UFS).  
E-mail: [cairogbj@academico.ufs.br](mailto:cairogbj@academico.ufs.br).

***Albuquerque & Junqueira. Presentation – Dossier “Beyond the theoretical debate: limits and potentialities of the integration between foreign policy and public policy”***

Domingos, & Vieira, 2020) are no exception, they show that the general situation has not changed: to a large extent, foreign policy is not an issue usually approached by the researchers, journals and more traditional papers in the field of public policy.

Although abroad, in the foreign scholarly community, this approximation between the fields is much older (Hermann, 1963; Milbrath, 1967; Rourke, 1972; Zimmermann, 1973; Cohen, 1973; Ingram, 1988) and there has been an attempt to define foreign policy as public policy in Brazil (Wrobel, & Silva, 1993), with some criticism (Lima, 2000), papers seeking to establish connections between fields with the aim of open new theoretical avenues began to arise a few years later. Pioneer approaches such as Couto (2004) about judicialization and foreign policy and the one from Sanchez et. al. (2006) on the need for constitutional reforms to turn the foreign policy formulation in Brazil more akin to other public policies' formulation have paved the way for the development of a research agenda which bridges gaps between the fields of foreign policy and public policy.

Some other works go through different ways, focused on bridging theoretical gaps between the fields, or on empirical demonstration to show their feasibility. Pasquarelli (2010), for instance, examines the diplomacy of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002) and Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010) through public policy analytical lenses; Milani and Pinheiro (2013; 2016) study the pluralization of actors and agendas in foreign policy issues that shows it belongs to the public policy field; Silva and Klein (2016) examine the proposal of creating a National Council of Foreign Policy and the experience of the Brazilian Committee on Human Rights and Foreign Policy.

In all such cases, there seems to be a willingness to establish a bridge between different fields that allows foreign policy to be examined through other lenses than the traditional approaches to International Relations. In most cases, there seems to be a guideline to follow: they define foreign policy and public policy, explain why these two fields of study are connected and what are the advantages of studying foreign policy this way and defend why it should be done. In some cases, as noted in the previous paragraph, the authors empirically demonstrate their argument.

In this sense, this dossier aims to contribute to this research agenda by offering a diversified set of papers that brings together studies on public policy and studies on foreign policy. Here, there are no literature reviews on the subject, that has already been

***Albuquerque & Junqueira. Presentation – Dossier “Beyond the theoretical debate: limits and potentialities of the integration between foreign policy and public policy”***

done before and competently. Our contribution to this debate is to gather papers that help to renew and revive the debate.

The first paper, titled “The tasks of Foreign Policy in the Brazilian constitutional order: public policy with permanent and conjunctural objectives”, receives authorship of Osvaldo Quirino de Souza Filho and it problematizes the foreign policy delimitation as a state policy, government policy or even public policy. It presents the long debate about differences between policy, polity and politics, arguing that foreign policy can be better understood as public policy, as Souza Filho brings together the Theory of the State and the Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988 to conclude that the Brazilian foreign policy’s main objective is to defend the national interest, which could be also understood as public goods and services provider.

The next paper, by Ademar Pozzatti Junior and Luiza Witzel Farias, “Transfer and diffusion of health policies via international cooperation in South America: lessons from the empirical evidence of international law”, argues that foreign policy, besides being considered as public policy, stimulates other policies’ internationalization, using empirical evidence from the International Law. By examining South American health policies, the authors conclude that cooperation in health issues is strongly enacted through policy transfer and regional institutions may have a catalyst effect in stimulating public policies, highlighting that new research in the subject could be progressively developed with further interdisciplinary studies.

In continuity with the institutional analysis, but in a different issue and another scope, Camilla Geraldello writes “Brazil and WTO dispute settlement: an analysis of the Brazilian decision-making process” aiming to verify the motives behind Brazil’s decision to initiate disputes in the World Trade Organization from 1995 to 2018. Based on a case study about orange juice, the author uses a relational approach between different levels of analysis to show that Brazilian performance in search of dispute settlement may be explained through the interactions between different ministries, including Itamaraty. As Itamaraty is the main foreign policymaker in Brazil, this fact opens new agendas for future research seeking to include other domestic actors that look forward to international objectives.

Brazil is also examined by Daniel Wanderley Caliman in “Instrumentalization of Brazilian foreign policy to hegemony building: from Cardoso’s neoliberal bloc to Lula and Rousseff’s neodevelopmentalist’s”. Through an analysis tying Foreign Policy

**Albuquerque & Junqueira. Presentation – Dossier “Beyond the theoretical debate: limits and potentialities of the integration between foreign policy and public policy”**

Analysis and hegemony concepts from Antonio Gramsci and Nicos Poulantzas, the paper examines the former presidents’ foreign policies seeking to observe its particularities around the search for greater autonomy in the international system. Also alluding to the connections between foreign policy and public policy, Caliman concludes that domestic disputes between certain sectors for national hegemony, as the bourgeoisie and the working class, affect the central government’s foreign actions, as well as on the international hegemonic arrangements.

Isabela Gerbelli Garbin Ramanzini and Natanael Gomide Junior explain other analytical dimensions over the central theme of the dossier, in “Social Participation in Human Rights Regimes: comparative study between the Inter-American Human Rights System and the Mercosur Institute of Public Policy on Human Rights”. Through democratic governance, the authors try to observe the link between international and regional organizations with public participation, affirming that its operational dynamics are opposed to each other. However, the two human rights regimes are directly influenced by non-state actors, such as organized civil society, epistemic communities and non-governmental organizations, and they are interconnected, reaffirming that human rights public policies’ matter in the American continent, including the Southern Cone.

The last paper in this dossier, “Transparency and access to information in the international performance of the municipality of São Paulo”, by Danilo Garnica Simini and José Blanes Sala, highlights the internationalization of cities as public policies provider. São Paulo’s analysis is important as it pioneered the decentralized internationalization in Brazil, and it also has its own municipal bureaucratic apparatus for foreign relations. The paper verifies if São Paulo has advanced through information access concerning public transparency, noting that this is an ongoing process at a slow pace, but with great potential. It is still up to civil society to note the relevance of the city’s international actions to further public policies also in times of crisis such as the new coronavirus outbreak.

We hope that this dossier, “Beyond the theoretical debate: limits and potentialities of the integration between foreign policy and public policy”, reinforce the potentialities of the interaction between these two fields of study, showing that despite having its own particularities, the fields of public policy and foreign policy complement each other in substantial ways. The debate is still open for new approaches, analyses and observations; it is up to the Brazilian academic community to promote this multidimensional dialogue.

## **Referências**

- Batista, M., & Domingos, A., & Vieira, B. (no prelo). Políticas públicas: modelos clássicos e 40 anos de produção no Brasil. *BiB – Revista de Informação Bibliográfica*, 2020.
- Brasil, F. G., & Capella, A. C. N. (2016). Os estudos das políticas públicas no Brasil: Passado, presente e caminhos futuros da pesquisa sobre análise de políticas. *Revista Política Hoje*, 25(1), 71-90.
- Cohen, E. C. (1973). *The public impact on foreign policy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Couto, E. F. (2004). Judicialização da política externa e direitos humanos. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 47(1), 140-161.
- Hermann, C. F. (1963). Foreign policy. In S. Nagel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies*. New York, Basel: Marcel Dekker.
- Ingram, H. M., & Fiederlein, S. L. (1988). Traversing boundaries: A public policy approach to the analysis of foreign policy. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 41(4), 725-745.
- Lima, M. R. S. (2000). Instituições democráticas e política exterior. *Contexto Internacional*, 22(2), 265-303.
- Melo, M. A. (1999). Estado, governo e políticas públicas. In S. Miceli (Org.), *O que ler na ciência social brasileira (1970-1995)* (2ª ed., Cap. 2, pp. 59-100). São Paulo: Sumaré.
- Milani, C. R. S., & Pinheiro, L. (2013). Política externa brasileira: os desafios de sua caracterização como política pública. *Contexto Internacional*, 35(1), 11-41.
- Milani, C. R. S., & Pinheiro, L. (2016). The politics of Brazilian foreign policy and its analytical challenges. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 0, 1-19. doi: 10.1093/fpa/orw027
- Milbrath, L. (1967). Interest groups and foreign policy. In J. N. Rosenau (Ed.), *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy* (pp. 231-51). New York: The Free Press.
- Pasquarelli, B. V. L. (2010). Política externa como política pública: Uma análise da atuação diplomática brasileira durante o Governo Lula. *Revista Política Hoje*, 19(1), 187-221.
- Rourke, F. E. (1972). *Bureaucracy and foreign policy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Salomón, M., & Pinheiro, L. (2013). Análise de política externa e política externa brasileira: Trajetória, desafios e possibilidades de um campo de estudos. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 56(1), 40-59.

**Albuquerque & Junqueira. Presentation – Dossier “Beyond the theoretical debate: limits and potentialities of the integration between foreign policy and public policy”**

Sanchez, M. R., et. al. (2006). Política externa como política pública: Uma análise pela regulamentação constitucional brasileira (1967-1988). *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, 27, 125-143.

Silva, D. C.; & Klein, M. (2016). A política externa brasileira como política pública: A proposta de um Conselho Nacional e a experiência do Comitê Brasileiro de Direitos Humanos e Política Externa. *Mural Internacional*, 7(2), 203-218. doi: 10.12957/rmi.2016.26899

Sorgine, G. F., & Santos, M. H. C. (2018). A política externa brasileira como política pública: Elementos para análise e debate. *Meridiano 47 – Journal of Global Studies*, 47(19), 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20889/M47e19009>

Souza, C. (2006). Políticas públicas: Uma revisão da literatura. *Sociologias*, 8(16), 20-45.

Wrobel, P. S., & Silva, A. M. (1993). Entrevista com Celso Lafer. *Revista Estudos Históricos*, 1993, 6(12), 271-284.

Zimmerman, W. (1973). Issue area and foreign-policy process: A research note in search of a general theory. *American Political Science Review*, 67, 1204-1212.