

Alfredo G. A. Valladão is a Professor at the Paris School of International Affairs (Sciences Po-Paris) where he teaches Latin American geopolitics. He is a Member of the Board of Trustees of UNITAR and President of the Advisory Board of the EUBrasil, a Brussels-based association dedicated to encouraging dialogue between Brazil and the institutions of the European Union. From 1999-2010 he was the Director of the Mercosur Chair at Sciences Po, focused on European Union-South America relations, and was the Editor of twenty collective books on regional integration and bilateral trade negotiations, as well as eight books and reports on bilateral defense and security issues. He was the Coordinator of the Working Group on EU-Mercosur Negotiations, and he launched and coordinated – in partnership with the Brazilian representation of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung – the Annual International Conference of Fort Copacabana on “Defense and Security European-South American Dialogue”. Since 1995, Dr. Valladão has a weekly radio op-ed column at Radio France International (RFI – Brazilian Service) and from 1981-1993 he was Columnist and Diplomatic Correspondent for the daily newspaper Libération (Paris).

Brazil, India, and China: Emerging Powers and Warfare

Alfredo G. A. Valladão

A twenty-first-century 'Emerging Power' (EmPo) faces an unprecedented challenge: how to pursue a traditional Westphalian sovereign power rise in an increasingly interdependent, post- Westphalian world. Most of the new century's challenges have a universal character that threatens an emerging 'international community interest' – or 'interest of mankind' (Pardo A., 1967; Baslar K., 1998) – and have to be tackled by collective action. Traditional rivalries between national interests do not disappear, but they are strongly limited by this new political environment.

The rise of the new EmPos – and of their military capabilities – is a direct consequence of their brisk economic successes, boosted by the global marketplace and growing interdependence. Paradoxically, globalization has also undermined a country's capacity to master its own economy, the most important ingredient of traditional national power. 'Money is the sinews of war and the grease of peace,' wrote Richelieu in the 17th century (Cardinal de Richelieu, 1740: 123). Obviously, some states are more sovereign than others, but this slow dilution of power also applies to the last 'omnipower' (Legro, J. W., 2008: 2). The US is the main promoter and defender of last resort of this globalization process, which at the same time is restricting its own margins for sovereign action (Valladão A., 2006: 243-260).

Nowadays, any emerging country that seeks to enhance its own influence in world politics cannot but develop a strategy of further integration into the global economy. The bigger the power ambition, the larger the part

one will have to play in strengthening the present liberal order which, in turn, is watering down the 'national' state power. This does not make it impossible to break collective rules, to ignore international institutions, to adopt different degrees of mercantilist self-centered policies, or even to indulge in military adventures. It simply means that the price to be paid for such conduct is getting higher and higher.

Status-Seeking versus Accountancy

Emerging Powers are trapped in a dilemma. On one hand, they are struggling for important changes in the post-World War II power system in order to be admitted as peer players in the exclusive Big Power club. But on the other hand, they are also compelled by the need to maintain the status quo from which they derive their growing international protagonism. EmPos are, essentially, status-seeking – but not necessarily accountable – powers. They want to make sure that the present system keeps favoring their national 'emergence' and they try to ramp-up enough political clout to secure that global strategic decision-making outcomes will not hamper their 'rise' to power. For the moment, they are pushing for seats at the decisionmakers' table, but are still very reluctant to assume their part of responsibility for building and implementing a new international collective order that could constrain their own sovereign margins for maneuver. 'If your not at the table, you are on the menu', says the popular dictum. But that doesn't necessarily mean that you have to do the cooking.

No EmPo is envisioning its future as a world hegemon. Their ultimate goal, for the time being, is to become strong enough to be able to play balance of power games without rocking the boat. But they are confronted with a delicate balancing act: pursuing their ambition of building national strategic military capabilities in order to be taken seriously by the established powers and, at the same, being compelled to answer the call to become ever more engaged in the collective defense against global threats. Now, an ever-deeper security and defense cooperation with the established powers may jeopardize their chief priorities: a self-defined military doctrine and force organization with a power-balancing bias, as well as independent defense and procurement policies.

BICs – Brazil, India, China: The Three Big "Emerging Powers"

One should beware of 'Eurocentric' *parti pris*. Each state has its own strategic culture rooted in its historical military experience and in the role that the armed forces played in its statebuilding process. EmPos have very diverse historical paths. The standard tools developed for studying the Western way of war (e.g. Jones A., 1987; Fuller J.F.C., 1957; Howard M., 1976) are definitely not enough to understand the actual foundations of the military strategies and security perceptions of the new powers (Black J., 2004).

Another difficulty is defining who is an 'Emerging Power' in geostrategic terms. Jim O'Neill's 2003 'BRICs' economic metaphor (Wilson D. and Purushothaman R., 2003) lumping together Brazil, Russia India and China, cannot answer that question. If Brazil can certainly be labeled an EmPo, India and China could be better defined as 're-emerging' powers, while Russia can be seen as a 'submerging' ex-superpower. Sometimes, for

reasons of regional representation or intra-regional sensitivities, South Africa, Mexico, Argentina, South Korea or Indonesia are placed in the EmPo category. But none of these states, not even Indonesia, has the resources and clout to play a meaningful role in global affairs in the foreseeable future². Actually, Brazil, India and China (or ‘BICs’) are the most serious candidates: they are ‘monster countries’ (Kennan G., 1994: 143) with enormous territorial, natural and human resources, they are already exerting a fair degree of influence outside their own regions, and they have been showing a strong will to make use of this newfound influence.

Differently from Western experiences (European, North American and, in part, post-Meiji era Japan), BICs don’t have a history of imperial expansionism and force projection in far away places³. Their armed forces served more as guarantors of internal stability and defense against foreign threats and incursions. Before their modern ‘nation-state’ status, they were all self-contained ‘empires’ (or, sometimes, part of foreign controlled empires) much more concerned about holding their many parts together, under a single authority, than conquering new territories. Most of the time, military confrontations were the result of internal political fragmentation, with local power centers competing for pre-eminence or trying to secede. As for defense against foreign enemies, battles were more local border wars and skirmishes or, as in the case of India and China, huge defeats against a much stronger invader.

Old Defensive Strategic Cultures

Traditionally, the possession of a vast and diverse landmass has its strengths and weaknesses. Strength, because a hostile power had to think twice before planning to conquer and administer such huge spaces and masses of human beings. Weakness, because of the difficulties of maintaining centralized control and political stability in view of ever-resurgent centrifugal local political ambitions and the sheer size of forces needed to cover a geographical behemoth. These particularities have nurtured a specific strategic culture. War is seen through defensive lenses: holding a neighbor’s hostile forces at the borders and suppressing domestic insurgencies. Therefore, the objective of inter-state warfare is not allout ‘victory’, but the best possible political settlement allowing a return to the status quo ante – though this prudent approach did not often applied to the power rivalries of intra-state conflicts. This is a long way from the European or American focus on expeditionary campaigns or some hardcore expressions of the ‘Western way of war’ – particularly in the US military tradition – with its ‘Jomini bent’ on mobilizing every resource available in order to secure the enemy’s unconditional capitulation (Colson B., 1993)⁴.

In this defensive strategic culture, priority was given to building up very large land forces, leaving the naval and aerial components in a weak and subordinate role. Part of the Army was assigned to man the most problematic borders in peacetime, but its primary mission was domestic: population and territorial control. The military played (and still play) a large number of domestic functions: constabulary force, civil engineering, social assistance, relief operations and repression against domestic opposition or insurgencies (sometimes akin to actual war operations). Procurement and deployment of the

two other forces were directly linked to the Army's specific missions. Air Forces, developed in the 1950-1980s, were made mainly of helicopters and tactical aircraft adapted for the defense of mainland and possible counter-insurgency roles. Surface-to-air missiles and anti-aircraft guns against foreign aerial threats complemented these missions. Obviously, each BIC country had to adjust its Air Force assignments to a more or less conflictive environment. For China, defense of the mainland against aerial and tank offensives was the top priority, while India had to give more weight to close air support, tactical bombing and air superiority for border war operations⁵. Brazil, on the other hand, benefiting from its significantly safe neighborhood, could prioritize domestic aerial missions (civilian airlift and interception of crime-related civilian aircraft) alongside the classical mainland defense. Absent from this picture, was any serious aerial power projection capabilities. As for the BIC's Navies, they were clearly underdeveloped and their missions were limited to a coastal role – and even this circumscribed task could hardly be met most of the time. But it is also true that they could rely for their security, sometimes reluctantly, on the Pax Americana guaranteed by the US blue-water fleets.

During the 1960-1970s, a last and new element was added to these essentially defensive grand strategies: the nuclear dimension. Nuclear (small) arsenals were not seen as tools to play balance of power games with the two great Cold War superpowers, but as a way to 'sanctuarize' the national territory against neighboring powers and foreign aggression in general. China, in the 1960s, was first in acquiring an atomic weapons capability. Its main goal was status seeking – to enhance its position as a permanent member of the UN Security Council by becoming a member of the exclusive nuclear powers' club – but it was also to buy an insurance policy against possible future threats to its territory coming from the USSR, the US or even Japan. In the 1970s and 1980s, development of a nuclear deterrent was pursued by all three BICs, basically in the framework of regional arms races: India versus China and Pakistan, Brazil versus Argentina, China versus the USSR and India⁶.

Accumulating Power Without Sparking Hostile Reactions

The novelty, in the last ten to fifteen years, is the 'emergence' of the BIC countries as putative global players. Now they have to pay attention to the impact of their rise to power not only on their neighborhood, but also on the world at large. They are also confronted with the necessity to protect a set of national interests situated very far away from home (trade flows, lines of communication, access to raw materials, space...). In addition, they now have to manage actively the consequences of a more open relationship with the outside world on their own political systems and on their political elites' hold on power (flows of global information, cultural and population control). For the first time, they are forced to become committed players in the international arena.

In today's interdependent world system, newcomers are deeply dependent on reliable and beneficial working relationships with the traditional powers. The BICs have to square the circle on how to keep accumulating power and asserting it in the world scene, without triggering a hostile reaction from those they are displacing and that could destroy their ambitions. The most explicit political theorization of this delicate balancing

act was China's 'peaceful rise' concept introduced in its official foreign policy, in 2003, at the beginning of the Hu Jintao administration – before being abandoned, one year later, in favor of 'peaceful development,' a less benevolent and less constraining concept (Glaser B. & Medeiros E., 2007: 291-310).

In this context, military power is being perceived as a way to pursue a two-track policy. First, as a means to consolidate the country's 'rise', above all in its own region – considered as an indispensable step in the road to become a global player. Second, in order to be recognized as a cooperative non-threatening partner by the established powers – EmPos have to show their willingness to take responsibility for the maintenance of global security. Trying to put together a military apparatus that can combine these two broad missions is a tall order and can only be an incremental and lengthy process.

Military Modernization: The Capacity to Say “NO”

BICs have many differences, but there is a common pattern concerning their military strategies' priorities. Regarding the 'first track' – to become the most important regional military power – all of them are trying to build modern war fighting capabilities to ensure their traditional missions (border and domestic security) but, also – and mainly – to achieve two new strategic goals. First: the capability to 'say no', which means a credible deterrence against established powers' pressures. Today, nuclear 'mutual assured destruction' has limited use when faced with the overwhelming power of modern conventional high-tech weapons. One does not counter a circumscribed conventional aggression with a suicidal nuclear strike. This is leading the EmPos to enhance their nuclear capabilities (for those who do have one, which is not the case of Brazil) but also to search for conventional military solutions. All of them are prioritizing, one-way or another, the idea of 'asymmetric warfare', which, in this context, means acquiring and mastering high-end civilian and military technology, not primarily for long-range force projection (at least for the time being), but in order to deter big power or rival regional power interventions in their near-abroad. In the last decade, all EmPos have been reformulating their military missions and acquiring high-tech capabilities, particularly in the field of information and network centric warfare.

The second strategic goal is to build an overwhelming 'regional' military power, not only as deterrence against neighbors but also as a way to affirm one's leadership. This entails growing military capabilities to project power in the near abroad. This evolution from a 'passive' to a more 'pro-active' defense posture is also linked to the new security challenges arising from the BICs' dependence on the global economy. Reliable export and imports transport routes for goods, energy, mineral and agriculture commodities, parts and components, are at the core the EmPos' economic performance. To provide security for their strategic trade flows – Sea Lines of Communications (SLOCs) in particular – and to uphold their sovereignties over their Exclusive Economic Zones or other large resources-rich national territories (e.g. the Amazon) are fast becoming primary missions of their armed forces. That means enhancing strategic reach and out-of-area capabilities as well as building and strengthening the capacity for joint operations between the three forces.

Asserting dominance over a wider area beyond traditional defense perimeters has been translated into anti-access/area denial strategies, clearly pursued by the Chinese military (US Department of Defense, 2009: 10-19), but also present in India and, with less emphasis, in Brazil. The mainly outmoded territorial defense forces are being converted into modern flexible forces able to operate and to project power, at least in their enlarged neighborhood, in both offensive and defensive mode. Ground forces, while still remaining the backbone of domestic security, are shedding their static defense traditions and adopting a more offensive maneuver-oriented posture. Modern conventionally armed short and medium range missiles, land-, air- and sea-launched, as well as cruise missiles, are being added to the force structures. Air defense is being tailored for local air dominance. Air forces are procuring modern strike aircraft for extended regional air operations beyond their national borders – including, in the case of China and India, maritime strike planes equipped with anti-ship missiles –, and aerial refueling and early warning and control capabilities (AEW&C). Yet, the real novel development is certainly the new priority given to build relevant green- and even blue-water navies: conventional and nuclear-powered submarines, advanced destroyers and frigates equipped with anti-ship cruise missiles (ASCM), and aircraft carriers that are slowly and gradually showing the flag in maneuvers or missions sometimes far away from their littoral environments. Finally, the EmPos have wakened up to the crucial importance of space for the modern battlefield.

“Asymmetric Warfare” Doctrine

Each EmPos have to cope with very specific geopolitical situations. First, there is a clear distinction between those who live in dangerous Westphalian environments (regional power military competition, border tensions, ‘vital’ strategic threats to their sovereignty) and those who benefit from a more pacified milieu: China and India on one hand, Brazil in the other. Second, these countries are differentiated by the degree of vulnerability of their political regimes. Legitimacy of the national political system and institutions, and the presence – or not – of radical anti-systemic opposition movements are two key elements that determine the military vision and planning. If regime survival is perceived as the top priority of the power elite, the control of the domestic population will be placed high in the agenda of the security forces, and the armed forces’ ‘police’ function will be important. Even civilian information flows and technologies are seen as lethal weapons. China, as well as other authoritarian non- EmPo regimes, like Iran, Venezuela, Cuba or North Korea, have been trumpeting that they are engaged in ‘information wars’. Democracy represents the great divide. The power elites of democratic Brazil or India feel safer than China’s Communist Party (CCP) leadership, and this has a deep impact on their conceptions about the role of the armed forces and about war itself.

China: Near-Abroad Dominance

China’s ruling elites are confronted with perceived threats arising from a regional nuclear balance of power, border disputes with India, Japan and some of the South China Sea coastal states, possible spillover effects of the Afghanistan-Pakistan-India tensions,

North Korean uncertainties, old anxieties about the Sino-Russian border, and the overwhelming presence of the US Navy in the region. But they also have to deal with domestic instability: the Taiwan conundrum, the Tibetan and Uyghur revolts, growing regional imbalances between coastal and interior provinces, worsening of social inequalities, and the fear of a gradual loss of legitimacy of the CCP rule. How to deal with the linkage between these external and internal dimensions is at the core of what China's strategists call the 'comprehensive national power'. In their latest Defense White Papers, military authorities have clearly stated that security issues are related to upholding national security and unity, as well as to the struggles for strategic resources and strategic locations and dominance, like energy, commodities, finance, information or shipping routes. This broad combination of tasks is expressed in the doctrine of 'asymmetric warfare' that stresses a multidimensional concept of warfare: 'war is not only a military struggle, but also a comprehensive contest on fronts of politics, economy, diplomacy, and law' (Guangqian P. & Youzhi Y., 2005)

China's nuclear deterrence forces, and their permanent upgrading (specially of its nuclear-armed submarine fleet), are still seen as the ultimate guarantee of regime survival against a foreign foe. But at the conventional operational level, the new doctrine is embodied in the concept of 'active defense': China will not initiate wars of aggression but, in order to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity, its armed forces would have to fight and win 'local wars' by taking the initiative and placing the emphasis on 'active offense'. Part of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) is being transformed from a static border defense and internal security force to a more offensive force with emphasis on integrated operations with the air force. A real capacity of long-distance maneuvers and to project power in the 'near-abroad' is being added to the PLA's domestic tasks which are still viewed as its core function.

Concerning the Air Force, integration with ground forces operations is complemented by the concept of 'Joint Anti-Air Raid' for anti-access and area-denial that calls for attacks against an enemy's bases and naval forces. As for Navy operations, they are conducted under the 'Offshore Active Defense' concept with a focus on Taiwan and the first island chains. But a new dimension being discussed by Chinese military strategists – 'Far Sea Defense' – envisages the fleet's presence much farther away, outside China's claimed 200 nautical miles Exclusive Economic Zone, well into the Pacific Ocean, the South China Sea or even the Indian Ocean. Construction of aircraft carriers task forces – linked to the actual expansion of a sustainable long-range attack submarine fleet (Eaglen M. & Rodeback J., 2010) – is being considered as a possible step in order to be able to defend the country's maritime interests in a broader definition (US Department of Defense, 2009). In any case, China is already expanding its naval footprint to the West based on its 'string of pearls' concept of building bases along the Indian Ocean rim: Gwadar port in Pakistan's Baluchistan province, listening posts in the Burmese Coco Islands, container ports in Bangladesh and Sri Lanka and a naval base in the Maldives (Pant H. V., 2010).

The crucial role that C4ISR (Computerized Command, Control, Communications, Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance) plays in modern conflicts has led Chinese thinkers to develop the idea of ‘integrated network electronic warfare’. All ‘active defense’ operations are being planned ‘under conditions of informatization’. The goal is to disrupt an adversary’s battlefield network information systems and to achieve dominance of the electromagnetic spectrum. The testing of an anti-satellite weapon (ASAT), in January 2007, was clearly a demonstration of China’s will to acquire significant counterspace capabilities (Covault C., 2007). Another aspect is cyberspace warfare that includes the civilian networks. The controversy between Google and the Chinese government, in January 2010, over censorship and cyber-attacks against the Silicon Valley firm (Markoff J. & Barboza D., 2010), as well as suspicions of widespread ‘hacker’ intrusions into US private and governmental networks is an indication of how Chinese authorities look upon the Internet and the transnational flows of information as one of the main modern battlefields⁸.

India: The ‘Cold Start’ Doctrine

India’s strategy is driven by the perception of more immediate threats: persistent tensions on the borders with Pakistan and China, proxy terrorist attacks coming from its western neighbor and an entrenched domestic Naxalite-Maoist insurgency affecting significant parts of its western states. In 2004, the Indian Army High Command unveiled a new war doctrine dubbed ‘Cold Start’ (Kapila S., 2004). The main goal is to acknowledge the importance of using advanced technology, particularly electronic networks, to fight a short-duration limited conflict in a nuclear environment. The ‘Cold Start Strategy’ is aimed at Pakistan and has a declared offensive bias. The Indian army would no more stand at the border waiting for an aggression in order to counterattack, but would launch ‘blitzkrieg’ type operations at the onset of a conflict. The military goal is not to capture small parts of Pakistani border territory – to be used as trump cards in the negotiations following a cease-fire – but to destroy the Pakistani military without too much damage to civilians. ‘Cold Start’ is a ‘pro-active’ war strategy based on quick mobilization and overwhelming use of firepower to annihilate the enemy’s forces.

This doctrine is a stark choice in favor of mobile warfare based on ‘integrated battle groups’ combining armor, infantry, artillery and combat air support. A modern and technologically upgraded Indian Air Force is paramount for assuring overwhelming air superiority and close air support. For the first time, even the Navy aviation is supposed to support the ground troops’ offensive, and conventional ballistic and cruise missiles have a central role as the main firepower against the adversary’s military forces and installations. However, this weakening of the distinction between strike corps and defensive corps does not mean a conversion to expeditionary operations, long-range strikes or the occupation of large parts of the enemy’s territory. ‘Cold Start’ military goal is to fight a violent but limited war, inflicting heavy damages to the enemy forces in order to force a cease-fire without triggering a nuclear exchange.

Since 2004, India’s military establishment has integrated two more variables to its new strategy: border tensions with China and containing the Chinese rising naval presence in

the Indian Ocean. In 2009, the Indian Army Chief, General Deepak Kapoor announced a new 'two-front war' doctrine: 'there is now a proportionate focus towards the western and northeastern fronts' (Pandit R., 2009). The missions of the Indian Air Force, besides acquiring a leading role for nuclear deterrence, have also been widened to cover an extension of the strategic reach from the Persian Gulf to the Strait of Malacca. But the most important novelty is certainly the development of the first-ever Indian maritime doctrine contemplating a 'bluewater' role for the fleet and nuclear-armed submarines for strategic deterrence. India, which has already Asia's most powerful fleet, is planning to add about 100 warships to its navy within 2020 (Lamont J. & Sood V., 2009) and to enlarge its naval footprint. New Delhi has already signed maritime defense cooperation agreements with Oman and Qatar, has established an electronic monitoring station on Madagascar and has shown a clear interest in developing a naval base and trading entrepôt at Iran's Chah Bahar port as an answer to China's presence in the Pakistani port of Gwadar (Blanche Ed., 2009; Kaplan R., 2009). India is also leading and upgrading the Milan biennial Indian Ocean-Asia-Pacific naval exercises, where China is conspicuously absent* (newKerala.com Online News, 2009).

Considering India's strategic position between potential nuclear foes with significant modern conventional capabilities, these more offensive military doctrines rest on a credible nuclear deterrent and the capacity to master the most modern conventional warfare technologies. Hence, India is following China's path in enhancing its nuclear arsenals, by developing longer-range ballistic missiles as well as nuclear submarines, and prioritizing the inclusion of top of the line information and electronic warfare technologies into its operational plans. India's armed forces do have important missions of domestic security, but their main function is clearly to build enough endogenous military strength to avoid being constrained to seek outside help from the US or other big powers.

Brazil: Mastering Technology and Naval Projection

Brazil is in a very peculiar strategic situation: the lack of military threats, either from its neighbors or a Big Power. Historically, South America, although plagued by civil wars and domestic insurgencies, has been one of the most peaceful regions on the planet regarding inter-state conflicts, and could indeed be defined as an 'intriguing anomaly' (Holsti K. J., 1996). The region is also located far away from the world's historically important battlefields and has benefited, since its independence in 1822, from the implicit strategic protection of the British Royal Navy first, and then the US Navy. A small Brazilian expeditionary force did fight with Allied troops in Italy during World War II, but the country has not taken part in an armed conflict since the Triple Alliance War against Paraguay (1864-1870). Its huge and sometimes inhospitable landmass is one of its best deterrents. Thus the primary mission of the Brazilian armed forces, confronted with the challenge of controlling a relatively unpopulated continental-size territory, has always been to guarantee the internal security. Debates about national defense were traditionally unknown among the country's civilian elites. Pacifism, the promotion of international law, and the idea that conflicts between states should be solved by diplomacy and arbitration are part of the national identity.

This benign neglect has been changing since the 1990s. For the first time in its history, Brazil is having a significant economic and diplomatic impact outside its own region and its economic success is linked to deep interdependencies with the rest of the world. Brazilian leaders are now aware that the country has many interests that need to be defended outside national borders. Brazil wants to be part of the world's decision-making process at the highest level, participating in the G-20, laying claim for more 'voice' in international fora like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and seeking a permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council. Contemporarily, Brasilia has vigorously pursued South American integration and a Brazilian leadership in the region as a power base for its global ambitions. In that context, military power is becoming an important element of the country's international projection. The first ever Ministry of Defense, headed by a civilian, was created in 1999, replacing the old structure of three military ministries (one for each force). The first official 'National Strategy of Defense' (NDS), was published at the end of 2008 (Brazilian Ministry of Defense, 2008). The country's defense budget is traditionally low but has nearly doubled in the last decade. In March 2010, the Brazilian Congress approved the establishment of a Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, directly subordinated to the minister of Defense, and the creation of a quadrennial National Defense White Book.

The 2008 NDS states emphatically that the country is not willing to exercise power on other nations – 'Brazil does not have enemies' (Brazilian Ministry of Defense, 2008: 16). Hence, the Armed Forces should be organized in terms of capacities and not specific threats. The second important guideline is achieving national independence by building an autonomous technological capacity and a strong defense industry, particularly in the spatial, cybernetic and nuclear strategic sectors. Concerning the armed forces missions, the priority is still to monitor and control the vast Brazilian air space, territory and jurisdictional waters, and to respond to any aggression. The new strategy envisages a more pro-active posture, specifically in two huge resource-rich areas: the Amazon and the sea zone surrounding the extensive pre-salt oil and gas reserves discovered in 2007 (Durham L., 2009). For the Army, it means mastering joint operations and all the tools of electronic and information warfare, in order to transform static ground forces concentrated in the main southern urban areas into flexible and mobile units capable of power projection inside the national territory and organized in Rapid Reaction Strategic Force brigades. Like China or India, Brazil stresses the importance of an 'asymmetrical war' (identified as a 'national-resistance war'), as the best way to fight a military enemy 'with far superior power' that would 'disregard the unconditional Brazilian sovereignty on its Amazon region, assuming alleged interests on behalf of mankind' (Brazilian Ministry of Defense, 2008: 16). Despite this hypothetical scenario, the new ground forces' missions are still to contribute, alongside the police forces, to guarantee internal security. This is also the main mission of the Air Force, which prioritizes territorial air surveillance and the capacity to fight and ensure local air superiority at any one point of Brazil's immense landmass. The Army will also take growing responsibilities in UN peacekeeping operations, deemed essential for Brazil's status as a global protagonist.

The real novelty concerns naval power. Without naming any adversary, the stated principle of the nation's fleet reorganization is clearly 'sea denial' – so much so that 'power projection' is hierarchically subordinated to this principle. The defense of oil platforms, sealanes of trade, islands in national waters and the capacity to join international peace-keeping operations are the Navy's main tasks. At the operational level, priority should be given to a powerful underwater force – conventional and nuclear-powered submarines – as well as to conventional aircraft carriers. The concept of asymmetrical war is also applied to sea combat: the surface forces are considered as tactical or strategic reserves for the forward engagement of the underwater forces. A submarine equipped with a nationally designed and produced nuclear engine has become the icon of the new national defense policy. But in any case, Brazil will have to deal with the same ambiguity that characterize the other BICs' strategies: a defensive area denial posture but with offensive out-of-area capabilities and the possibility of a doctrinal geographical expansion of its perceived security perimeter.

Doubts could also arise concerning nuclear technology. Brazil has developed a uranium enrichment plant with its own centrifuge technology, but the country is also strongly committed to nuclear nonproliferation. Its Constitution forbids any military use of nuclear technologies (Art. 21, § XXIII-a) and it has signed all the relevant agreements (Non Proliferation Treaty, Tlatelolco Treaty and the Nuclear Suppliers Group), plus a bilateral intrusive safeguards regime with Argentina (ABACC – Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Yet, because of the nuclear submarine program, the NDS states clearly that Brasilia will not subscribe to the IAEA Additional Protocol (Brazilian Ministry of Defense, 2008: 36). Since the beginning of the 2000s, Brazil has decided to upgrade its nuclear programs for peaceful use and has hinted that it is interested in becoming a nuclear fuel exporter by tapping its uranium ore deposits. Mastering the whole nuclear cycle is seen as an essential element of the country's regional and international leadership role – something that, in the future, could introduce some degree of uncertainty about Brazil's nuclear doctrine.

From Active Defense to Active Offense

Like it or not, the emergence of local military powers with significant area denial capabilities, particularly at sea, is a matter of concern not only for neighboring countries, but also to the big established powers. In its 2010 QDR Report, the US Department of Defense has clearly stated that America should maintain 'unmatched capabilities' so that it can 'deter and defeat aggression in anti-access environments' (US Department of Defense, February 2010). Strategic concepts like India's 'Cold Start' or China's 'active defense', rest on the ambiguities surrounding the connection between 'strategic active defense' and the primacy of seizing the initiative in active offense, and between defense of the national territory and dominance of the near-abroad.

If Brazil's modernization programs are still embryonic and the country benefits from a peaceful neighborhood, this is not the case with the two Asian BICs. The prospect of China becoming a dominant regional naval power has already pushed India, Japan,

Australia and the US to strengthen their naval cooperation (Chellaney B., 2007), even if this ‘Quadrilateral Initiative’ was somewhat toned down. Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and other ASEAN countries, which do have maritime territorial disputes with Beijing, are hedging their bets by facilitating the US naval presence in the region’s waters and ports. India, in 2009, has made public its plans to greatly expand its ‘blue-water’ fleet. On the other hand, New Delhi’s announcement of its new ‘two-front’ war doctrine is steering concerns in China and Pakistan (Pant H. V., 2010), strengthening their already close military cooperation. Competition for military dominance between these three regional nuclear powers, plus the US and (as yet) non-nuclear Japan, is not the best recipe for regional stability.

Sharing the Burdens Of Global Security: Pick and Choose

In order to preempt aggressive balance of power developments and to convince the established powers that they are responsible global players, EmPos have been showing a willingness to share at least a small part of the burden of guaranteeing global security. BIC countries are starting, cautiously, to subscribe to some operations designed to secure what can be called an enlarged definition of ‘global commons’¹⁰: protection of maritime trade and seabed infrastructure for communication and information networks, cyberspace security, confronting threats posed by transnational crime, terrorism and piracy or contributing to peace-keeping missions. These limited shows of military support for the public good has many advantages. First, it is a legitimate and consensual manner to begin exercising power projection. Second, it is a way to preempt accusations of ‘free-riding’ on the big powers’ global security guarantees. Last but not least, securing access to resources critical for the smooth functioning of the transnational production chains and protecting economic lifelines is absolutely vital for sustaining the EmPos economic growth.

In 2009, China sent a small group of warships to the Gulf of Aden (Task Force 529) on a counter piracy mission, in parallel with the European naval forces (EU NAVFOR Atalanta), other Western and US ships – even India and Russia have contributed with a destroyer each. But the Chinese Task Force has been very reluctant to accept more than a basic informal level of coordination with its counterparts, and its main objective is to protect only Chinese merchant ships. Actually, China has used this mission as a peaceful way to test the enlargement of its naval footprint into the Indian Ocean. India and Brazil have also shown that they are concerned by any increase in coordination with Western navies that could limit their doctrinal and operational elbowroom. India does participate in the Quad Initiative with the US, and the Brazilian Navy is the main partner, along with the US Navy, in the annual South Atlantic UNITAS maneuvers, but both countries have been strengthening their naval links with bi-oceanic trilateral naval exercises with South Africa, and have been averse to grant any legitimacy to big powers naval presence in their maritime regions.

Peace missions suffer from the same tensions. Since 2000, there has been a twenty-fold increase in Chinese peacekeepers that are now deployed in ten different theatres, particularly in Sudan, Liberia, Lebanon and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Gill B.

& Huang C-H., 2009). India has a long history of peacekeeping missions, while Brazil is leading the MINUSTAH (United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti) and has fielded more than 1.500 troops to Caribbean island. But the three EmPos insist on a strict application of the principles of non-interference and absolute respect for national sovereignty, which make them extremely reluctant to take part in international sanctions or armed forces 'police' interventions, even sanctioned by the United Nations, and even in case of extreme human rights abuse¹¹. In general terms, they shun the ideas of 'stakeholdership' for global stability and refuse entering into formal military alliances, even at a regional level. They consider that to cooperate with the established powers in specific issues is in their self-interest provided it is not a long-term commitment, that they can pick and choose how and when to do it, and that their armed forces do not have to be submitted to a collective discipline or command.

Conclusion

War for Brazil, is still a theoretical proposition far away into the future. For India, living with permanent tensions at its borders, it is perceived as an actual possibility. For China, it is an uncertain contingency that must be prepared for in its quest for regional military clout, even if that means some kind of local confrontation with the US superpower. But the BICs share the same vision: military power is an essential ingredient in their 'rise' to world player status and they are ready to commit a greater percentage of their national budgets to upgrade their Armed Forces' doctrines, organization and equipment. Their strategic goal is to be respected by neighboring states and to be able to withstand eventual pressures from the big established powers. No BIC country is projecting itself as a world 'hegemon'. They are not interested in exporting their 'values' or 'way of life'. In fact these countries seek to be recognized as peers by the established big powers and to participate in the most important international decisionmaking fora, but reject any comprehensive and formal collective responsibility to care for global security and global governance. China and India more, Brazil less, act as if 'the only effective multilateralism is lucrative multilateralism' (Holslag J., 2006: 11).

Yet, the three new players know that, in their own interest, they have to accept some responsibility for maintaining the world order, and they have to show that their 'emergence' does not constitute a strategic threat, either to the neighboring countries or to the established powers. But the Emerging Powers have to live with a paradox: a rising defensive military power that is based on operational offensive capabilities and doctrines. This ambiguity breeds mistrust on their real intentions and could generate countervailing military responses from neighbors and big powers alike. In that case, having to cope with a belligerent environment, the EmPos would have killed the goose that laid the golden eggs.

Endnotes

- ¹ Cf. Legro's definition of 'omnipower': 'The United States has a unique position in the world today because it is a regional power in all the world's regions.'
- ² The same can be said concerning some over-ambitious governments, such as Venezuela and Iran, that dream of acquiring this kind of status.
- ³ Some consider that China was an expansionary power during the XIII-XVI centuries. As a matter of fact, China was conquered by Genghis and Kublai Khan's armies. The Mongol Yuan dynasty's unsuccessful campaigns against Japan, Champa, Vietnam or Java, at the end of the XIII century can be seen as the last spurts of Mongol expansionism. The succeeding 'Han' Ming dynasty, founded in 1368, spent most of its resources in pushing back the Mongols and, then, defending China against recurrent Mongol and Japanese threats, until its demise in the XVII century. The Chinese maritime expeditions of 1405-33 had to face the Mandarin's hostility and remain a weak-willed interlude in China's foreign policy history.
- ⁴ E.g. Douglas MacArthur famous quotations: 'The American tradition has always been that once our troops are committed to battle, the full power and means of the nation would be mobilized and dedicated to fight for victory' (MacArthur D., 1964, 27-30) and 'war's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war there is no substitute for victory.' (MacArthur D., 1951, 334-335)
- ⁵ Since 1947, India fought five major border wars, four against Pakistan and one two-front war against China.
- ⁶ China's first nuclear test occurred on October 16, 1964. India's first explosion took place on May 18, 1974, but its reprocessing facilities were launched at Trombay, in 1964. Brazil started its military nuclear program in the 1970s, under a military government, but abandoned it officially in the 1980s, after the reestablishment of a democratic government and a bilateral agreement with Argentina, in 1985, to put a definite end to their nuclear arms race.
- ⁷ Asymmetric low-tech solutions stressing the role of irregular forces and/or terrorist outfits as state weapons are not a priority for the three EmPos. These strategies are being conceived either by nonstate combatant forces or by confrontational local regional middle-powers, such as Iran, Pakistan or Venezuela. Most of the time, those kinds of solutions have only a very limited strategic deterrence function, but are pursued as one possible instrument of tactical war fighting capacities.
- ⁸ In March 2010, on what can be seen as a self-fulfilling prophecy, the Pentagon has announced the formal establishment of a Cyber Command (USCYBERCOM), a unified sub-command of the US Strategic Command responsible for the nuclear arsenal and global deterrence, as well as space and information operations. A full general will command the USCYBERCOM.
- ⁹ The Milan biennial naval exercises were established in 1995. Thirteen nations participated in the Milan 2010 naval meeting: Australia, Bangladesh, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Vietnam.
- ¹⁰ The OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms still defines 'global commons' as 'natural assets outside national jurisdiction such as the oceans, outer space and the Antarctic'.
- ¹¹ The EPs have been very critical of the 'Responsibility to Protect' (R2P) concept, promoted by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan and adopted explicitly in the 2005 UN World Summit Outcome Document (United Nations, 2005).

References

- Baslar K. 1998. *The Concept of the Common Heritage of Mankind in International Law: 117-158*, The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Black J. 2004. *Rethinking Military History*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Blanche Ed. 2009. 'Enter the Tiger and the Dragon: India and China move into the Arabian Sea to protect their energy lifelines to the Middle East,' *The Middle East Magazine*, Apr. 6-11
- Brazilian Ministry of Defense. 2008. *National Strategy of Defense*, Brazil: Ministério da Defesa.
- Chellaney B. 2007. 'The U.S.-India-Japan-Australia Quadrilateral Initiative: New Great Game,' *Asian Age*, 2 June.
- Colson B. 1993. *La culture stratégique américaine – L'influence de Jomini*, Paris: Economica-FEDN.
- Covault C. 2007. 'Chinese Test Anti-Satellite Weapon,' *AVIATIONWEEK.COM*, 17 January.
- Durham L. 2009. 'Brazil Dancing the Pre-Salt Salsa,' *Explorer*, AAPG, November 2009. www.aapg.org/explorer/2009/11nov/brazil1109.cfm. 11th November 2010
- Eaglen M. & Rodeback J. 2010. 'Submarine Arms Race in the Pacific: The Chinese Challenge to U.S. Undersea Supremacy,' *Backgrounder* n° 2367, The Heritage Foundation, February 2, 2010.
- Fuller J.F.C. 1957. *Military History of the Western World*, New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Gill B. & Huang C-H. 2009. 'China's Expanding Peacekeeping Role: Its Significance and the Policy Implications,' *SIPRI Policy Brief*, Feb., 8 pp. SIPRI Policy Paper No. 25, Saona, SIPRI, Nov. 4-6.

- Glaser B. S. & Medeiros E. S. 2007. 'The Changing Ecology of Foreign Policy-Making in China: The Ascension and Demise of the Theory of 'Peaceful Rise', *The China Quarterly*, 190 (June): 291- 310.
- Guangqian P. & Youzhi Y. (eds.) 2005. *The Science of Military Strategy*. Beijing: Military Science Publishing House, 2005. [Quoted by US Department of Defense, 2009: 14].
- Holslag J. 2006. 'The EU and China: the Great Disillusion,' *BICCS Asia Paper*, 1 (3) (5 Nov): 1-15. (Also published in *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 11 (4): 555-8).
- Holsti K. J. 1996. *The State, War, and the State of War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard M. 1976. *War in European History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones A. 1987. *The Art of War in the Western World*. Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois Press.
- Kapila S. 2004. 'India's New "Cold Start" War Doctrine Strategically Reviewed,' *South Asia Analysis Group*, paper n° 991, 4 May. www.southasiaanalysis.org/%5Cpapers10%5Cpaper991.html (accessed Nov. 2010).
- Kaplan R. 2009. 'Center Stage for the 21st Century: Rivalry in the Indian Ocean', *Foreign Affairs* 8(2) (March/April): 16-32.
- Kennan G. 1994. *Around the Cragged Hill: A Personal and Political Philosophy*, New York & London : W. W. Norton.
- Lamont J. & Sood V. 2009. 'India plans to build 100 warships,' *Financial Times UK*, 31 July.
- Legro, J. W. 2008. *The Omnipower: the United States and Regional Orders*, Draft Paper for GIGAOxford- Sciences Po Conference, Paris, 8-9 October.
- MacArthur D. 1951. *General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's Address to Congress, April 19, 1951, Washington, D.C., With Highlights of His Career*, Chicago: Rand McNally: 27-30. — 1964. *Reminiscences*, London: Heinemann.
- Markoff J. & Barboza D. 2010. 'China Schools Said to Be Tied to Online Attacks,' *The New York Times*, 18 Feb., A1.
- newKerala.com Online News. 2009. 'Navy of 13 countries to participate in Milan 2010 at Andaman,' 7 Dec. <http://www.newkerala.com/news/fullnews-6271.html> (accessed 11 Nov. 2010)
- Pandit R. 2009. 'Army Reworks War Doctrine for Pakistan, China,' *The Times of India*, 30 Dec.
- Pant H. V. 2010. 'India's Quick-Strike Doctrine Causes Flutter,' *Japan Times*, February 2, 2010. — 'Many in denial over China's quest for bases,' *Japan Times*, February 12, 2010.
- Pardo A. 1967. Note verbale to the UN's 22nd Session of the General Assembly, U.N. Doc A/6695.
- Richelieu Cardinal de. 1740. *Testament politique*, Vol. 2, La Haye: Jean Van Duren.
- United Nations, 2005. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, 60 Session, Agenda items 46 and 120, 24 Oct., §§ 138-139.
- US Department of Defense, 2009. 'Military Power of the People's Republic of China 2009,' Annual Report to Congress. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense. — February 2010. *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, pp. IV, VIII. Washington DC.
- Valladão A. 2006. 'Democratic Hegemony and American Hegemony,' *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 19 (2) (June): 243-60.
- Wilson D. and Purushothaman R., 2003. *Global Economics Paper n°99*, New York: Goldman Sachs Group Inc.