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In May 2007, the Inter-American Studies Center at Université Laval held its fourth annual colloquium that focuses on issues related to inter-American cooperation. After having successfully addressed themes such as trade relations, democracy, and inequality, the Center decided this year to focus on issues related to security in the Americas.

It is clearly observable that the context of security threats to the Americas has been radically transformed over the last twenty years. These transformations require new responses and changes in the ways that governments work, as well as the ways in which regional institutions function.

Four years after the Special Conference on Security in the Americas in Mexico, and after the adoption of the Declaration on Security by the OAS, it is important that we review the new agenda for inter-American security. This is a particularly timely topic, as the next ministerial conference on security and defense is to be held in Canada in 2008.

In addition, the tragic events of September 2001 profoundly changed the security context in North America. The events forced the affected governments to take a more concerted approach in order to protect the region from any further potential attacks. It seemed necessary to compare the institutional responses in both environments in order to better understand the new security agenda in the Americas and evaluate the performances of these institutions in this new era of multidimensional threats.

It is with great pleasure that I, along with those responsible for this work, publish the work from the colloquium on the new forms of security threats in the Americas and of the reaction of institutions regarding these new threats. In the following chapters, the reader will find texts that address the situation throughout all of the Americas as well as issues that are specific to North America.

Those responsible for this electronic publication would like to thank Nicolas Diotte and Frédéric Tremblay for their excellent work in order to ensure the success of the May 2007 colloquium. They would also like to recognize the support of the ministère des Relations internationales du Québec, the largest financial supporter of the CEI, as well as the Canadian Ministry of National Defence, for their generous contribution in helping to make the colloquium possible.

The texts gathered together in this volume were written by the top experts in the field, and were written, naturally, with a concern for undertaking an in-depth analysis, while also trying to help clarify and highlight the major issues related to inter-American cooperation regarding security matters, for an interested yet not necessarily expert public. We hope that the reader will benefit from the texts gathered in this work. We also wish the reader an enjoyable read.

Gordon Mace
Director of the Inter-American Studies Center
Le Centre d’études interaméricaines de l’Université Laval a tenu, en mai 2007, la quatrième édition de son colloque annuel sur les questions liées à la coopération interaméricaine. Après avoir abordé successivement les thèmes des relations commerciales, de la démocratie, et des inégalités, nous avons voulu privilégier cette année la problématique de la sécurité dans les Amériques.

Comme tous sont à même de le constater, le contexte de la menace à la sécurité dans les Amériques a subi de profondes transformations depuis une vingtaine d’années. Ces transformations exigent de nouvelles réponses et supposent de nouvelles façons de faire de la part des gouvernements mais aussi de la part des institutions régionales.

Quatre ans après la conférence de Mexico sur la sécurité hémisphérique et après l’adoption par l’Organisation des États américains de la Déclaration sur la sécurité, il nous est apparu pertinent de faire le point sur le nouvel agenda de la sécurité interaméricaine. D’autant plus que la prochaine conférence ministérielle sur la sécurité et la défense se tiendra au Canada en 2008.

Par ailleurs, les tragiques événements de septembre 2001 ont marqué profondément le contexte de la sécurité en Amérique du Nord. Ils ont interpellé avec force les gouvernements concernés et favorisé une concertation accrue afin de protéger la région contre toute nouvelle attaque. Il nous a semblé nécessaire de comparer les réponses institutionnelles dans les deux environnements pour mieux comprendre le nouvel agenda de la sécurité dans les Amériques et évaluer la performance des institutions dans cette nouvelle ère de menace multidimensionnelle.

C’est avec grand plaisir, par conséquent, que le responsable et les artisans de cette manifestation publient les actes du colloque sur les nouveaux contours de la menace à la sécurité dans les Amériques et sur la réaction des institutions à cette nouvelle menace. On trouvera dans le volume qui suit des textes traitant de la situation dans l’ensemble des Amériques ainsi que des contributions portant spécifiquement sur l’Amérique du Nord.

Les responsables de cette publication électronique souhaitent remercier Nicolas Diotte et Frédéric Tremblay qui n’ont pas ménagé leurs efforts pour assurer le succès du colloque de mai 2007. Ils désirent également exprimer leur reconnaissance au ministère des Relations internationales du Québec, principal soutien financier du CEI, et au ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada pour leur généreuse contribution à la réalisation du colloque.

Les textes réunis dans ce volume ont été écrits par les meilleurs experts du domaine avec un souci d’analyse rigoureuse bien sûr mais aussi avec l’objectif de clarifier, pour un public intéressé mais sans être expert, les principaux enjeux de la coopération interaméricaine en matière de sécurité. Nous espérons que le lecteur tirera profit des textes assemblés dans cette collection. Nous lui souhaitons une lecture agréable.

Gordon Mace
Directeur du Centre d’études interaméricaines
In this section, we discuss the main strategic issues linked to the new configuration of the threat to security in the Americas since the end of the Cold War. The various dimensions of the threat to security in the Americas today have changed immensely in the past 15 years. Inter-state conflicts were the main threat to security in the 80’s, but security has now become multidimensional and considered as a global issue. The papers included in this section offer a general presentation on drug traffic and its impact on governance, on how trans-national criminality affects the security of the governments and of the hemisphere, and on the way states and regional institutions cooperate to address these problems and the main challenges for the coming years.
When asked what has changed in the field of security in the Americas, the immediate answer is that the situation has improved throughout the region, as its citizens no longer find themselves threatened by their own armed forces. Fifteen years ago, the hopes and expectations of a more peaceful world coincided with the resurgence of Latin American democracies, which favored cooperation in security matters. This gave place to a dynamic period in which compromises on disarmament and limitations regarding weapons of mass destruction were updated, along with policies aimed at exercising the democratic civic control of the armed forces. The international environment, in turn, encouraged the expansion of democracy and the reduction of public expenditures in defense. Also, the post-cold war era introduced new issues, as much in the theoretical debate as in the overall political agenda. While scholars examined the Security Sector Reform (SSR) and the Critical Security Studies (CSS), a growing capacity to analyze the security perspectives for Latin America and the Caribbean emerged, which was produced by its own specialists. Meanwhile, the local conflict hypothesis slowly disintegrated, giving way to a more intense and effective period of sub-regional cooperation, compared with the initiatives that were implemented in the 1960s.

However, one must find this positive description of the current situation rather unconvincing. In analyzing this issue more thoroughly, it becomes apparent that the democratic control of the armed forces is not entirely complete. Although the coups d'état appear to have vanished, none of the countries that underwent democratization currently have an effective democratic civic management of their respective defense organizations.

First failure: The military autonomy resulting from the civic incapacity to produce defense public policy.

The expectations surrounding an original academic production that might reflect the specific conditions of Latin American politics were extremely optimistic. The lack of public investment devoted to the training of defense specialists, combined with rather limited links between university experts and political leaders, has caused the confinement of local thinking to produce a fragmented literature.

Second failure: Latin America remains under the tutelage of North American specialists.

The structural weakness of the Latin American and Caribbean political institutions has proven to be incapable of providing adequate space for the growing inter-relation among the sub-region’s partners. The internal political actors within each country continue to favor mistrust over cooperation, as well as unilateralism over integration.

Third failure: In spite of a vigorous dialogue between heads of states, the hegemonic aspirations remain present.

A negative effect of this legacy is that the most classic realism has come to dominate the global agendas. The global and local situations began
having an effect on individual guarantees, and once again, the security issues regained notorious prominence in the realm of international relations. Realism and its military responses, defined the United States’ war on terror and its preemptive policy as its highest national priority. Although sub-regional cooperation has increased on the one hand, it appears as though inter-regional tensions have increased on the other.

Therefore, where does this leave us today? It arguably leaves us with a vast security agenda. Throughout the hemisphere, multidimensional security is the expression of the diversity of problems and of the impossibility of reaching consensus on individual and compatible paths regarding both security and defense. It is the result of a superficial compromise to establish a formula that involves all actors, but compels none of them.

In the multilateral agenda, global issues are openly discussed, in terms of questions relating to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. However, in other matters, there is no common hemispheric response. Narcotrafficking, terrorism, organized crime, maras (gangs), public insecurity, the arms race (conventional weapons and light weapons), environmental disasters, compulsive migrations, democratic civic control of the armed forces and of the democratic elaboration of defense policies, and ideological identities and poverty, are all phenomena that affect to differing degrees each and every country throughout the continent.

The region has a heterogeneous history. With the exception of Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, countries that joined the inter-American system from the beginning, the remaining thirteen Caribbean States began entering the system in the late 1960s. Within this group, only Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago have armed forces, yet with similar functions belonging to constabulary forces. The institutions of the Organization of American States (OAS) were developed with the taking into account of these countries’ structures.

Therefore, the presence of the newly-admitted members, as well as the changes in the international political context, has fostered modifications within the OAS, aimed at improving the responses to the regional agenda’s problems. This is how the Department of Multidimensional Security was created, which is in charge of a series of agencies such as CICAD, with the Inter-American Observatory on Drugs and Anti-Money Laundering programs; or such as CICTE, with its Crisis Management Exercises on Terrorism and Policy Formulation and Coordination programs; or the Department of Prevention of Threats against Public Security, that includes programs that address Humanitarian Mine Action, the Slave Trade, Organized Crime and Gangs, and Small and Light Weapons. Proposals and means of actions should arise from these agencies and programs in order to deal with the problems related to the new security agenda. Surprisingly, the OAS’ organization chart confuses tasks and overlaps missions. An example of this can be found in looking at the Committee on Hemispheric Security, which addresses problems that are dealt with by the Department of Multidimensional Security
Fourth failure: There exists a multilateral institutionality, yet with no authority to address hemispheric issues.

What is even worse is that in spite of the creation of these agencies, the concrete responses to security remain concentrated on the same resource that had previously been used to address traditional threats, notably, the military instrument. When facing the new threats, the armed forces can only be used when the continuity of the State or the sovereignty over its territory is threatened. As well, as agreed in the Declaration on Security in the Americas, “Each state has the sovereign right to identify its own national security priorities and to define strategies, plans, and actions for addressing threats to its security, in accordance with its legal system and with full respect for international law and the norms and principles of the Charter of the OAS and the Charter of the United Nations” (UN). This statement refers to the agreement of Mexico, yet the most powerful countries continually violate it. The “policialization” of the military, in terms of police tasks, and equally, the “militarization” of the police force, only produces a “securitization” of the complex regional agenda, without offering efficient solutions.

This brings up some important questions. Is not the hemispheric agenda being securitized when Mexico and the United States negotiate the “Regional Security Initiative”, a plan that will surely be as successful as Plan Colombia? (Corchado, 2007) Another question that deserves some reflection is whether or not George W. Bush’s promise in Guatemala to address problems relating to the maras can be effectively achieved using Washington-provided helicopters and radars? (Clarín, 2007) Is the donation of toys to Casa del Niño (Children’s House) in Puerto Belgrano between UNITAS exercises, a solid common defense practice? In which category/area should we place, for example, the building of schools in Carazo, Nicaragua by the United States’ South COM? Finally, is the transfer of over 1200 North-American soldiers to Central America, in the context of the humanitarian exercise “New Horizons”, a solution to the problems of underdevelopment?

Unfortunately, these are the only proposals currently being financed by the hemisphere’s most powerful partner. By contrast, it is important to note that, in the developed countries, the recent experiences of attempting to dismantle international terrorists were placed under the responsibility of the investigation agencies, as well as the police forces, and not in the hands of the military, which have been trained by the best-trained armies on the planet.

Fifth failure: International cooperation in attempting to help solve the institutional deficit in Latin America is minimal.

Deviating institutions that specifically focus on issues related to social order have dangerous implications for the civic control of the armed forces. It also represents a risk of state violence against the most
marginalized sectors. The internal security system’s mission is the prevention of crimes as well as the punishment for crimes committed, whereas the mission of the defense system is to respond to attacks committed against the State’s integrity and sovereignty. Public security is enforced by the Penal Code, while defense is enforced by the Charter of the United Nations, and in the worst case scenario, by the Military Code. Security depends primarily on the Ministry of Justice, and defense on the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, the National Congress and multilateral entities such as the United Nations and the OAS. The United States Southern Command proposal to develop joint interagency activities is ill-directed. The United States Southern Command’s recently published “Command Strategy 2016”, stipulates that only one military command should interact with interagencies from Latin American countries, which ultimately means that the U.S. military would work with Latin American police forces.

A growing tendency, although not only in the Americas, is the privatization of security. Security contractors are enterprises of dubious origin. The privatization of security creates greater social inequality between those than can afford the respective security costs and those that cannot afford to do so. Private contractors do not comply with the rules of engagement, the respect for human rights, or the respect for humanitarian rights. These enterprises denationalize the protection of inhabitants, since they are not governmental agencies and they lack transparency guidelines and regulations. They are motivated by profit and not by national foreign policies or by the national security interest.

Sixth failure: There is an important deficit in the management of security problems.

Overlapping should be avoided. An example of this, for instance, could be by not summoning the Conference of Defense Ministers and rather, only invite those countries that have Defense Ministers. Meanwhile, when organizing meetings of Security Ministers, only those countries that have the jurisdiction to attend should be invited. Furthermore, investment should be diversified, by not only supplying the armed forces, but also by providing other agencies with the capacity to fully carry out their functions.

Finally, I would like to briefly discuss a few issues concerning South America’s security problems.

A new sub-regional alliance emerged last April 16-17 on Margarita Island, Venezuela. This coalition is called the Union of South American Nations, or UNASUR, and its permanent secretariat will be located in Quito, Ecuador. There were other topics also discussed during this meeting, such as the creation of a future organization of South American countries that produce and export gas, OPPEGASUR, as well as the creation of an Energy Council, which would also be located in Ecuador. The tensions that arose during this encounter clearly reflect the growing differences between South American countries.
The sub-region is fragmented. Some argue that South American leaders sustain a pragmatic vision, and not an ideological one, in order to establish balances of power and obtain benefits from the ensuing commercial advantages. According to Ernesto Lacau, the failure of the neoliberal project in the late 1990s, along with the need to elaborate more pragmatic policies that would have combined market mechanisms with larger degrees of public regulation and social participation, led to more representative regimes, and to what is now being called, a general turn to the center-left. In other words, this could be considered as a change in the State system (Lacau, 2006). However, others believe that without a basic consensus to sort out the political obstacles through formal proceedings agreed by the different parties, democracy and the regional understandings will be lost. In this sense, the strengthening of the Bolivarian road towards socialism appears to be a watershed, including nationalizations in Bolivia, and possibly in Ecuador—the Andean turbulence—, which will eventually compel the governments throughout the region to side with or against Chavez’s alternative policies. Tensions along the border continue to increase, as is revealed by the current situation between Ecuador and Colombia. As well, refugees and forced migrations create rivalries between different groups of people. Furthermore, the illegal traffic in arms from one country to the other, supplies transnational organized crime gangs.

Throughout the world, Latin America is the region that contributes the lowest amount of its GNP resources to its defense budget, approximately 1.4 percent. As far as Central America is concerned, none of the countries invests more than 1 percent of its GNP in this field, with El Salvador and Nicaragua contributing the lowest amount amongst all countries. The military expenditure is increasing in South America, since its lowest level in 1997. However, the amount of military expenditure cannot be determined for certain, since many of the allocations are not included in the approved defense budgets, and are instead received from transfers and extra-budget allocations that are decided later on over the course of the year. García Belaunde, Peru’s current Minister of Foreign Affairs, recently stated that the massive purchasing of armaments affects the region’s military balance and is a genuine cause for concern (Admundo.com, 2007).

According to the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), the Center for Latin American Liberalization and Development (CADAL) and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), military expenses within the continent increased by 7.2 percent between 2005 and 2006. The largest increases in defense spending were undertaken by Venezuela, Chile, Brazil and Colombia, with Argentina a distant fifth. The official explanations refer to a recovery of the obsolete material; a recovery that is underway in countries that have the unfortunate title of being the most unequal societies in terms of wealth distribution (Arroyo Borgen, 2007). These purchases reveal a growing atmosphere of regional mistrust and disclose the effects of populism, which appeals to negative feelings regarding democratic values. This is, in fact,
a re-militarization without militarism. It is the worsening of the belief that a nation’s power depends almost exclusively on its military strength, which in this case, is under the control of civic authorities and is thus not directly under the control of the armed forces. It is, moreover, a double re-militarization of the Americas, for both an increase in military budget expenditures as well as for the militarization of the police functions.

The possibilities of changing this agenda are quite limited. This is mainly a result of the United States’ insistence, thanks to its unilateral short-sightedness, in exporting its domestic agenda throughout its backyard. The North American government prioritizes the military solution, even though this has already proven to be ineffective in providing adequate responses to the issues of the political, social and economic agendas. Instead of consistently working for the improvement of the police forces, the transparency and independence of the judicial bodies, and the professionalization of customs and migration departments, it only grants resources when the strengthening of the military instrument is needed.

The presentation of this article in Canada presents the author with the opportunity to make an important criticism of Canada, the other country within the Americas that is in a privileged position to positively contribute to the agenda. Canada’s oscillation between two distinct roles is problematic. On the one hand, it is grounded in an idealist voluntarism, in adopting a discourse on how human security should automatically become the dominant concept in multilateral hemispheric organizations, as well as in bilateral relationships. Yet, on the other hand, Canada is involved in a submissive relationship with its major partner, the United States. The potential that Canada holds provides significant expectations and hopes for a stronger commitment to work for and to find solutions to the deep-seeded causes of the hemisphere’s problems.

Final failure: The compromises by regional powers, within the hemisphere, are exclusively a response to their own domestic agendas.

Although sub-regional mechanisms have achieved a partial dismantling of the threats posed by its neighbor, the international discourse has re-militarized the agenda. Meanwhile, public insecurity continues to encourage both citizens and government leaders to look towards militarized solutions. Consequently, a struggle between democracy and governability has been established. Governments tend to choose the latter, weakening the consolidation of democracy and the universality of human, political and social rights. It is clear that cooperation solves problems through negotiation, by imposing criteria for peace and by creating transparency and predictability guarantees. It is time that a large number of actors from the public and private domain are convinced that none of the Latin-American countries can unilaterally, or hegemonically, build a credible defense system.
1. For a detailed description see Diamint (2006).
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Disagreements among states about important issues are inherent in international relations and so our attention is drawn to potential military conflict when we consider the threats to international security. Latin America has made some progress in dealing peacefully with its interstate disputes during the new millennium. Although none of the twenty disputes that existed in 2000 have been definitively resolved (see Appendix), three are at various stages of International Court of Justice processes (Honduras-Nicaragua, Nicaragua-Costa Rica and Nicaragua-Colombia), another one is in an OAS-mediated process (Guatemala-Belize) and there appears to be a new willingness between Chile and Bolivia to address their dispute (El Mercurio, 2007).

Nevertheless, the overall picture is less sanguine. The Americas are facing new and potentially destabilizing challenges today, both internally and externally. The 2003 ruling by the International Court of Justice to resolve the Honduras-El Salvador dispute in the Gulf of Fonseca inadvertently created a new controversy of the Isla de Conejo. Ecuador and Peru have moved beyond their 1998 territorial resolution to focus their disagreements on a new issue: maritime boundaries. The current high price of energy has turned maritime boundaries into an issue much larger than fisheries, as countries scramble to sign contracts with international oil companies to explore for fossil fuels in disputed territories. Colombia’s increased efforts to resolve its decades-old civil war has created new militarized tensions along the border with Ecuador and heightened tension along a long contested border with Venezuela. After a decade and more of hope as countries transitioned out of failed political (military dictatorships, civil wars and a one party state in Mexico) and economic (import-substitution and an inefficient and bloated presence of the state in the economy) systems, Latin American countries are being buffeted by forces that threaten to undermine democracy and increase military expenditures beyond those that may be prudent. The combination of these factors can potentially provoke a renewed rash of militarized interstate disputes in the region.

Venezuela’s new Russian-made fighter jets flying overhead while Venezuelan troops occupy the newly nationalized oil facilities in the Orinoco introduce more uncertainty into an increasingly insecure environment. The Russian jets, particularly with Venezuelan pilots who have a fraction of the training of their U.S. counterparts, are no match for US fighter jets. So to whom were the overflights directed—Colombia with whom Venezuela disputes territory and FARC’s status and who was one of the rhetorical targets of Chavez’ 1992 failed military coup; Guyana and the 40% of its territory claimed by Venezuela; Trinidad and Tobago which dispute natural gas-rich waters with Venezuela, or Chile in case Bolivia provokes a conflict over the outlet to the sea? (In the 1980s, Venezuela overflew Costa Rica with its U.S.-supplied F-16s as a warning to the Sandinista government about pursuing Contra rebels into Tico territory.)

This paper considers the possibility that such interstate conflicts in Latin America might escalate into militarized interstate disputes (MIDs). I begin
with a brief summary of the model I developed in earlier work to explain militarization of interstate disputes (Mares, 2001). With this model before us we can pick out some key determinants of the use of military force and evaluate how those variables have evolved over the last decade. Using this analysis, I conclude that we are entering into a dangerous phase in intra-Latin American relations and offer some suggestions about how the probability of militarized conflict can be decreased.

A Model of Militarized Interstate Conflict

In *Violent Peace: Militarized Interstate Bargaining in Latin America* I argued that leaders use foreign policy to provide collective and private goods to their domestic constituencies. In terms of militarized interstate conflict, the key question for the leader is whether the use of military force will benefit her constituencies at a cost that they are willing to pay and whether she can survive their displeasure if the costs are high.

In my argument, the willingness of constituencies to pay costs varies with the value that they attach to the good in question. Their ability to constrain the leader varies with the institutional structure of accountability. The costs of using military force are influenced by the political-military strategy for the use of force, the strategic balance with the rival nation and the characteristics of the military force used. A leader may choose to use force only when the costs produced by the combination of political-military strategy chosen (S) + the strategic balance (SB) + the characteristics of the force used (CF) are equal to or lower than the costs acceptable to the leader’s constituency (CC) minus the slippage in accountability produced by the domestic means of selecting leaders (A). Force will not always be used when these conditions are met, but force will not be used in their absence.

\[
S + SB + CF \leq CC - A \quad \text{may lead to the decision to use force}
\]

\[
S + SB + CF > CC - A \quad \text{no force will be used}
\]

A number of these key variables are developing in potentially destabilizing ways. The political military strategies for using force have not changed recently—Latin Americans would not seek military conquest of their rivals, but weak states still want to keep issues alive and influencing the domestic politics of one’s rival in hopes of shaking up a stagnated or deteriorating bargaining process remain a goal for some revisionist leaders. The characteristics of force to be used have also not changed—they are getting more sophisticated, but leaders are unlikely to seek long lasting military conflicts that require massive mobilization of human and economic resources. Hence, quick strikes by a few aircraft, patrol boats or small contingencies of troops remain the norm in Latin American MIDs. Consequently, the key variables that should demand our attention are the strategic balance, the costs to constituencies and the accountability of the leaders to their constituencies.

The strategic balance includes economic, diplomatic and military factors and has become more uncertain in each area. The U.S. has lost credibility
as an influential diplomatic, economic and even military actor since it is tied down in a War on Terrorism, in Iraq, and unable to respond effectively to the diplomatic affronts of Hugo Chávez (including discussing an alliance with Iran and calling the U.S. President a ‘devil’ at the United Nations). The historic unwillingness of Latin American nations to become significantly engaged in demanding that parties engaged in conflict return to a status quo ante situation means that a government engaged in provocative behavior can expect to make at least short term gains before responding to regional pressures for peaceful resolution of conflicts. In addition, new alliances seem to be in the works which might lead weak revisionist states to perceive that the regional context has moved in their favor. Here I am referring to the strong foreign policy rhetoric of Hugo Chávez in Venezuela and the assumption to office of his seemingly close allies in the weak revisionist states of Bolivia and Nicaragua, as well as in a weak Ecuador that is increasingly concerned that the Colombian-U.S. alliance to fight the FARC is spilling over into its territory. The uncertainty here arises because no one knows how far Chávez will go in economic and military terms to support his allies, nor how far his allies might venture in anticipation of that support.

A long postponed modernization of Latin American militaries fuels uncertainty and suspicion. Honduran purchases of military aircraft increase tension with Nicaragua, which refuses to destroy more SAM-7 missiles unless Honduras and El Salvador rid themselves of military aircraft (Latin American data Base, 2007). Chile’s purchase of F-16C fighter jets and state-of-the-art Leopard tanks and Humvees, are reported to be “of great concern to Peru, Bolivia and Argentina” (Council on Hemispheric Affairs, 2001). Venezuela’s military modernization project has accelerated in the last two years, with US$4 billion spent on fighter jets, attack helicopters and 100,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles and ammunition. There are also plans to build a Kalashnikov production facility, which combined with claims that the specific caliber of ammunition used in these Kalashnikov’s are also useable in FARC’s older models, raises fears about leakage from the Venezuelan Army to guerrilla groups in the region (Abad, 2006). Venezuela’s military assistance to Bolivia is non-transparent and confusing to the latter’s neighbors (Romero, 2007).

Perhaps the most important variables that are of concern in the current situation, however, are those incorporating the constituency’s willingness to absorb the costs of militarized disputes and the leader’s accountability to that constituency. Both of these factors are affected by the domestic instability and dramatic shift towards national populist governments Argentina, Nicaragua, Bolivia, and Venezuela.

A national populist government represents a backlash against the failures of economic reforms carried out in the heady days of the so-called “Washington Consensus” on privatizing as much of public and social services as could be found private buyers. National populism thrives in the context of truncated democratic reforms begun beforehand but also promoted by the Washington Consensus. For the purposes of our discussion, we don’t need to decide whether the economic and political reforms
were misconceived from the beginning or just poorly implemented; what matters is that these failures stimulated the dramatic increase in resentment from the middle and lower classes at precisely the moment that they were feeling historically empowered to influence their government. Their political mobilization takes both the institutionalized political form of voting for those political leaders who articulate quick fixes to their problems and the chaotic rebellion of “power in the streets” that has brought democratically elected Presidents crashing down in Argentina, Bolivia and Ecuador, as well as overturned a coup in Venezuela and forced a fraudulently elected President out in Peru.

This situation has produced a resurgence of national populism, a particular ideology that emphasizes the responsibility of a government to wield its power in favor of its downtrodden citizens. Political leaders ride this wave to power and then find that they must deliver a constant and significant level of benefits to the previously disenfranchised. But once leaders encounter the economic limits to such a scale of redistribution they cast about for easy targets to blame for the failures. In Latin America, the U.S. and neighboring countries have always been such targets. Today, with increased interdependence (e.g., Argentina-Chile; Uruguay-Argentina, Nicaragua-Costa Rica) and foreign investment by Latin American countries in neighboring countries (e.g., Brazil in Bolivia, Chile in Peru) the potential for resentment among Latin American states has increased.

Among the most troubling implications of national populism is its reliance on military symbolism. The military is an institution that by its very nature (individual citizens sacrifice their independence if not lives for the benefit of the nation) should represent the nation. The fact that often the military uses its force against the people, particularly the same class that propels national populism, does not mean that the military as an institution is delegitimized in national populism; rather, the goal with respect to the military is to ‘popularize’ it, to make it serve the needs of the ‘people.’ But as the military becomes a more active and overt participant in governing, issues become militarized, with the consequence that military force regains its legitimacy as a means of resolving conflict. To some degree the legacy of the human rights violations of military governments in the 1970s-80s had de-legitimized the very concept of using military force to resolve conflict. But when Presidents Morales and Chavez send the military in to physically occupy property that has been nationalized the positive messages about the military in the service of the nation and the emotional appeal of force as a means of asserting national aspirations becomes re-legitimized. The spectacle of Bolivian troops occupying property that had belonged to the Brazilian state-owned enterprise Petrobras is all the more worrisome since one would have thought that Bolivian leftists would not want to create problems for the left-leaning government in Brazil.

The resurgence of national populism indicates that the newly empowered lower classes are willing to pay high costs to achieve what they see as a ‘just’ resolution of national conflicts. For example, Bolivia is paying a significant economic price for pursuing a national populist strategy with
regards to its potential energy exports. Bolivia is a poor country that has a resource, natural gas, that can generate billions in revenue if properly managed. Chile, with a stable and growing economy, would be happy to purchase gas from Bolivia, as would Mexico and the U.S. But Bolivians insist on using gas exports to leverage an outlet to the sea through territory Chile conquered from Bolivia and Peru a century and a half ago. Since Chile will not be blackmailed into territorial concessions, Bolivia has foregone those markets and the capital investment, employment, fiscal revenue and economic spinoffs that such exports would generate. They have even gone so far as to prohibit Argentina from re-exporting Bolivian gas to Chile as Argentine exports (“ni una sola molécula”).

National populism also affects the accountability of leaders to their constituencies, although in different ways depending upon national circumstances. In Bolivia and Ecuador a significant portion of political power resides in the streets. This power is not just a threat for center and right wing politicians. Abdala Bucaram and Lucio Gutierrez were initially lauded as populists in Ecuador, but they were overthrown by riots in the streets when their policies displeased the middle and lower classes; can Evo Morales in Bolivia really feel he is immune to similar pressures that drove his predecessors Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada and Carlos Mesa from office? Consequently, leaders in Ecuador and Bolivia are significantly more accountable to their constituency because they can credibly be removed without having to wait for the next election.

The major national populist experiment, that in Venezuela, has had the opposite effect on leadership accountability. Unprecedented oil revenues have allowed Chávez to deliver sufficient goods and services to his constituencies in the poor neighborhoods that he doesn’t have to worry about the poor turning against him in the short term. (The rich and upper middle classes have already demonstrated that their political power in the streets is insufficient to drive Chávez from office.) With that degree of freedom, he has set about to build an institutional structure that gives him significant abilities to reward allies and hurt opponents. As a result, Chávez has been able to dramatically decrease the transparency of government, thereby making it difficult to evaluate what is going on in the government other than the delivery of social services to targeted poor areas. Chávez is thus able to disguise costs and shift the blame for any failures to Venezuelan ‘traitors’, U.S. imperialists and Latin American leaders who sell out to the U.S.

Speculations About Militarized Interstate Conflict

Any discussion about the identification of threats and their likelihood to escalate to militarized interstate conflict needs to specify the determinants of escalation. My model of militarized bargaining offers one specification. Using that model and reviewing recent history it appears that the constraints on militarizing a conflict have decreased significantly. The strategic balance in the region is uncertain, making it possible for revisionists to think that perhaps their own military weakness can be offset by the ‘justice’ of their case and the resources of friendly countries. Violence
as a means to resolve internal conflict is gaining acceptance once again and nationalist rhetoric is overvaluing the inherent value of many items or topics in dispute among neighboring states. The constituencies may be willing to pay higher prices for nationalist goods and the nation populist leaders may either find themselves propelled to pursue them (Bolivia and Ecuador) or insulated from responsibility for those demands (Venezuela).

The militarized bargaining model does not say that conflicts will inevitably militarize in the current situation. But it does predict that were a catalyzing event to develop, militarization, even war is more likely to occur today that just a few years ago.

**Conclusion**

Latin America’s security scenario has become more problematic of late. The real threats to security in the region don’t come from terrorists or drug lords. Instead, they come from the unresolved historical disagreements between Latin American states, the reappearance of class conflict and the resurgence of national populism. Above all, they come from the failure of the political leadership in the 1980s and 1990s to use the grand opportunity provided them by history and the poor themselves to set the bases for economic, political and social development.

Until this era of national populism runs itself into the ground the best defense against military conflict has to be developed by the status quo states themselves. Militarizing a conflict is a rational decision, even when undertaken by national populists. It will be up to the status quo countries to decrease the ambiguity in the strategic balance by refusing to sanction any non-peaceful efforts to resolve disputes, to demonstrate the will and capability to quickly and severely punish any cross border incursions and to identify in a clear and precise manner the provocative behavior of national populist leaders.
### Interstate Disputes in Contemporary Latin America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Disputes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala-Belize</td>
<td>Border demarcation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras-El Salvador</td>
<td>Isla de Conejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras-El Salvador-Nicaragua</td>
<td>Maritime demarcation in Gulf of Fonseca; depletion of fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras-Nicaragua</td>
<td>Maritime demarcation in Atlantic; migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua-Costa Rica</td>
<td>Migration; transit rights in San Juan River; maritime rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua-Colombia</td>
<td>Territorial dispute over San Andres &amp; Providencia Islands, including right to drill for oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia-Venezuela</td>
<td>34 points on border in dispute; migration; guerrillas; contraband, including but not limited to drugs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia-Chile</td>
<td>Territorial dispute: outlet to the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador-Colombia</td>
<td>Territorial incursions by Colombian Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor but Active Disputes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela-Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
<td>Maritime boundaries; natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti-Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Migration,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador-Peru</td>
<td>Maritime limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile-Peru</td>
<td>Final implementation of 1929 treaty covering Peruvian access to Chilean port at Arica (settled); maritime limits re: fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama-Colombia</td>
<td>Guerrilla incursions into Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia-Costa Rica</td>
<td>Territorial sea in the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador-Colombia</td>
<td>Increasing guerrilla and drug trafficker penetration of Ecuador as result of Plan Colombia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Post-Cold War World -- Globalized Economy

II. The Impact of the Drug Export Boom on the Politics and Economies of Bolivia, Peru and Colombia

III. The U.S. War on Drugs
f. Post-Cold War World — Globalized Economy
   a. International trade — flows of capital and goods across borders; transnational "diaspora" of MNCs facilitated by globalization.
   b. Transnational underworld also facilitated by globalization — most drugs enter the country through standard shipping containers, a technological innovation that created the foundation of the infrastructure of globalized trade.
   c. About 20 million shipping containers enter US ports each year — a comparable number go out — no incentive to disrupt the flow of commerce. Even with heightened concern on terrorism, the ease to commerce is located to inspect fewer containers. Inspection systems that might be put in place to combat terrorism will not likely affect the drug trade.
   d. NAFTA contraction — designed to open the border for the free flow of goods but close the border for the movement of people, drugs, and new terrorists.
   e. International financial system — despite tighter controls, incentive to step free and secret flows of money. Illegal users are only one user of a vast system.

---

The Impact of the Drug Export Boom on the Politics and Economies of Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia

In 1980s, Andean Region inserted into global economy as major exporter of illicit narcotics

---

a. Bolivia 65% Amazonian
b. Coca, traditional Andean crop, grows between 500-1500 meters, in the foothills of the Andes or "high jungle" of the Amazon Basin – Light green strip – Chapare & Yungas

Peru: Alto Huallaga – colonization zone east of the Andes similar to the Chapare region of Bolivia

Colombia: Similar illicit coca zones emerge in colonization zones of Guaviare, Caqueta and Putumayo
1980s: The Lost Decade and Development Failures in Latin America

- The closing of the mines in La Banda due to structural adjustment, and recruiting workers abroad to fill the vacancies increased the population of the Chapare.
- Economic crisis in Peru and the rise of Fidel Castro coincided with the rise of the coca producers in the AHS meetings, creating a support base and some projects of support for Cordemex.

The formation of the Coca Unions in the Chapare and their emergence as a political force

The rise of cocalero leader Evo Morales
Colombia

- Colombia did not experience the "lost decade" unlike most of its neighbors. It experienced relative economic success (though with great inequality and high levels of rural and regional poverty) and had sustained economic growth from the late 1980's, without a recession, until 1999.

- Infrastructure to support a multibillion dollar illegal export industry.

- Illegal export earnings (likely greater than economy's ability to absorb it) limiting domestic investment of legal means to about a billion dollars annually. "The Laundromat is too small." Colombian economist Francisco Thomaz.

- Major Narco investment in rural landholdings, one of the most exposed and vulnerable areas of the economy, leading to:
  - Unprecedented land concentration
  - An escalation of agrarian conflicts
  - The rise of right-wing paramilitary groups with links to traffickers, landowners, and the Armed Forces

- Drug trade helped re-shape the armed conflict from an insurgency between guerrillas and the state (1964-1993) into a multipolar and multi-faceted war among guerrillas, paramilitaries, traffickers and the state (1993-present).

Colombia: Narco Lands

(Agrarian lands purchased with narco-dollars)

Author and Source: Dr. Alejandro Reyes, Georgetown-UNDP project

Copyright 2007 M. Ehrenkranz & UNDP

Agrarian Conflicts

Author and Source: Dr. Alejandro Reyes, Georgetown-UNDP project

Copyright 2007 M. Ehrenkranz & UNDP
The drug export boom re-shaped and led to an escalation of Colombia’s internal armed conflict that had antedated the drug trade by several decades.

It created new social and land conflicts, created a new armed actor – the paramilitaries –, brought the United States directly into the conflict, and provided abundant resources to the guerrillas, leading them to expand their size, weaponry and territorial reach..
The U.S. War on Drugs

I. Supply-side Approach versus Demand Side Approach
   a. Roughly 66-67% focus on supply
   b. Internationally, primary focus in disrupting the supply from Latin America, and coca/cocaine

II. The Pentagon, after initial reluctance, adopts new post-Cold War mission with the National Defense Authorization Act in 1989 which named the DOD as “single lead agency in the War on Drugs.

Four phases of the U.S. War on Drugs in Latin America

Phase 1: FORCED ERADICATION OF COCA CROPS (1986-1989)
   Operation Trash Can 1986: US combat troops are deployed to Bolivia – first such mission in South America.

   Result: Temporary decline in coca production, increase in price of cocaine on streets of US cities, effect diminishes and disappears as farmers replant coca in distant valleys and new regions, an effect that came to be known as the “billion effect.”

   Impact on overall flow of cocaine to US: zero beyond temporary disruptions

Phase 2: THE BOTTLENECK OR “KINGPIN” STRATEGY

At the neck of a global coca/cocaine market that looks like an hourglass, with millions of cocaine consumers in the US and internationally at the top of the hourglass, and the hundreds of thousands of cocalero campesinos in the Andean region (at this point largely in Peru and Bolivia) at the bottom, there exist a few large multinational drug cartels centered in Colombia.

In 1989, the US and Colombian Governments begin a major crackdown of the Medellin Cartel, producing the worse phase of terrorist violence in Colombia’s long, internal conflict.

Immediate Result: The dismantling of the Medellin Cartel, temporary spike in price of cocaine on streets of US. Emergence of the Cali Cartel to fill the vacuum. New efforts to dismantle Cali Cartel were successful. Result: emergence of hundreds of smaller cartels, “cartelitos” – many connected with paramilitary forces, and new larger cartels in Mexico.

Impact on overall flow of cocaine to US: zero beyond temporary disruptions

This strategy was designed to break the link between the coca fields in Bolivia (Chapare) and Peru (Alto Huallaga) and the cocaine processing facilities based in Colombia. Radars were based in Peru, Colombia and Ecuador and Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) were sent to the region. Peru and Colombian presidents gave orders to shoot down narcotics-running planes.

Result: Denial of airbridge, major reductions of 70-75% of coca fields of Bolivia and Peru.

Impact on overall flow of cocaine to US: zero – coca production was displaced to Colombia.

---

Illicit Crops – Colombia 1995

Author and Source: Dr. Alejandro Reyes, Georgetown UNDP project
© 2007 MHermia & UNDP-RRAE
Phase 4: PLAN COLOMBIA 2000-2005

By 2000, all aspects of the coca/cocaine had been pushed up into Colombia. Plan Colombia was designed to repress the coca production that had now moved to Colombia and that was feeding the internal violence, with the FARC controlling coca-producing zones and internal coca markets, and the paramilitaries consolidating a position in all aspects of the trade, from coca cultivation, to cocaine production to distribution.

Plan Colombia:
- created two Colombian anti-narcotics battalions, provided helicopters and logistical and training assistance.
- financed aerial fumigation of coca crops, distinct from the programs in Bolivia and Peru because of the conflict.
- provided to a lesser degree alternative development programs, justice assistance, human rights and other programs.

- In 2002, Congress authorized the use of Plan Colombia funds for non-narcotics missions, subsuming the anti-narcotics struggle into the wider War on Terrorism.

Results of Aerial Fumigation:

![Graph showing Cultivos Ilícitos vs. Aspersión Aérea from 1991 to 2000.](image)

*In 2002, there were 7,000 hectares of coca production due to information obtained from UAVs. FUENTE: Centro Nacional Cultivos Ilícitos.*
2005 Results

- Colombia, with U.S. assistance, sprayed almost 139,400 hectares of coca in 2005. The Government of Colombia also reported that about 32,000 hectares were eradicated manually in Colombia.

- The survey also found 144,000 hectares of coca under cultivation in 2005 in a search area that was 8.1 percent larger than that used in 2004. The potential production for the 144,000 hectares of coca found by this year’s survey is 545 metric tons of pure cocaine.
Immediate Result of Plan Colombia: Colombian farmers effectively re-planted as fast as fumigators could fumigate or have moved into new zones of production (a balloon effect within the country).

Coca production again began to rise in Bolivia and Peru (international balloon effect) – though in 2006 it leveled off in Bolivia.

Peru and Bolivia are now producing cocaine, and in some cases, pioneering new international markets, such as Brazil.

In 2006, despite record levels of fumigation and manual eradication in Colombia – and almost six years and 5.4 billion dollars, coca production in the Andes may have reached its highest levels in 20 years and cocaine production and trafficking remains undiminished.

Impact on overall flow of cocaine to US: zero

---

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>136,200</td>
<td>169,800</td>
<td>144,650</td>
<td>113,850</td>
<td>114,100</td>
<td>160,800</td>
<td>175,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>42,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 194,100 | 194,000 | 185,000 | 190,000 | 223,700 | 206,450 | 186,200 | 204,200 | 225,500 | 254,800 |

* 2006: OFFDCP reported only figures for Bolivia or Peru, not point estimates.

Sources: State Department and ONDCP

---

Figure 1

**Andean Coca Cultivation, 1987-2006**

*Figures reflect the average annual area cultivated for the period 1987-2006.*

Sources: ONDCP and State Department. Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA)
Conclusions:

- If the war on drugs is to succeed, the reduction of the flow of cocaine to the US, 20 years and two phases of anti-drug strategy have failed.
- The measures taken to substitute coca and heroin production, including measures to reduce the consumption of cocaine and heroin, have been unsuccessful.
- Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru have benefited from the dramatic decline in coca production in the late 1990s and early 2000s.
- However, the region remains one of the world’s most significant sources of drugs, with major centers in Peru and Bolivia, which are major producers of high-quality coca and opium poppy.
- Countries should adopt a holistic approach that recognizes the long-term and complex nature of the drug problem and the need for a comprehensive strategy that includes prevention, education, and demand reduction.
- The "War on Drugs" should be replaced with a more comprehensive approach that emphasizes education, prevention, and law enforcement.
- The Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA) has supported programs that address the root causes of drug production and trafficking.
The city and state of São Paulo, Brazil experienced some of the worst violence in their history during the winter of 2006, when members of the prison-based gang First Capital Command (PCC) staged prison riots and engaged police and other security forces in street battles. During the three outbreaks of violence between May and August, gangs launched at least 200 attacks against security forces, public buildings, banks and buses in São Paulo state. At least 130 civilians and more than 40 police officers were killed, as well as hundreds of criminals. The federal government offered to send the military forces, although the offer was rejected by São Paulo’s Governor.

On December 12, 2006, Mexican President Felipe Calderón sent 6,500 federal police and military troops to his home state of Michoacán in a bid to restore government control over an area that has witnessed some of the most brutal acts of violence at the hands of drug cartels. The deployment of federal forces on such a large scale, specifically for combating organized crime, was unprecedented in Mexico.

Unfortunately, these operations had at best served only to temporarily disrupt criminal activity in the targeted areas, or to divert it to other parts of the country. While the federal forces were disrupting cartel operations in Michoacán, the drug lords shifted their activities to other coastal states, such as Guerrero and Jalisco. The need to turn to the military to combat transnational organized crime (TOC) is a strong indication that traditional law enforcement approaches are not working.

On February 19, 2007, three Salvadoran representatives to the Central American Parliament (Parlacen) were murdered in Guatemala, creating a severe political and security crisis in that country. Four officers in the Criminal Investigation Division of the Guatemalan National Civil Police, including the head of the Organized Crime Unit, were arrested for the murders. The officers were themselves killed four days later while being held in the El Boquerón maximum security prison.

On March 18, 2007, Jamaican police announced that the death of Pakistan cricket team’s coach Bob Woolmer was a murder case. Woolmer died only hours after his team lost to Ireland in a match that eliminated Pakistan from the Cricket World Cup. Speculation is that Woolmer was killed, possibly at the hands of South Asian organized crime, to prevent him from uncovering evidence of large-scale illegal betting on cricket games.

These are but four recent examples out of many that demonstrate the hand of transnational organized crime at work in different regions of the Western Hemisphere. The era of globalization has created vast new opportunities for criminals. Transparent national borders, fewer trade restrictions, and modernized financial and telecommunications systems provide greater opportunities for criminal organizations to expand their operations beyond national boundaries. Countries in Latin America and the Caribbean are particularly at risk of transnational criminal intrusion because of their interlinked geography, a pervasive culture of corruption, and a general inability to keep pace with technological advances. As a result, these nations are vulnerable to such illegal activities as drug
trafficking, arms trafficking, trafficking in persons, gang violence, kidnapping, extortion, and a host of related criminal activities. The ensuing levels of crime and violence can be devastating for the emerging economies of the region, and especially for those that are largely dependent on the tourism industry, such as in the Caribbean.

In Latin America, “old” problems of domestic insecurity arising from weak institutions and incomplete democratization intersect with “new” transnational challenges such as organized crime. Organized crime exploits insecurity and violence, and because of a number of factors has the ability to make itself increasingly more mobile, flexible, powerful, and threatening to the Western Hemisphere. The first of these factors is high profitability, which provides organized criminals with vast resources for the expansion and protection of their criminal enterprises. By the most conservative estimates, criminal proceeds amount to between two and five percent of the region’s GDP, and organized crime takes the lion’s share of the profits. Second is the apparently declining ability of governments to guarantee their citizens’ basic right to security. The weakness and inability of law enforcement agencies allow criminals a relatively unconstrained level of freedom to expand their businesses and become more profitable. Third, the political, economic and social turmoil that affected several countries in the Hemisphere in the last decades provided fertile grounds, first for the development of local organized crime, then for its transformation into transnational organized crime. A fourth factor is border porosity; the weak border controls between interdependent states increases mobility and flexibility and aids the expansion of illicit enterprises. Technology, and the almost unlimited access criminal organizations gain to through their accumulating resources, is another factor that facilitates communications and the evasion of law enforcement. Easy access to military assault rifles and even more sophisticated weaponry, which allows criminal organizations to readily out-gun national law enforcement organizations, is another factor. Finally, corruption, facilitated by the availability of enormous amounts of ready cash from criminal proceeds, allows criminals to evade the rule of law, which creates a generalized sense of impunity. Two of these factors, high profitability and the social, economic and political environment are particularly important, and deserve further explanation.

The challenges that organized crime poses to governments is best exemplified by the huge profits it generates. For instance, a major portion of global cultivation, processing and trafficking of illicit drugs is concentrated in the Andean sub-region and Mexico. The Andean sub-region—particularly Colombia, Peru and Bolivia—is responsible for approximately 90 percent of the total global production of coca leaf and cocaine, and Colombia and Mexico are also important producers of heroin. Approximately 900 tons of cocaine are produced every year, a market worth US$ 60 billion in 2003 according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Overall drug-trafficking generates income of approximately $320 billion per year, a figure higher than the GDP of 90 percent of the Western Hemisphere’s nations (Tickner, 2007:4).
But drug-trafficking is not the only criminal activity that has flourished. According to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, human trafficking generates an estimated $9.5 billion in annual global revenue (Global—F.B.I., in TIP Report, 2005); and the profits from human trafficking fuel other criminal activities such as document forgery, which presents a whole series of additional complications in a terrorism-conscious post September 11, 2001 world.

Despite the Hemisphere’s enormous real and potential wealth, poverty and inequality continue to be pervasive problems. In fact, Latin America it is perhaps the most unequal region on earth. According to the World Bank World Development Indicators database, approximately 20 percent of the region’s population lives in extreme poverty, and in some countries (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru) the level of extreme poverty rises to 50 percent or more of the population living below the poverty line (World Bank World Development Indicators database).

Although frequently linked to poverty, under-development in and of itself does not cause crime, and the poorest nations are not always the most crime-prone. More strongly correlated with crime is income inequality. It has been argued that stark wealth disparities provide criminals with both a justification (addressing social injustice) and an opportunity (wealth to steal) for their activities. The Gini index is also indicative of high levels of income and consumption disparities: Bolivia, Haiti, Colombia, Brazil and Paraguay exhibit particularly acute levels.

São Paulo is a good example of deep inequality. The city is Brazil’s main financial and industrial center and it houses many multinational corporations and branches of the world’s major banks. Despite its wealth, São Paulo is a contrast of rich and poor. Parts of the city are as affluent as any cosmopolitan center in the developed world, while the residents of the favelas, or slums, suffer under grinding poverty with no social services, opportunities or security. Gangs form in these environments, sometimes even originally with good intentions, such as providing security for the slum’s residents, but they eventually turn criminal in nature, extorting and controlling the people they originally intended to “protect”.

Maras are active throughout Central America, Mexico and the United States and have become increasingly visible. Key criminal gangs include the Mara Salvatrucha and the Mara 18. The estimated numbers of gang members in Central America vary; but UNODC places them at around 70,000. The explosion of gangs in Central America, with the high visibility of their violent acts, and the growing perception of insecurity experienced by citizens has converted this problem into what many believe is the main security challenge confronted by Central American governments. But a revealing statistic comes, for example, from the Institute of Forensic Medicine of El Salvador, which for 2000 reported that only 8% of the firearms homicides committed in the country in 2000 were related to Mara activity. Recent research by the Washington Office on Latin America and a research team led by the Center for Inter-American Studies
and Programs of the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) revealed that while a growing and complex problem, the transnational and criminal nature of youth gangs is “quite limited” (Barnes). The more serious problem faced by these countries are well-organized transnational criminal networks deeply involved in the drug trade flowing North and the arms trade flowing South—but there is little doubt that these same criminal networks take advantage of gangs, at least as foot-soldiers, couriers, and eyes and ears.

The consequence of the continuing expansion of organized crime is that it is having a multiplier effect on all other forms of violence, on the economy of the affected countries, on the quality of life of citizens, on the privatization of security, on the militarization of law enforcement, and on the corruption it generates.

TOC acts as a catalyst for other forms of violence and crime; it affects directly or indirectly everyone in a society; and erodes the bonds that unite governments and its people. Organized crime breaks social cohesion, divides, corrupts, destabilizes, and destroys societies and governments. The multiplier effect of TOC can be seen from the sharp increase in homicide rates in those countries with strong organized crime networks. The region boasts comparatively high homicide rates and extraordinary levels of kidnapping. During the 1990s, the average homicide rate in the region was estimated at 22.9 per 100,000 inhabitants, more than twice the global average. Colombia, El Salvador, Brazil, Venezuela, Ecuador and Mexico were six of the highest homicide rate countries in the world. According to the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), homicide rates in recent years have remained steady or have increased in most parts of the region, with the exception of Colombia, where rates appear to have fallen. Today, several countries in the Hemisphere are still ranked in the top 10 countries with the highest intentional homicide rates, including Jamaica, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Brazil. According to PAHO, the main cause of death for males in the Andean region in 2000 was homicide, with a rate of 83.3 per 100,000 inhabitants. In Brazil the rate was 56.7. The rate for Central America was 45.5 (PAHO, 2006). By contrast, the latest figures for Canada hover just above 2 per 100,000 according to Statistics Canada (The Daily, 2005).

Of course, not all violence is related to organized crime or transnational organized crime; common crime is a large part of the problem, as is domestic violence, for instance. A study by the Inter-American Development Bank concluded that between 10% and 36% (depending on the country) of women in Latin America have been victims of physical violence in their home, a staggering revelation (IADB, 2000).

Organized crime also has direct and considerable economic consequences for the countries, taxing their health and rehabilitation systems, their security institutions, and forcing those residents that can afford it, out of necessity or fear, to spend money on walled compounds with razor-wire, alarm systems, added insurance and private security guards. A UNDP study of El Salvador estimated the cost of violence in that one country
to be 11.5% of its GDP, or US$ 1.7 billion (UNDP, 2005). The Inter-American Development Bank estimates that for the region as a whole, crime and violence cost approximately 168 billion dollars; that means a staggering 15% of GDP.

Because of its enormous revenues, organized crime plays a key role in corrupting individuals and institutions. Transparency International’s 2006 Corruption Perception Index shows that 25 out of 30 countries in the Hemisphere score below 5, which indicates serious perceived levels of domestic corruption. Moreover, more than a third (11 countries) scores below 3, which indicates a perception of rampant corruption. These perceived levels of corruption are not the result of petty corruption, but rather of the comparatively limitless amounts of money that TOC uses to fulfill its goals, threatening the very governability of the weakest countries in the region.

The expansion of organized crime and transnational organized crime produces a perceived state of lawlessness. The consequences of this sense of lawlessness incite public demands for the use of hard-line police tactics, or of military forces, as seen in Mexico and Brazil. Some of those who propose the use of military forces to combat TOC argue that the region’s military institutions are not corrupt, unlike the police. But using the military to fight organized crime, except in a very limited and strategic way (for instance, improving control over porous land and maritime borders), will expose the institution to the same corruption that weakens police forces throughout the region—which could have enormous national security implications in a time of political or civil strife. Another basic reason not to involve the military in fighting TOC is that they are trained to kill, not to maintain the rule of law, manage community relations or to investigate crime.

Recognizing that the ability to fight transnational organized crime transcends the power and resources of single countries, in 2000 the member states of the United Nations adopted the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (known as the Palermo Convention) which represented a major step forward in the fight against transnational organized crime. The Convention, and its three Protocols2 contain a series of measures including the creation of domestic criminal offences, the adoption of new frameworks for extradition, mutual legal assistance and law enforcement cooperation, and the promotion of training and technical assistance for building or upgrading the necessary capacity of national authorities. In October 2006, the member states of the Organization of American States (OAS) adopted a Hemispheric Plan of Action against Transnational Organized Crime, which essentially constitutes the Western Hemisphere’s vision and common framework for implementing the Palermo Convention.

The countries of the Americas had in fact pioneered a number of binding international treaties through the OAS to combat specific aspects of transnational organized crime that subsequently became models for the United Nations. These include the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and other Related Materials (CIFTA) adopted in 1997; and the Inter-
American Convention against Corruption adopted in 1996. More recently, although not in a binding manner, the Organization’s member states have begun examining specific individual and collective actions to fight trafficking in persons, through the Conclusions and Recommendations of the First Meeting of National Authorities on Trafficking in Persons, held in Venezuela in March 2006. The Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission, one of the OAS’ flagship organs, has been engaged in the various aspects of the fight against the trafficking of illicit drugs and related crimes since 1986. These treaties, bodies and mechanisms provide the region with multilateral tools to address transnational organized crime. But much more remains to be done, particularly with regard to the effective implementation of these legal instruments.

One of the most important problems is the lack of qualified personnel to successfully carry out criminal investigations and prosecutions. The proof needed to substantiate an indictment and prosecute the alleged responsible parties can be very difficult to obtain. This again is due in part to the economic power of the people involved in organized crime, but also to the difficulty in detecting their illegal activities, the lack of specialized scientific and technical (forensic) capabilities and measures available to police and public security ministries to obtain useful and lawful evidence, the fear of victims and witnesses in testifying against criminals, and the ease with which criminal organizations can adapt and overcome new legal and judicial obstacles, among other reasons.

Governments in the Americas must strive to enhance internal and international cooperation in the areas of prevention, investigation and prosecution of transnational organized crime, but within the framework of the rule of law and respect for human rights. They should ensure the successful use of accusatorial criminal justice systems in prosecuting transnational organized crime cases by outlining clearly the different roles prosecutors and police have under these new systems, and by providing adequate funding and training for police, judges and prosecutors. Their legislation needs to be modernized to allow the use of special investigative techniques such as undercover investigations, controlled delivery, plea-bargaining, electronic surveillance, asset seizure, forfeiture and sharing. Financial intelligence units need to be strengthened as do regulations for banks and other financial institutions to prevent the laundering of illegal assets. Most importantly efforts need to be made to establish safe and effective witness protection programs, at least for the most important TOC cases. Police forces also need to be reformed and modernized, offering officers better pay and a social safety net so that they will be less susceptible to corruption.

International organizations, including the OAS, the Inter-American Development Bank and the United Nations, especially its Office on Drugs and Crime, can help. Although significant actions are currently underway in the region, it is clear that a coordinated and multilateral application of resources among states, and international and regional organizations is needed if serious inroads are to be made in confronting the increasingly complex nature of transnational organized crime in a globalized Americas.
Notes

   http://www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/tiprpt/2005/ 46606.htm
2. The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children; the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air; and the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition.
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Introduction

Despite well-developed state institutions, including strong and independent judiciaries, and increasingly well trained police forces, perhaps no other complex phenomenon threatens to undermine the two-generation-old democratic political system in the Caribbean than organized armed violence. Manifesting itself in the form of kidnappings for ransom, murder, extortion, protection rackets, drug trafficking, gun running, prostitution, domestic violence, and trafficking in stolen automobile and automobile parts, human trafficking, organized armed violence is increasingly part of the social and political landscape of Caribbean from Antigua and Barbuda Guyana, from Jamaica to Trinidad and Tobago, and countries in between.


What, then, explains rising and increasingly pervasive crime and violence in the Caribbean? The central contention in this essay is that two dynamic and interrelated factors drive crime and violence in the Caribbean. Factor number one is the existence of a sometimes loose, sometimes tight relationship between the dominant political parties and organized crime gangs in the region, which maintain extensive links with international counterparts. And factor number two is that the region’s role as a transshipment point for illicit drugs fuels organized gang activity, the central criminal entities. This pattern of crime and violence must be understood as part and parcel of the global economic and political forces that impact and impinge upon economic and social relations and political stability in the region.
A Theoretical Digression

According to Nye (2002), three different though interrelated levels of interactions structure the system of international relations: the world of military power and might; the world of economic power and influence; and the “multifarious and proliferating nongovernmental activities shaping our world: currency flows, migration, transnational corporations, NGOS, international agencies, cultural exchanges, the electronic media, the internet, and terrorism (Judt, 2002: 1-9). These nongovernmental actors communicate and interact within this third-level space undeterred and impeded by government intervention and, in the process, frustrating the power of any one state, including the US, to the point of neutralization. Among the activities that produce the greatest frustration at this level of interaction are the types of illicit activities pursued by organized crime groups, including drug trafficking, money laundering, weapons smuggling, human trafficking and terrorism. And because of the intermestic nature of these activities, the operational space for these organized crime groups is both domestic and international. To better understand these illicit interactions, this analysis draws upon Milward and Raab’s (2006; 2003) theory of dark networks, which views entities such as organized crime groups as “dark (covert) networks” (2006: 333-360; 2003: 413-439).

For the most part, the interests of dark networks center on destruction or on enriching themselves at the expense of social and political stability, and are the prime elements in the recent spate of violence in the Caribbean. Organized crime gangs, therefore, constitute “un-civil” society groups, which are both a cause and consequence of the corruption of the political system. These groups serve as a source of new recruits for organized crime groups; are used by organized crime groups to commit different crimes; provide support to organized crime groups in organizational development; gather useful information for organized crime groups; can be used by organized crime groups as security agents; are essential elements for trafficking drugs and related crimes within the structure of organized crime groups; provide protection in their territories for activities executed by the organized criminal structure; generate a political instability useful to organized crime groups; terrify the population, and by threatening communities they serve the purposes of organized crime groups (www.cicad.oas.org). Therefore, not only are international governments and agencies frustrated with the impunity with which these “covert networks” operate but equally so are national governments. Crime and violence in the Caribbean, therefore, despite local peculiarities, cannot be separated from the international economic and political context within which these activities are unfolding.

Crime and Violence in Context

The most recent spate of violence in the region began with the arrival of cocaine to the Caribbean at the beginning of the decade of the 1980s, and by the fact that local drug dealers/traffickers are now paid in commodity as opposed to cash. This arrangement has created its own local dynamic in terms of use, abuse and gang war over drug turf. In addition, gun
running and gun ownership, partly a by-product of the drug trade and partly a by-product of politics, also play a significant role in crime and violence as illegal weapons are widely used in the commission of homicides, which have put the region’s average at 30 per 100,000 annually. For example, the number of homicides committed in 2002 ranged from seven to 11 in Eastern Caribbean states—including the once-tranquil Barbados—to very worrying levels in Guyana (60); Trinidad and Tobago (172) and Jamaica (1,045). Complicating the challenge of combating crime are shocking disclosures of crooked cops in police services reportedly linked with drug-trafficking networks, as well as the kidnapping-for-ransom racket in Trinidad and Tobago among other countries.

Kidnappings in Jamaica in 2002 resulted in a number of deaths linked to drug trafficking and gun-running crimes, while the reported 19 cases of armed abductions in Trinidad and Tobago were primarily to meet monetary demands ranging from TT$200,000 to TT$5 million. Until 2001, kidnapping for ransom money was not a feature of serious crimes in Guyana. However, the deaths of at least three known abducted victims among the estimated 60 people murdered elevated the level of fear that gripped that country during most of 2002. Trinidad and Tobago has experienced high degrees of gun-related homicides: 32.8 per cent in 1995; 60 per cent in 2000; and 72.6 per cent in 2005. These developments have raised the temperature on the level of fear that permeates the societies in the region as depicted by the attitudes of Table I the attitude of citizens of Trinidad and Tobago to crime and violence.

Buttressing these conclusions is the 2002 assertion by Jamaican Member of Parliament Donald Buchanan that drug dealers in Jamaica are attempting to use their power to control political candidates and called for legislation to prevent infusion of drug money into the electoral process. An example of this assertion reflected the now-incarcerated gang leader Donald “Zeeks” Phillips’s ability to exploit the fact that he was half-brother to a Member of Parliament for Central Kingston by engaging in crime, violence and extortion with relative impunity. When Zeeks and members of his gang were arrested in 1998, rioting by his supporters shut down Kingston for two days. Zeeks was eventually released on $25,000 bail. In the wake of the arrest of Zeeks and members of his gang, this time on October 17th 2004, on illicit narcotics and ammunition charges, a shoot-out subsequently ensued between his supporters and police at the police station where they were being held.

Meanwhile, Zeeks used the proceeds from his criminal activities to build a school (named after him) in his community of Matthews Lane, which viewed him as a community leader and, in the process, gave him greater “legitimacy” and latitude to carry out his illicit activities. His profile and power in that community made him a power broker in that the parliamentary representative for that garrison community would not win the vote and perhaps his seat without “acknowledging” and “accepting” Zeek’s role in that community. Immediate past Prime Minister PJ Patterson decision to shake his Zeke’s hand while thanking him for keeping the roads in his area clear during a demonstration against the
government served also to “legitimize” these “dons” in the eyes of their respective communities.

In Trinidad and Tobago, Prime Minister Patrick Manning commented that “the illicit drug trade has created a criminal elite with considerable financial resources with which they corrupt public institutions and officials and recruit the country’s children for all forms of criminal activity... Illegal drug profits [are] being used to buy weapons and ammunition that end up in the hands of feuding gangs, pushing up the murder rate.” Guyana’s former Home Affairs Minister Gajraj contended that “some deportees have become criminal kingpins, corrupting government officials and organizing native Guyanese into gangs that are smuggling drugs into the United States and firearms into Guyana...” (Seattle Times November, 17th 2003). Additionally, authorities in Jamaica have begun to express concern that one of the country’s major criminal gang in Jamaica has established branches or “gang incubators” in some schools in the Parish of St. Catherine (Rose, 2006). And ostensibly because of their connection with high-ranking members of the incumbent government of St. Kitts and Nevis, Charles “Little Nut” Miller, Glenroy “Bobo” Matthew, and Noel “Zambo” Heath resisted extradition to the US on drug trafficking charges. What are the roots of these developments? This analysis asserts a linkage between organized crime and violence and the political system and process in the region.

Putting these data into context is a new World Bank and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) report, which argues that the high rates of crime and violence in the Caribbean are undermining growth, threatening human welfare, and impeding social development because increases in crime retard a country’s ability to attract development financing, divert resources toward formal and informal security measures, and reduce the level of worker productivity. In general, not only does crime impact upon business but it represents a major impediment to foreign investment. According to the authors, a one-third reduction in the homicide rate, for example, could more than double the region’s rate of per capita economic growth (Cedeño and Jackson, 2007).

The Political Nexus between Crime and Violence in the Caribbean

“Un-civil” society groups have emerged in many inner city communities in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and other parts of the Caribbean because the state remains consistently incapable of fulfilling many of its core functions—providing a consistent set of public goods, including security, education and health care. The past two-and-a-half decades have witnessed these functions increasingly being provided by an emergent “un-civil society,” reflecting gangs, whose leaders and members employ violence as a rational means of exercising their authority over their “communities,” and the creation of a situation reflection the emergence of a government-within-a-government. As a consequence, an almost parallel relationship exists between the emergence of these “un-civil society” groups and upsurge in crime and violence, which has galvanized in
frequency, intensity, and character in recent years. Perhaps no other complex phenomenon, therefore, threatens to undermine the two-generation-old democratic political system in the Caribbean than organized and un-organized armed violence.

From Belize to Guyana, from Jamaica to Trinidad and Tobago, and from Antigua to Barbados and to parts in between, Caribbean countries are being forced to contend with increasing numbers of gangs and attendant armed violence that are threatening political stability and democracy. Rival gangs in depressed, inner city communities fight one another for control over drug turf. Gang leaders also initiate conflict against rival leaders in order to assume the role of “community leader.” As a “community leader,” the gang leader then is viewed by the government as the individual most able to be the arbiter of violence, agent of stability and the person most capable of managing public works projects in these communities. The legitimacy acquired by this new role of community leader and power broker provides political cover for expanding his drug turf, which, in turn, expands and escalates the violence as new entrants into the drug trade seek to capitalize on the wealth and opportunity that gang activity presents. Ironically, these gangs have a historical association with political parties, Among these were the notorious Mongoose Gang in Grenada used by Prime Minister Eric Gairy to terrorize citizens into support his Grenada United Labor Party (GULP); and the infamous Tontons Macoutes that performed a similar function in Haiti, especially during the 27-year dynasty of François (Papa Doc) Duvalier and his son Jean-Claude (Baby Doc) Duvalier.

Haiti

Haiti’s 25-year Duvalier dynasty orchestrated and exercised its own brand of political terrorism by means of the hands, guns and whims of the notorious “tontons macoutes,” who still remain engaged in organized violence in Haiti today. Cité Soleil, Haiti’s largest slum, with a population of some 300,000 people, is home to hundreds of chimères (Creole for “bad boys”), armed youth gangs who fought for Aristide and are increasingly involved in crime and the drug trade. Groups opposing Aristide accused the Lavales party of arming the chimères at the beginning of the 1990s. According to local analysts, Haiti’s then interim President Gerard Latortue’s support of local gang leaders was partly responsible for much of the violence in the nation. Former member of the Haitian government, Lelsy Voltaire, admits that the party was wrong to ally itself with the gangs.

The violence that ensued during the last presidential election violence was fueled in part by contraband weaponry entering the country from other countries such as Brazil, France, and Italy, as well as 2004 US sale of 2,600 weapons to the HNP, and the 2005 agreement dispatching US-authorized pistols, rifles, and tear gas according to the IANSA (Birns and Starke, 2006). According to reports, approximately one quarter of the weapons smuggled from Miami, Pompano Beach, and Fort Lauderdale from 2003-2005, landed in Haiti. The shipments of small arms to the universally repudiated the Latortue government nevertheless increased the
prospects for even greater violence given that many of those weapons were “leaked” into the hands of gang members and other “thugs,” as they were described by former Secretary of State Colin Powell (Birns and Starke, 2006). An estimated 210,000 small arms and light weapons either in hiding or in circulation in Haiti, most of which are held illegally, or are not properly registered, as the government lacks a functioning book-keeping system, according to International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA). And the resources to finance much of the arms trade could be linked to the Haitian-Colombian cocaine trade, which accounts for up to 10 per cent of the total quantity of cocaine entering the US (Birns and Starker, 2006).

Jamaica

Jamaica retains the distinction of the country, whose two main political parties have long been associated with organized gang activity. The two main gangs, “Clansman Gang,” which is affiliated with the People’s National Party (PNP), and the “One Order Gang,” which is affiliated with are associated with the Jamaica Labor Party (JLP), respectively. Following the country’s independence in 1962, the PNP and JLP each became aligned with industrial trade unions and competed to represent the newly mobilized workforce in return for patronage jobs. Violence became a norm in unionism and politics alike, and signaled the advent of one of the “garrison community” phenomenon and the relationship between party loyalty, political tribalism, and the spoils of party patronage.

The importance of party and patronage initially manifested itself in 1966 when Edward Seaga embarked upon a ‘slum clearance project’ in the West Kingston shanty town called “Back O’Wall,” now known as Tivoli Gardens. This housing development, along with other inner city communities in Mountain View, August Town, Arnette Gardens (Concrete Jungle), Olympic Gardens, Wareika Hills, and Rema and aligned with one or the other political party (Williams, 2005a; 2005b), signaled the advent of one of the “garrison community” phenomenon and the relationship between party loyalty, political tribalism, and the spoils of party patronage or the politics of clientelism (Edie, 1991; Stone, 1986; 1980). Patronage, thus, became central to attaining and maintaining political power. In turn, political power enabled incumbents to dispense patronage, especially to their respective garrison communities. By the 1970s, the fight for power based on political tribalism and patronage began to intensify, resulting in an increase in the nature and level of violence and political killings. According to one individual, “you may be surprised by how much politics means to us in the ghetto, but the reason is because we know that if our party loses, we will starve” (Ministry of National Security and Justice). Politically-motivated crime, therefore, for and on behalf of both political parties, structured most of the violent crime in Jamaica up to the end of the 1970s and into the 1980s.

For example, following the PNPs victory in the 1972 general election, a three-way gang fight ensued between Old Max, Tel Aviv (from Tivoli Gardens). Open gun battles along the boundaries of rival neighborhoods
resulted in the establishment of the Gun Court to try persons accused of
gun-related crimes. Some 593 persons, including dons and politicians,
were incarcerated. Up to this point, both political parties were able to
control the gangs and their leaders. However, it was while they were
incarcerated that a number of these gang leaders and members concluded
that they did not need their respective political parties to remain relevant
in their respective communities as well as to pursue their own interests.
Upon leaving prison and infused with a sense of independence of the
political parties, the phenomenon ‘donmanship’ becomes formalized as
a covert network for drug trafficking, extortion and assorted criminal
activity.

This type of network became firmly entrenched by 1980 when cocaine
trafficking through Jamaica and the Caribbean began to change the crim-
inal landscape. First, Jamaica’s general election of 1980 became the most
violent one thus far, resulting in 889 homicides—339 more than during
the previous election in 1976. A total of 28 police officers were killed. By
1984, crack cocaine began to replace the regular cocaine and because of
its lower cost, it became easier to market. A change in the focus of crime
was witnessed during the period 1981-1987 when politically motivated
murders declined while income-generating ones increased.

During this period, also, it was realized that gang members were receiving
financial support from their associate members in the US and Britain, and
that increasing numbers of guns were being imported into the country.
The gangs had now become fully independent of the political parties and
integrated into larger, more complex, global trafficking networks. Reports
indicate that by the end of the 1980s, the following gangs—Shower Posse,
Spangler Posse, Dog Posse, Tel Aviv Posse, Waterhouse Posse, Banton
Posse, and Dunkirk Posse—had over 5,000 members, which frustrated the
efforts of local and international authorities to manage local and transna-
tional criminal activities. In addition, the decade of the 1990s witnessed
guns such as M16, Tech9 automatic pistols, and .45 caliber automatic
weapons designed to carry more shots and kill at a longer range becoming
the most prevalent types of firearms used by these gangs. Moreover, the
fact that M16 rifles are military weapons (Williams 2005b), which are
sold only to governments allied to the US, ended up in the hands of these
gangs, confirmed suspicions about the linkage between the various
Jamaican governments and these gangs.

Among the PNP-linked dons were, George “Feathermop” Spence, Anthony
“General Starkie” Tingle and Aston “Buckie Marshall” Thompson. Immediate past Prime Minister PJ Patterson shook the hand of Donald
“Zeeks” Phipps, the Matthews Lane don, thanking him for keeping the
roads in his area clear during a demonstration against the government.
Zeke, incidentally, paid for the construction of a in his community; this
school has been named after him. The JLP-linked dons included Claudius
Donovan ‘Bulbie’ Bennett, one of Jamaica’s most wanted men for over a
decade, was head of the Clansman gang. It is alleged that was because he
was a supporter of the ruling PNP that he was able to elude capture until
his death by the police on October 30th, 2005 (Williams, 2005a; 2005b). Joel Andem, leader of the Gideon Warriors Gang (‘don’ of August Town community) is the alleged right-hand man of Colin Campbell of the PNP.

Other Caribbean Countries

With some variation, the depressed communities of Morvant, Laventille, Patna Village, Bagatelle, and Factory Road area in Trinidad and Tobago are home to numerous crime gangs, whose “community leaders” deliver blocks of votes in return for control of public works projects and other government largesse. Initially organized around various criminal activities, the advent of cocaine (especially crack cocaine) in the 1980s, largely as a result of the country’s proximity to Venezuela, witnessed an upsurge in violence as these groups vied for turf. A number of these gang leaders were once members of the now-defanged Jamaat al-Muslimeen, the local Islamic group responsible for the 1990 coup d’etat in Trinidad and Tobago. Prior to the coup, the Jamaat, under the leadership of the Imam Yasin Abu Bakr, was involved in a range of community services in the area of education, health care, education, buyers’ cooperatives, skills development, and spiritual development and strengthening.1

The Jamaat was perceived to be performing some of the functions of government, which provided them some goodwill in many of the marginalized communities. However, these efforts were insufficient to dampen the violence being occasioned by the influx of drugs. In an effort to manage this violence, the government of Prime Minister Manning, took the expedient route of “legitimizing” these gang leaders by referring to them as “community leaders,” and charging them with the responsibility of managing (meaning reducing) the level of crime and violence in their communities. The carrot offered was the management of public works projects, such as CEPEP and URP, with the expectation that the jobs and skills development provided by these programs would present these young men with alternatives to crime.

In a strange case of irony, rather than reduce crime and violence, the opposite occurred. The realization that such vast sums of money were being made available to gang leaders to manage these projects intensified the level of violence and new individuals vied for gang leadership and the mantle of “community leader.” Part of this mobilization-by-violence stemmed from the increasing realization that vast amounts of money were being made by many well-heeled members of society, who had their own transshipment and distribution networks.

Moreover, the Trinidad and Tobago situation is particularly interesting in light of the wave of kidnappings for ransom of members of wealthy families, the murder of private security guards for their weapons, which are then used in the commission of other crime, a development that is also occurring with great frequency in Belize and Guyana. To greater and lesser extents, organized criminal gang activity, closely and/or loosely affiliated with the main political parties can be found throughout the Caribbean.
Conclusion

Increasing crime and violence in the Caribbean, therefore, is largely the result of “dark (covert) networks”—“un-civil” society groups of organized gang activity loosely and not-so-loosely affiliated with the dominant political parties. These “covert networks” are criminal gangs, whose interests center most often on destruction or on enriching themselves at the expense of social and political stability. “Un-civil” society groups are the result of a corruption of the political system whereby overt political entities seek short term political gain by circumventing the overt political route to power. The use of “un-civil” society groups for short term gain will ultimately prove futile. Once created, these entities are almost always impossible to contain thereby posing a threat to the stability of the political system that created them.

Given that the countries in the region are highly dependent on tourism, and given that crime and violence threaten to divert tourism flows and revenues and undermine democracy and stability, the time has come for these countries increase their levels of cooperation and coordination in managing the effects of crime and violence. The openness of these economies and the implementation of the Caribbean Single Market and Economy that now facilitates the flow of good, services and people for licit and illicit purposes call for the implementation of a new and more robust crime-fighting architecture—a Caribbean Police System (CARIBPOL)—to serve the needs of the region. With regard to tourism, an intelligence-led, region-wide Visitor Safety and Security Network is but one strategy.

Note

1. As a Muslim, Bakr believed that Islam was the only true African religion and that other religions practiced in the country, such as Orisha, Shango, Spiritual Baptists, and Rastafarianism were lesser forms of African religious beliefs and practices.
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Part 2

The Collective Institutional Responses to Security Threat in the Hemisphere

This second part discusses the institutional responses to security threats in the region and examines the institutional structure of inter-American cooperation in a historical perspective. It analyzes the new inter-American framework as well as the main changes in the collective fight for security in the Americas since the end of the Cold War. This section also provides an overview of different collective responses and tools for regional security, such as those of the OAS, the United Nations, the Rio Group and the South American Union.
The contemporary Inter-American security system is the outcome of the often contradictory policies undertaken by the hegemonic United States and the subordinate governments of Latin America and the Caribbean intended to guarantee their individual national security while simultaneously bolstering the collective security of the Western Hemisphere. Washington’s pursuit of regional preponderance throughout the 20th Century, but especially in the aftermath of WWII and its rise to superpower status, has time and again conflicted with the Latin American and Caribbean states’ perennial aspirations to preserve their own national sovereignty and right of self-determination. By virtue of its hegemonic position, the U.S. has in the post WWII period consistently been able to define, virtually unilaterally, what comprised an existential threat to the hemisphere. Nonetheless, differences between the U.S. and Latin American states, and among the Latin American states themselves, regarding the precise nature of the “threats” to hemispheric security and how to respond to them have often occurred in the past and continue to do so today.

Such fundamental differences in security priorities, perceptions of threats and preferred responses to threats explain why most Latin American and Caribbean states tend to distrust and resist U.S. unilateral leadership on issues pertaining national security. Traditionally when the U.S. perceives that its strategic advantage is threatened, it unilaterally asserts its economic and military leadership. More often than not, these policies go against the grain of the Latin American states’ need to build and secure sovereign and democratic states; forge an inter-state society capable of addressing common security concerns; and accomplish regional cooperation and integration around a common purpose (Waltz, 1979; Bull, 1984; Morgenthau, 1993; Buzan and de Wilde, 1998; Gilpin, 2001; Herz, 2003; Buzan, 2004; Hurrell, 2005).

The Origins of the Threats to Hemispheric Security: 1821-1889

The discrepancies in perception among the U.S. and Latin American States, of whom and what constitutes a common security threat have their roots in the process of independence from Europe in 1821. Since the early nineteenth century, the Latin American ideals of independence, modernization, democratic consolidation and regional integration have been contested not only from within by the domestic authoritarian and populist tendencies but also from without. During this time, the existential threat to the new Latin American states was represented mostly by European imperialism. Later on, Latin American states had also to confront the U.S. recurrent attempts to establish and institutionalize its claim to regional hegemony. So in contrast with the U.S. that was concerned mainly with regional hegemony; the Latin American states had to deal with a double existential threat that contributed to their constant instability (Waltz, 1954; Waltz, 1979; Watson, 1984; Buzan, Waever and de Wilde, 1998).

Inter-state conflict was also a prevalent security issue. All through the nineteenth century the newly formed Latin American states frequently tried to kill one another in conflicts such as the 1846 to 1847 U.S.-Mexican
War, the 1864 to 1870 War of the Triple Alliance, or the 1879 War of the Pacific. But by and large the conflicts that these emerging states had to face were characterized by a series of low intensity wars that never lasted long enough for the new nations to be set on a path to form strong states. Consequently by the end of the nineteenth century, Latin American elites developed weak state apparatuses that allowed for European powers to constantly intervene in domestic affairs, and for the U.S. to ultimately succeed in establishing its sphere of influence in the hemisphere (Fenwick, 1963; Monroe, 1967; Watson, 1984; Smith, 1996; Holden, 2000).

By the end of the nineteenth century, the defeat of European colonialism and the triumph of U.S. strategic preponderance and regional hegemony, allowed for a revival in the Western Hemisphere of ideals of cooperation and integration that had first emerged at the time of the emancipation of the Latin American states (Bolivar, 1824; Scheman, 1987). So under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of State led by former Secretary of State James G. Blaine, the First International Conference of American States took place in Washington on 1889. This conference was supposed to establish the basis for an Inter-American institutional framework to foster economic integration, democracy and a common security policy (Diamint, 2000).

The U.S. and Latin America, Multilateralism or Conflict: 1889-1936

The success of the 1889 conference was limited in scope. Although it established the Commercial Bureau of American Republics (later renamed the Pan-American Union), it failed to gain general support for the establishment of a Customs Union, and an Inter-American Monetary Union. It also allowed for only partial negotiations on reciprocity treaties of experimental character, as, for example, the recommendation to adopt the metric decimal system and the adoption of treaties in favor of protection of trademarks and copyrights. The Latin American adverse experience with the U.S prevailed over the achievements of a U.S. sponsored institutional framework that could further regional cooperation, particularly regarding economic integration or security. The resulting failure by the U.S. to gain confidence among states in the region, combined with emerging efforts by the European powers to take advantage of the unstable situation within the underdeveloped Latin American states, led to a policy shift by the U.S. away from cooperation toward a further assertion of its hegemony in the Western Hemisphere (Fenwick, 1963; Smith, 1996; Burrell, 2000; Holden, 2000).

Consequently between the first Washington Conference in 1889 and the second International Conference of American States in Mexico City in 1902, tensions and controversy among the states in the hemisphere and the European powers steadily increased. These tensions became especially salient in 1899, when, in a boundary dispute between Venezuelan-British Guiana the U.S. forced Great Britain to end the conflict in arbitration (Olney, 1895; Scheman, 1987). The U.S. further asserted its supremacy in Central America in 1903, by supporting and recognizing the newly
independent government of Panama, and blocking the participation of Britain and France in the construction and administration of the Panama Canal (Pauncefote, 1901). Growing Latin American apprehensions were enhanced further by the active role played by the U.S. in the struggles for independence from Spain of the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Cuba. It became increasingly clear that feeling threatened by European intervention, the U.S. had once again engaged in unilateral actions to assert its hemispheric hegemony under the umbrella of the Monroe Doctrine and of Roosevelt’s corollary “The Doctrine of the Big Stick.” U.S. unilateralism hindered any development of a hemispheric common security policy at this time (McKinley, 1898; States, 1898; Fenwick, 1963; Smith, 1996; Holden, 2000).

Even if during the first decades of the twentieth century U.S. military preponderance in the American Continent was no longer in question, the Western Hemisphere had once more become an arena of conflict between the U.S. and Europe. This time around, instead of territorial gains, the U.S. and European powers attempted to enforce the collection of public and private debts in Latin America. Their constant interference in Latin American internal affairs not only frustrated common efforts toward regional integration, but also reinforced domestic authoritarian and populist tendencies, and increased the level of distrust between the U.S. and its neighbors. This is why during the Third Conference of the American States in Rio de Janeiro in 1906; all cooperative and integration efforts were dropped. Instead, collective efforts concentrated first on the defense of the principles of Latin American self-determination and national sovereignty, and second, on the adoption of a resolution recommending the examination and condemnation of the increased conflict between governments that had resulted from the compulsory collection of public debts (Drago, 1902; Fenwick, 1963). The U.S. responded by stating its respect for the idea of limiting force to recover of contract debts, contingent upon the acceptance of arbitration in order to solve the disputes, thus obstructing the scope of any new or existing European influences in the region. Yet even when with these policies the U.S. was successful in establishing its military, economic sphere of influence in the hemisphere once and for all; it also frustrated any attempt by Latin American countries to develop trust toward U.S. leadership and a common set of security policies. This atmosphere of mistrust has proven very difficult to dissipate.

Once the threat of European military and economic intervention disappeared, the U.S. found itself in a strong and secure enough position to promote cooperation through the promotion of democracy, regional integration and U.S. economic investment (Wilson, 1913; Fenwick, 1963; Smith, 1996). Notwithstanding President Wilson’s initial goals for U.S. hemispheric policies, his subsequent actions contradicted his original intentions that followed the same fate of the League of Nations (Carr, 1981; Scheman, 1987). The history of U.S. involvements in Latin American domestic affairs; its lack of political will to support and enforce an international body to confront security concerns; its lack of support for a peaceful settlement of disputes served to undermine U.S. leadership.
U.S. negative involvements in Latin American domestic affairs, for example during the Mexican Revolution against Francisco Villa, and in Nicaragua against the guerrillas of Augusto César Sandino, only deepened the prevalent mistrust. This distrust was further compounded by the fact that, at this time, the U.S. decided to retreat from any additional significant international role and concentrate mostly on internal developments (Carr, 1981; Glaser, 1994; Diamint, 2000; Gilpin, 2001; Pedersen, 2002).

Considering the uncertainty of U.S. intentions, it is not surprising that neither the results of the Fifth Santiago International Conference in 1923 nor the 1928 Havana Conference succeeded in gaining support for any form of continental security cooperation. Suspicions persisted even after the proclamation of President Roosevelt’s Good Neighbor Policy during the Montevideo Convention in 1933, at which time it became evident that a shift in U.S. hemispheric policy was necessary (Ingenieros, 1922; Haya de la Torre, 1926; Roosevelt, 1933; Fenwick, 1963; Pedersen, 2002). However, it was not until 1936, when the increasing economic development, domestic political stability and growing strides toward democratic consolidation were taking place in the Western Hemisphere that a U.S. policy shift took place. Then, the development of multilateral institutions became possible once the U.S. altered the Monroe Doctrine to include as its main component a regional consensus toward common security concerns (Buzan and de Wilde, 1998; Hurrell, 2005).

The Establishment of an Institutional Security Framework: 1936-1945

The 1936 Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace in Buenos Aires offered the first opportunity for a joint effort by the U.S. and Latin American states to seek collaboration for the preservation of continental peace through the development of an interstate institutional framework to prevent war (States, 1933; Peace, 1936; Burrell, 2000). During 1938, because war was looming large over Europe and becoming a possible threat for the rest of the world, the U.S. succeeded in strengthening the institutional ties between the states in the Western Hemisphere through the Declaration of Lima at the Eight Lima Conference. This declaration, later reinforced in Panama in 1939, called for a collective action in order to prepare Western Hemisphere’s common defense in case war broke out (Fenwick, 1963; Buzan and de Wilde, 1998). The idea of a collective action toward a common defense was extremely significant in that it rallied support around a common hemispheric integration principle and concrete purpose (Buzan, 1993; Herz, 2003; Hurrell, 2005). A policy of a common defense against war responded to the immediate security issues product of global instability facing the continent, while at the same time echoing the Latin-American constant preoccupation with national sovereignty and self determination. This common goal took a concrete form during the 1940 second meeting of Foreign Ministers in Havana, through the Collective Security: Resolution XV (Fenwick, 1963; Glaser, 1994; Burrell, 2000; Pedersen, 2002).
Resolution XV established a common security hemispheric principle through the Declaration of Reciprocal Assistance: Tratado Interamericano de Asistencia Recíproca (TIAR), which was first put to the test with less than optimal results during the Pearl Harbor attack on December 1941. In order to salvage the immature hemispheric security cooperation agreement that was floundering as a consequence of the weak general response, a project was presented at the 1942 Third Meeting of Foreign Ministers in Rio de Janeiro by Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela. This project aimed to sever diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany and Italy according to the particular circumstances of each country in the hemisphere. This qualification allowed for a tenuous reaffirmation of Resolution XV while defending the principles of self-determination and calling for plans for a reorganization of a collective security. Consequently, in spite of the weak hemispheric support for the U.S. at this time, it became increasingly clear that the defense of national sovereignty, democracy, as well as common security and defense against war were all principles around which the U.S. could effectively rally support to exercise its regional leadership (Fenwick, 1956; Fenwick, 1963; Glaser, 1994; Diamint, 2000; Gilpin, 2001; Pedersen, 2002).

At the end of World War II, during The 1945 Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace in Mexico City, the participating countries agreed on a resolution to establish an International Organization of the American Republics that would cooperate in reciprocal assistance and American security with different objectives from the already existing Junta Interamericana de Defensa (JID), which since 1942 had already been in charge of military-to-military hemispheric cooperation (Diamint, 2000). Hence, the first and most important security institutional arrangement, fully backed by the U.S. and supported by Latin American states was established. This arrangement, known as the Act of Chapultepec (Peace, 1945), was based upon all the principles established since the first Washington Conference in 1889, and was comprised of the Junta Interamericana de Defensa (JID) and the Tratado Interamericano de Asistencia Recíproca (TIAR), which formally established the Inter-American Defense System (Fenwick, 1963; Diamint, 2000). Signatory countries agreed first, on a resolution reorganizing, consolidating and strengthening the Inter-American System; and second, they agreed on the immediate need to establish more specific security terms by expanding the 1940 Habana resolution to include a common retaliation in case of an act of aggression by an American state (Peace 1945). These two agreements contemplated not only the establishment of procedures that would facilitate the constitution of a comprehensive regional security agreement, but also an arrangement consistent with principles and procedures of an international security organization for the Western Hemisphere (Scheman, 1987; Ruiz Blanco, 2003).

Cooperation and Consensus: 1945-1950

The Act of Chapultepec committed the states of the Western Hemisphere to negotiate a mutual security treaty that allowed for the development of
the first successful regional security institutional arrangement (Diamint, 2000; Ruiz Blanco, 2003; Shaw, 2004). This security community through the dual mechanism of the inter-military cooperation (JID), and the TIAR mutual security treaty was made possible because U.S. and Latin American states’ definitions of whom and what constituted a threat converged (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde, 1998:33-35). In addition, this security community counted with the U.S. economic support, and military and industrial hegemonic power. With the agreement and support of its Latin American neighbors, the U.S. continued to be the main force of a regional mechanism capable of determining what constituted an aggression that merited a concerted response (Fenwick, 1963; Waltz, 1986; Glaser, 1994; Diamint, 2000; Holden, 2000; Gilpin, 2001).

The realities of the post-World War II era drew the U.S. and Latin-America closer together as they sought to reduce tensions in the region. At the start of the East-West confrontation in addition to the regional security community, the U.S. and Latin-American states felt compelled to further develop, establish and enforce the principles of democratic consolidation, national sovereignty and self determination. These principles reemerged as part and parcel of the already existing process of regional integration based upon common security concerns. Latin American states felt that they could consent to U.S. leadership at this time because they seemed set on the path of a development of growing economies, stronger state apparatuses and stronger ties between social networks and state elites (Scheman, 1987; Covarrubias Velasco, 2000; Diamint, 2000; Tilly, 2007). Consequently within an environment of peace and security in 1948, the Bogotá Conference of American States consolidated former treaties and created the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS). The OAS was to promote common interests, the principles of self-determination, national sovereignty, economic development, democratic consolidation, and in conjunction with the JID and TIAR, security (Klepak, 2003).

From 1948 to the early 1950s an institutional framework for the management of the hemispheric governance was beginning to develop. The U.S. and Latin American states’ strategic interests seemed to converge and support regional institutions to promote the common interests of security, democracy and economic development in the hemisphere. These common goals were to be achieved through a two-tier institutional framework formed by JID and TIAR, and through the OAS and the Inter-American Development Bank (BID). It appeared that by trying to simultaneously advocate for all of these consolidating principles, including democratic consolidation and sustained development, the U.S. was effectively exercising its leadership in the hemisphere and supporting the development of an inter-state institutional structure capable of managing certain aspects of regional governance (Scheman, 1987; Burrell, 2000; Covarrubias Velasco, 2000; Holden, 2000). But global crises turned U.S. attention away from Latin America to events elsewhere in Europe and Asia and security threats attributed to Soviet and Chinese aggressions came to dominate U.S. foreign policy as the Cold War got underway (Smith, 1996; Holden, 2000; Klepak, 2003; Shaw, 2004).
**The Cold War: 1950-1980**

During the 1950s, the Cold War arrived in Latin-America. Perceiving the spread of communism in the region as an imminent danger, the U.S. abandoned the defense of the principles of democratic consolidation and sustained economic development as priorities for the Western Hemisphere to concentrate on the communist threat (Klepak, 2003). Latin American promotion of sustainable development and democracy, still perceived as a priority for a common policy by Latin American authorities was delegated and set aside. The U.S. assumed the position that international and regional institutions such as TIAR and the OAS were created and maintained as an effective control tool for the establishment and maintenance of its sphere of influence within the bipolar international system (Waltz, 1986; Mearshheimer, 1990; Glaser, 1994; Mearshheimer, 1994). Hence President Truman approved a National Security Council memorandum on Inter-American Military Collaboration, which asserted that the Cold War was a real war in which the survival of the free world was at stake. It also asserted that through the OAS and TIAR, the American continent needed to assume a consensual position of legitimate concern toward the prospects of the threat of a communist aggression in the hemisphere (Shaw 2004). As soon as the Soviet threat was defined as an imminent existential threat, the U.S. contended that it had the right to intervene within the domestic affairs of any Latin American state that faced communist political aggression. So according to the U.S. foreign policy calculations, in order to assure a positive regional security outcome in Latin America, it was better to have and support strong, predictable and efficient dictatorial regimes in power than to accept liberal regimes that would allow Communist penetration. This philosophy was clearly illustrated for example by the 1954 overthrowing of the leftist leader Jacobo Arbenz Gusmán in Guatemala and by the events of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis (Smith, 1996; Burrell, 2000; Diamint, 2000; Shaw, 2004).

U.S. constant intervention in Latin American domestic affairs during the following decades eroded the development of trust networks between domestic social groups and their respective states. This erosion gave a free pass to local political elites to resort to authoritarian measures to stay in power, thus negatively affecting the development capacity of Latin American governments, and promoting a process of Latin American de-democratization (Tilly, 2005:125-150; Tilly, 2007:133-160). The assumed position by the U.S. toward authoritarian regimes oscillated between passive acceptance and outright endorsement, especially when these regimes expressed their abhorrence to international communism. U.S. military assistance, economic loans and support including economic aid to questionable regimes, such as to the government of François Duvalier in Haiti, and to that of General Omar Torrijos in Panama for example, continued well into the 1970s and even the 1980s, with the U.S. repeatedly intervening in the civil war conflicts in Central America (Drier, 1963; Domínguez, 1983; Domínguez, 1990; Smith, 1996; Desch, 1998; Burrell, 2000; Pastor, 2001; Shaw, 2004).
During the Cold War the principles of self-determination and democratic consolidation were swept under the rug as a result of U.S. pressure and Latin-American acquiescence toward dictatorial governments that would be able to ensure U.S. security in the near future. But by complying with U.S. policies to confront the communist threat, these dictatorial regimes failed to fully assert control over their territories and integrate the different social actors and trust networks into public politics. These authoritarian and clientelistic domestic policies created autonomous power centers within their territories. And planted the seed for an environment where the development of future regional threats such as narco-trafficking and organized crime could flourish (Waltz, 1979; Waltz, 1986; Mearshheimer, 1990; Mearshheimer, 1994; Smith, 1996; Buchanan, 1998; Desch, 1998; Tilly, 2005; Tilly, 2007).


In addition to the damage caused by the repeated recessions and debt-induced depressions during the administrations of Presidents Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, the persistent unilateral actions by the U.S. against local revolutionary groups in Central America proved progressively ineffective and even counterproductive. The failures of U.S. policies in Central America prompted Latin American governments to take the initiative and intervene outside the auspices of the U.S. or the OAS through the Contadora group and the Esquipulas accords. The success of these initiatives made clear that Soviet intervention was no longer a big enough threat to rally Latin American support for U.S. policies in the region. The U.S. was gradually loosing influence and needed to look for alternative hemispheric policies to maintain a leadership role. In addition, far-reaching transformations in the international arena during the 1980s, such as the coming to Latin America of the already underway “third wave” process of democratization; the crumbling of the Berlin Wall; the reunification of Germany; the liberation of Eastern Europe; and the implosion of the Soviet Union; lead to the unexpected end to the decades-old and well-known bipolar international system.

Furthermore, the 1983 U.S. invasion of Grenada and the devastating performance of the U.S. during the 1991 Desert Storm Operation generated new challenges and new opportunities for the asymmetrical Inter-American system. The new international environment and the emergence of the U.S. as the sole superpower dissipated the uncertainties previously generated by the Soviet threat, and allowed for the U.S. to shift its foreign policies. Consequently as opposed to only challenges, the states in the Western Hemisphere perceived themselves to face a host of opportunities from a relative hopeful and united position (Perry and Primorac, 1994:111). Once again, the U.S. authorities felt secure and confident to promote common principles of regional economic integration, democratic consolidation and the promotion of a broader common security policy (Domínguez, 1990; Lowenthal, 1991; Buchanan, 1998; Desch, 1998; Thorp, 1998; Holden, 2000; Pastor, 2001; Corrales, 2003; Klepak, 2003).
This convergence of interests was reflected in the increased willingness by
the U.S. and Latin American states to rely upon international organizations
and regimes such as for instance the 1994 Summit of the Americas or the
In addition, states in the hemisphere recognized that an opportunity
existed to take advantage to utilize and develop further the already
established two-tier regional institutional arrangement: the OAS and BID,
and the JID and TIAR. This inter-state institutional structure was to serve
the interests of both the U.S. and Latin American states by participating
actively first, in the promotion of economic development and democracy
and second, in the development of a cooperative security agenda
(Krasner, 1982; Keohane, 1984; Keohane, 1986; Lowenthal, 1991; Smith,
1996; Agüero, 1998; Borón, 1998; O’Donell, 1999; Burrell, 2000; Keohane
and Nye, 2001; Pasto, 2001; Shaw, 2004).

The Emergence of a New Security Community:

With communism no longer considered to be an imminent threat, the U.S.
and Latin America began to reassess and redefine the security threats
to the hemisphere. The U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) expanded
the security agenda and included within the new constellation of Inter-
American security concerns all the following issues: 1) Cold War
residuals, particularly in Central America and Cuba; 2) insurgency and
terrorism, which at the time was represented by disruptive anti-democratic
elements in Peru, Colombia and México; 4) Drug-trafficking and organized
crime activities; 5) immigration and refugee issues; 6) arms control and
non-proliferation mainly of conventional arms; 7) routine Inter-American
security cooperation such as protecting the Panama Canal; 8) conflict
resolution and peacekeeping in places such as Haiti; 9) Social issues and
the environment, including assistance in nation-building and democratic
consolidation; 10) energy security; and 11) civil-military relations and
the role of the armed forces in democratic societies (Perry and Primorac,

This broad agenda that included issues—such as nation-building,
democracy and the environment—that previously were not considered
to be security threats required a multilateral institutional mechanism sup-
ported by the U.S. and Latin American states. To this end in 1991 and
under the auspices of the OAS, the Hemispheric Commission of Security,
renamed in 1994 as the Hemispheric Security Committee (CHS) was created.
The main goal of the CHS was to broaden the already existing common
security issues and the JID concept of military inter-state cooperation
to include not only evident security issues such as drug trafficking or
inter-state conflict, but also issues such as confidence building, economic
interdependence, social development, the defense of democracy and the
environment (Smith, 1996; Pastor, 2001; Herz, 2003). The main purpose
of the CHS was to achieve a hemispheric consensus that would reflect the
recognition that all of these new common security issues represented
a regional, as well as national, security threat and so would require a

The new security doctrine of the CHS required: 1) for the U.S. government to collaborate with other Latin American states, and share resources and sensitive information with other military institutions in the region; 2) more importantly, this doctrine intended for the U.S. military authorities to support and subordinate at least in part, its forces and intelligence agencies to an international structure; and 3) to include a great number of new issues, such as poverty, democracy or the environment for example, that were previously not considered as security threats by either the U.S. or any other country in the continent. Therefore the willingness and ability of Latin American states to engage the U.S. within the framework of the CHS and the OAS’s umbrella would depend on whether the U.S. government exert its leadership in the region and could expect positive results insofar its own security issues were concerned. To successfully develop, these ambitious goals required a long period of peace and stability, but the September 11, 2001 attacks brought the development of this comprehensive security agenda to a halt. The reality of a new and different existential threat resulted in a disengagement of the U.S. from Latin America, at least for the time being.

For the first time, realizing their vulnerability to the immediate threat of global terrorism, the U.S. authorities pulled away from multilateralism and the CHS expanded security agenda imposing once again a policy of unilateral remilitarization and military intervention. As in the Cold War, the basic need to maintain U.S. world military supremacy became more important than the need to build a broader, multilateral hemispheric security agenda (Bermudez Torres, 2003:85-88). Since then, the U.S. authorities have concentrated all of their attention and most of its military resources toward the Middle East knowing full well that it could temporarily disengage from Latin America, without jeopardizing its hegemonic position. As Buzan asserts: No other great power would likely challenge U.S. primacy in the Western Hemisphere, therefore Latin America is destined to fall under a new Monroe Doctrine (Buzan b, 2004:144).

The 1995 Williamsburg Process
The U.S. recognized that in light of this new international environment first, the hemispheric security agenda needed to be narrowed to very specific security issues and second, the U.S. national security could not be completely entrusted to a multilateral organism like the OAS. Therefore, recognizing that it still needs to rally the support of its neighbors insofar a common security agenda is concerned, the U.S. has supported the 1995 Williamsburg Process, a parallel route under the full control of the DOD. The Williamsburg process concentrates on military to military cooperation, directed and funded by the U.S. Department of Defense which consists on six main points: 1) The recognition that mutual security rests on the preservation of democracy; 2) the acknowledgement that military security forces play a critical role in support and defense of the legitimate interests, of sovereign and democratic states; 3) the reaffirmation of the armed
forces as subordinate to a democratically controlled authority, situated within the bounds of national constitutions, and always respecting human rights; 4) the promotion of open discussion on defense matters; 5) the setting of a final goal of resolution of the outstanding border and other disputes through negotiated settlements; and 6) the promotion of a greater cooperation in support of meeting security needs, including narco-terrorism (Perry, 1995).

From the standpoint of the U.S. political authorities, especially after the September 11 attacks, the DOD needs to pursue the following specific strategic security objectives: 1) a hemispheric security agenda that would strengthen democracy by supporting strong state institutions. As the case in Haiti showed, the U.S. needed to devote considerable resources first and foremost to the armed forces in order to restore an elective government; 2) the direct control, attention, and resource allocation to foster civil/military relations in certain countries such as Colombia for example, to strengthen civilian expertise in defense matters; 3) to foster the peaceful resolution of disputes, and the defense transparency and confidence in security-building measures; 4) to carry out the U.S. military responsibilities under the Panama Canal treaty for a smooth transfer of properties, as well as the determination of a military presence in Panama; 5) the confrontation of drug-trafficking and the combat of international terrorism by both, the U.S. and Latin American states; 6) to improve the capabilities for joint military action in peacekeeping; 7) the prevention of humanitarian catastrophic crises; and 8) to impede the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (Nye, 1995; Craddock, 2006). So even when the Williamsburg process can be considered an effort toward multilateralism, it is so insofar the decision control remains under the U.S. military control. The U.S. authorities are willing to act cooperatively with its neighbors only when the U.S. military can determine the resource allocation and most importantly, the hemispheric security agenda setting process (Casto, 2006; Romero, 2006).

**CICAD**

After 1991, the threat of drug-trafficking took center stage and emerged as common security issue. In order to confront it, the U.S. government needed to propitiate an international environment where Latin American states could conceive themselves to be bound with the U.S. by a common set of rules and values, and be able to share in the workings of common institutions. So in an effort to frame the drug problem as a shared concern, and to defuse the widespread condemnations of the 1989 Panama military intervention by most Latin American governments; the first Bush administration decided to participate in the Cartagena I, San Antonio, and Cartagena II Summits, thus acknowledging the need for its commitment to a greater multilateral cooperation on drug control issues, and the need to create the conditions for an anti-drugs consensual regime. To confront the drug problem as a common threat, new approaches that would offset the failure of previous unilateral strategies needed to be developed (Bagley, 1991; Bagley, 1996; Cepeda Ulloa, 1996; Smith, 1996; Walker III,
To this end, the OAS spearheaded a multilateral process that had already started with the Inter-American Program of Action in Rio de Janeiro in 1987. The OAS General Assembly voted to establish the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD), and the adoption of the Declaration and Program of Action of Ixtapa in 1991 (CICAD, 1987; CICAD, 1990). CICAD was created to promote and facilitate the proliferation and sharing of information about drugs, as well to prevent their illegal use. Six years later in 1992, the OAS’s General Assembly approved new legislation for the common prevention of money laundering and the flow of illegal funds. As a result in 1993, CICAD started a project to increase the flow of information, and to strengthen local governments so that they may be better able to stop drug trafficking and illegal arms sales across borders directed to drug traffickers. As a result of U.S. support, these efforts ultimately lead to the first negotiation for an Anti-Drugs Strategy Forum in 1996 and to the development of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM), which started in 1999 (Herz, 2003). By supporting CICAD, the U.S. has downplayed the rhetoric of the “War on Drugs” and the Certification Process, and attributed more importance to multilateral efforts. Under the umbrella of the OAS, through CICAD and MEM, the U.S. and Latin American states are yielding some of their authority, however modest, to the OAS and slowly developing an anti-illegal drug regime. OAS member states have increasingly established common expectations for the behavior of states in the hemisphere through a slow developing drug regime where the drug problem is confronted as a shared security threat (Buzan and de Wilde, 1998).\footnote{5}

The New Security Community: Unilateralism or Cooperation: 2001-2005

The lack of an imminent threat to the U.S. and the benign regional environment of the 1990s allowed for the development of a very broad and inclusive regional security agenda. As a result, Latin American states were able to engage the U.S. within the framework of the CHS and CICAD under the OAS’s umbrella. But after the September 11 attacks, threats such as terrorism, the proliferation of guerrilla and organized crime groups have derailed the CHS security agenda. The U.S. has shifted its attention toward the Middle East and disengaged the Western Hemisphere knowing that Latin America will still be there if and when the situation in the Middle East is sorted out. This attitude by the current Bush administration has caused a great deal of resentment among Latin American governments, who consider that—particularly immediately after the September 11 attacks—they have shown their willingness to cooperate fully to address U.S. security concerns without reciprocity. Consequently, even when the CHS scheme has not changed it certainly has been ignored. Issues of great importance to the U.S., such as narco-trafficking and terrorism, have dominated the regional security agenda setting process while issues of great importance to Latin American states, such as sustained
development, democracy and poverty, have taken the back seat (CHS, 2004; Isacson, 2005; CHS, 2006). It is clear that since 2001, a great discrepancy has grown between the U.S. and Latin American states, regarding their perceptions of what constitutes an existential threat. A growing schism between the U.S. and Latin America is expanding as to what should be included within a common security agenda for a Western Hemisphere.

During the XXXII OAS General Assembly, celebrated in Barbados in 2002; the Bridgetown Declaration stated that common security challenges such as terrorism, drug-trafficking, organized crime, illegal traffic of arms and ammunitions, disaster preparation; and environment degradation have gained priority. But during the 2002 meeting in Monterrey, Mexico instead of disaster preparation, democracy, good governance or the environment; the issues that took the center stage were the ratification of CIFTA and CICTE, supported mainly by CICAD, as well as a reform to TIAR (Bermudez Torres, 2003:91-102). In the meantime and in sharp contrast, in October 2003 the OAS adopted a new concept of hemispheric security through the passage of the Declaration of Security in the Americas. According to this declaration, the hemispheric security threats and concerns need to be expanded to encompass new and nontraditional threats, which include political, social, health, and environmental aspects (Chillier and Freeman, 2005:7-9). This means that practices that are considered as hemispheric challenges to security include terrorism, transnational organized crime, the global drug problem, corruption, asset laundering, illicit trafficking in weapons, and the connections among them. But in addition, this declaration included as imminent threats extreme poverty and social exclusion of broad sectors of the population, which also affect stability and democracy, erode social cohesion and undermine the security of states. Furthermore, it expanded to also include as imminent threats natural and man made disasters; HIV/AIDS and other diseases, other health risks, and environmental degradation; trafficking in persons; attacks to cyber security; the potential for damage to arise in the event of an accident or incident during the maritime transport of potentially hazardous materials, including petroleum and radioactive materials and toxic waste; and the possibility of access, possession, and use of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery by terrorists (OAS, 2003; Chillier, 2005).

When a security agenda is this broad, it becomes vague, confusing and impossible to take seriously. When imminent threats are difficult to identify, consensus becomes elusive and then cooperation is unattainable. In addition, the current Bush administration has increased the linkages between U.S. economic policy and U.S. security policy. Once again, unilateralism has become the best option for the DOD authorities to achieve its short term goals in Latin America (Higgott, 2004:147-75). Still, it is important to take a serious look at history. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the strengthening and institutionalization of the existing security arrangements and established multilateral regional partnerships has proven to be not only more effective, but also necessary to
provide long term collective security. The U.S. depends on the ability and willingness of its neighbors to confront and defeat common security challenges such as illicit trafficking and narco-terrorism (Craddock, 2006:6). In turn, Latin American states still needed to confront serious issues such as strengthening of government capabilities, good governance, and social inequity that require a lengthy U.S. economic and military support. All of these issues are important threats to the hemisphere and need a multilateral approach. The security gap that is dividing the U.S. and Latin America represents the biggest imminent threat that the Western hemisphere needs to address.

Conclusions

The U.S. military is not willing to concede any authority or share any sensitive information to an institutional arrangement and feel that it is compromising its strategic advantage. The DOD will not entrust any neighboring military command by compromising its national security.

Is some instances, such as the case of drug-trafficking and CICAD shows, the U.S. is willing to concede some of its authority and share the burden in order to confront a common security threat. In addition, in some cases such as the Williamsburg Process, where it needs the cooperation of its neighbors, the U.S. can seek out some modality of military to military cooperation insofar the DOD stays in control of the agenda-setting process. Any modality of multilateral security approach will succeed insofar the U.S. sees positive results. If and when multilateralism and cooperation stop bearing fruit, particularly in issues such as narco-trafficking, then the U.S. will revert to unilateral policies and CICAD and MEM efforts will cease to exist.

Presently, there is an increasing bifurcation as to what issues constitute an existential threat and merit a multilateral response. Since the September 11, 2001 attacks, the U.S. perceives terrorism as an imminent threat. In contrast, the Latin American and the Caribbean need to deal with direct threats to their national regimes and social fabrics. Issues related to corruption, organized crime, violence and lack of security and social instability. These threats are more real and immediate to any population and political elites than the possibility of a U.S. terrorist attack.
A state with a strong capacity enters democratic territory already in possession of means to enforce decisions arrived through broad, equal, protected, and mutually binding consultation (Tilly, 2007:161). But by and large, the trajectory followed by Latin American and Caribbean states particularly after 1991, has been one of irregular increments and decrements of state capacity matched by a similar change in degree of democratic consolidation. Even when democracy has been sanctioned as binding by all OAS member states through the Santiago Commitment to Democracy and the Renewal of the Inter-American System, the goal of a high quality democracy for Latin America and the Caribbean remains elusive. Socioeconomic inequality, political inequity, corruption and weak judicial systems have left their authoritarian legacies unresolved—and in some cases, intact—placing their governments and political elites at risk of constant intense domestic confrontations (Lynn Karl, 2004:187-195 and Tilly, 2007:163). Consequently today in the Western Hemisphere safe Cuba, the access to power may be achieved only through electoral means, but the day to day exercise of power, that is who rules and how, is still subject to authoritarian governance (Schedler, 2006:1-23). The present Bush administration has been consumed by an almost messianic notion of the need to promote and even impose democracy worldwide. But the current experience in Latin America shows that in the American continent, the U.S. may have to settle and accept at least in the near future, a Western Hemisphere community of democracies consisting mainly of democratically elected illiberal, low quality, incomplete or even authoritarian electoral regimes. Preventing terrorism in the region is important, but de-democratization in the Western Hemisphere remains an important threat that the U.S. has chosen to ignore and that Latin American governments perceive as imminent. Consequently if the U.S. expects to rally support among its neighbors against terrorism, it also needs to lead in the development of a long term common security agenda that addresses these concerns. The DOD needs to envision and be ready to confront a different type of conflict that includes operations during what is considered as times of peace. Security threats such as a growing gang activity, kidnapping, counterfeiting, and human trafficking and drug-trafficking undermine the already fragile democracies, and the Western Hemisphere presents an opportunity for the U.S. and the DOD to “test dive” a new model of hemispheric security that evokes a true interagency and international cooperation to confront these issues and promote high quality democracies long term (Stavridis, 2007).

2. These normative principles had been kept alive through the American Congresses of 1826 in Panama, 1847 in Lima, 1856 in Santiago and Washington, and 1864 in Lima, but deemed ineffectual for the lack of U.S. support (Fenwick 1956; Smith 1996).

3. The JID, the Inter-American Defense Conference, was established in order to foster an inter-military regional cooperation, whose objectives comprised the standardization of equipment, military organization and training. The TIAR, the Inter-American treaty for Reciprocal Assistance, declared that an attack on any state of the Western Hemisphere will be considered an attack on all (Diamint, 2000).

4. President Clinton backed these efforts toward multilateralism by the OAS General Assembly. The Assembly charged the Permanent Commission with the creation of a work group that would study and formulate recommendations for a common security hemispheric agenda. (Bermudez Torres 2003:83). Under the OAS umbrella, this working group began to revise the role of both the Junta Interamericana de Defensa (JID) and the Colegio Interamericano de Defensa (CID), to achieve the demilitarization of border conflicts, especially in Central America (Martino Ramos 2000:143-44), and with the final goal of modifying the hemispheric security doctrine to include all the above-mentioned issues (Perry 1994; Feinberg 1997; Martino Ramos 2000; Bermudez Torres 2003; Mendez 2004).
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In October 2003 in Mexico City, Latin American and Caribbean leaders declared a new concept of hemisphere security that is “multi-dimensional in scope, includes traditional and new threats, concerns, and other challenges to the security of the states of the hemisphere, incorporates the priorities of each state, contributes to the consolidation of peace, integral development, and social justice, and is based on democratic values, respect for and promotion and defense of human rights, solidarity, cooperation, and respect for national sovereignty” (OAS, 2003). The declaration enumerated a series of “insecurities” that plague the hemisphere and form four clusters as seen in the Figure. They range from traditional threats against the State, to concerns about natural disasters and environmental accidents involving hazardous materials and the full range of transnational criminal activities that have gained such notoriety in the region. They also recognize that profound political and economic structural disequilibria and inequities contribute to insecurity and instability.

The Declaration of Multidimensional security remains controversial. Some disparage it as a “shopping list,” with little actionable substance. Nevertheless, the twelve-year long debate provided the most serious consideration of the subject of Security in the hemisphere since World War II, and the declaration reflects and respects contributions from nearly all of the countries in the region. Throughout the discussions, it has been clear that most of these “insecurities” do not involve military response. Indeed, the set of issues on which consensus has been most difficult has been the disposition of the military components of the Inter-American System, that is, the modernization, or aggiornamento, of the hemispheric defense institutions created in the 1940s and of the relationships that accompany them.

The hemispheric security agenda remains a framework to be implemented. It has identified the insecurities, but not how governments and institutions of the regions will deal with them. Different organizations of the OAS have taken on the different issues, but integrating and coordinating responses within countries and sub-regions remains a slow work in progress. That there is agreement is no mean feat, but there is still much to do. After 15 years, obstacles still impede the renewal of the architecture of the Inter-American system.

Renewal of the Inter-American System

The story of renewal began in 1991 at the Santiago Conference on Commitment of Democracy and Renewal of the Inter-American System and evolved in three different, but mutually supporting tracks. First and
most important was at the Organization of American States itself and its Committee on Hemispheric Security. The second and critical track occurred at the Summits of the Americas, especially the early ones, and finally a third and parallel track took place in the meetings of Defense Ministers of the Americas.

1991 was a propitious moment for beginning the process of revision and reform. Democratically elected governments ruled in every country in the hemisphere except Cuba. In Central America, the Esquipulas Peace process had begun. Latin American countries had already begun a sharp downsizing of armed forces and their budgets as democratic governments sought to assert control over their defense establishments. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe’s (OSCE) cooperative security activities in Eastern Europe provided a model for developing confidence building measures (Carter, Ashton B, Perry, William J and Steinbruner, John D, 1992; Nolan, Janne E., 1993; or Zartman, I. William and Kremeniuk, Viktor eds. 1995). Canada became a permanent member of the OAS in 1990 and was an important proponent of a new human security focus. This convergence of global trends and hemispheric events provided an opportunity to re-examine the collective security framework established during World War II.

The Organization of American States and Committee on Hemispheric Security

The 1991 Santiago Conference was primarily focused on institutionalizing democracy, human rights, and economic development, but delegates also agreed to consult on an “updated and comprehensive perspective of security and disarmament,” and to cooperate in the “adoption and execution of appropriate measures to begin to prevent and combat the illicit use and production of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and traffic therein, chemical precursors and money laundering, and related trafficking in clandestine arms, ammunitions and explosives,” and, finally, “to initiate a process of consultation on hemispheric security in light of the new conditions in the region and the world, for an updated and comprehensive perspective of security and disarmament, including the subject of all forms of proliferation of weapons and instruments of mass destruction, so that the largest possible volume of resources may be devoted to the economic and social development of the member states; ...” (OAS, 1991)

A working group was established to “examine the background, initiatives, experiences and instruments produced within the framework of the inter-American system ... for the purpose of making the pertinent revisions and adjustments.” Argentine Ambassador Hernan Patiño Mayer was named chair and would guide the security discussion for the next several years.4

In 1992 at the Nassau General Assembly the concerns of Small Island States—disaster relief, arms smuggling, drugs-trafficking, and other transnational criminal activities—were included at the request of the Caribbean states (OAS, 1992). In addition, the statement on “Cooperation for Security and Development in the Hemisphere—Regional Contributions
to Global Security” (OAS, 1992) addressed development questions, as well as transparency in arms control and arms acquisitions. The General Assembly also asked for recommendations defining the “legal-institutional relationship” between the OAS and the Inter-American Defense Board. The working group was reconstituted as a Special Committee on Hemispheric Security.

Patiño Mayer introduced the “new concept” of cooperative security in the Hemisphere (Patiño Mayer, 1993) to replace the collective security concept inherited from the Second World War and the struggle against communism. Furthermore, he argued that the region must (1) re-examine its definitions of Security and Defense; (2) refocus the military dimension of hemisphere security, (3) build a positive civil-military relationship based on the premise of civilian leadership of the military, and (4) work for incorporation of the Inter-American Defense Board as an advisory entity of the Organization of American States. The first two themes fell clearly under the rubric of confidence-building measures on which all could generally agree. The second two issues would prove more difficult.

In Managua in 1994 the General Assembly again renewed the mandate of the Special Committee and instructed it to give special attention to the additional issues of OAS-UN cooperation in regional security (anticipating the Central American Peace Process), disarmament, transparency in acquisitions, confidence and security building measures and military technical exchange, as well as civil-military relations. It agreed to continue to study the IADB-OAS relationship (Vaky, Viron P and Muñoz, Heraldo 1993:21-22).

The Special Committee organized a meeting of Experts on Confidence and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs) in Buenos Aires in March 1994 and a larger, regional conference on the same subject in Santiago in 1995. The Declaration of Santiago on Confidence and Security-Building Measures (OAS, 1995) adopted a list of goals strongly influenced by the confidence-building measures of the on-going Central American peace process (Herdicia Sacasa, 2004, Villalta Vizcara, 2002). These included advance notice of military exercises, student exchange, participation in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and Standardized International Reporting of Military Expenditures, exchange of information on defense policies and doctrines (later to become defense “white papers”, increasing security of land, sea, and air transport, cooperation in natural disaster prevention and response, and communications regarding border situations, among other issues. The Caribbean countries called for a special meeting on the concerns of small island states.

Expansion of the Security Agenda, 1996-1999

Under a succession of Chairs from Brazil, Mexico, Antigua and Barbuda, and Chile, the Committee on Hemispheric Security continued to add new themes and commitments to the security agenda. The 1998 San Salvador Meeting on Confidence and Security Building Measures called for participation by “government, civilian and military officials and by civil society.” Chile’s successful experience in developing a civil-military dialogue on
defense policy through its National Defense Book (white paper) process led to a call for white papers throughout the region. Transparency in defense spending, conventional weapons management and the special concerns of small island states continued to be addressed. Member states committed to the removal of anti-personnel land mines from Central America (by 2000) and from the Peru-Ecuador Border, and promoted the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Land Mines and on their Destruction (Ottawa Convention) and the Convention Against the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical and Biological or Toxic Weapons. The Convention against the Illicit Production of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials (CIFTA) was signed in 1997 and ratified by most countries by the end of the decade. The Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions was approved by the OAS General Assembly in June 1999 and entered into force in 2002 (Gaviria, 2004). An Inter-American Committee on Disaster Reduction (IACNDR) was created.


The 1998 Santiago Summit of the Americas and the 1999 Guatemala General Assembly each made a special point of calling on the OAS to convene the special conference on security as called for in 1991. Secretary General Gaviria appointed a Special Advisor who took responsibility for formulating and compiling responses to a questionnaire on security concerns. Discussion of the questionnaire occupied the Committee between 1999 and 2002 when the compendium of replies from Member States was finally presented to the Committee.5

In 2002 at Bridgetown, Barbados, the Caribbean states again introduced their concept of a multi-dimensional approach to security.6 The General Assembly declared that “the security of the Hemisphere encompasses political, economic, social, health and environmental factors,” and “Member States should seek to enhance and, where necessary, develop appropriate and relevant mechanisms to deepen co-operation and co-ordination in order to address in a more focused manner the new multidimensional threats, concerns and other challenges to hemispheric security” (OAS, 2002).

Bridgetown set the stage, at long last, for the Special Conference that was held in Mexico City in October 2003 and for the promulgation of the Declaration of Multidimensional Security Concerns. CHS Chairman, Mexican Ambassador Miguel Ruiz-Cabañas described the enormous integrating task that the declaration reflected. “From the very early stages in the negotiation process, it was clear that we all have different perspectives and different priorities when addressing the issue of security for our people, for our countries, and for our region. Some countries would put emphasis on traditional military threats to security, while others would focus more on natural disasters, extreme poverty or epidemic diseases. Thus our primary challenge consisted in identifying principles, shared values and common approaches to hemispheric security, that would serve
as a basis for our understanding of the issue, in order to outline a road map for security in the Americas that could be flexible enough to respond to the security requirements of all member states” (Ruiz Cabañas, 2003). The Rapporteur’s final remarks also left clear that much remained to be done. In particular, he noted, “Latin American democracies are vulnerable, flawed by a security problem ... that needs to be addressed urgently, with actions undertaken in a spirit of solidarity (and) regional cooperation.” He also noted that “in terms of the institutional architecture for hemispheric security, one task remaining is to clarify the links between the OAS, the IADB and TIAR”.

The Contentious Issues: The Inter-American Defense Board and the Rio Treaty

The disposition of the Inter-American Defense Board was one of the most contentious issues over the years. Its relationship to the OAS is heir to and fraught with all of the historical tensions of cold-war political divisions and hostile civil-military relations in the region. The Inter-American Defense Board (IADB, or Junta Interamericana de Defensa, JID, in Spanish) was created at the third wartime Meeting of Consultation in 1942 in the aftermath of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Envisioned as a planning staff and reflecting the concept of collective security, the Board was charged with studying problems of hemispheric defense and recommending solutions (Atkins, 1999:230). The Board was not mentioned in the 1948 OAS Charter, but remained part of the overall Inter-American System, operating with relative autonomy as a separate organization of the region’s militaries, distinct and apart from the civilian OAS. By the 1990s, with the changed security climate of a region seeking to deepen democracy, in which countries have declared peaceful relations with their neighbors and see no global enemy, the Board’s purpose was no longer clear.

The question of the legal disposition of the Inter-American Defense Board languished in the CHS agenda from the very beginning. Not until March 2006, under the persistent leadership of Chilean Ambassador Esteban Tomic, was the Committee able to develop recommendations and present a revised Charter to the General Assembly. The resolution incorporating the Board to the OAS as an “entity” with technical autonomy was adopted on March 16, 2006, in a special session called for the purpose (OAS, 2006). A rotating presidency was established (thus addressing concerns about the permanent US Chairmanship of the Board) and in July 2006 a Brazilian General Assumed leadership of the Board. The deed was done. The Board became part of the OAS, but its relationship to the Committee on Hemispheric Security and its taskings still remain unclear.

The Rio Treaty

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty in English, TIAR in Spanish usage), signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947 is another cornerstone of the Inter-American System. The treaty was the product of a series of meetings that began in 1936 in which the United
States gradually set aside its claim under the Monroe Doctrine to intervene unilaterally if the Latin American States would accept collective responsibility for maintaining peace. From its inception, the issues of collective security, peaceful resolution of disputes and non-intervention in the internal affairs of states, as well as whose definition of threats of aggression should prevail were in tension (Fenwick, C. G. 1962).

Either the Rio Treaty or the peace and collective security provisions of the OAS Charter (Chapters V and VI), were invoked on twenty-two occasions between 1948 and 1990 (Morales, 2004). A majority of the invocations of the peace and security provisions involved disputes between Latin American countries, and on several occasions the US invoked the Treaty to justify unilateral actions already underway, e.g., Guatemala (1954) and the Dominican Republic (1964). The United States ignored the Treaty when it supported Great Britain against Argentina in the Falkland/Malvinas crisis in 1982 and on other occasions when it took unilateral actions in the area—Grenada 1983, Panama 1989, and in the Central American conflict. Mexican President Vicente Fox called the 1947 treaty “obsolete and useless” in a speech to the OAS on September 7, 2001. Nevertheless, the treaty was invoked, at Brazil’s initiative, in the aftermath of the September 11 bombing of the World Trade Center and Pentagon. However, it was not mentioned in the November 2003 declaration on Security in the Hemisphere and Mexico formally withdrew from the treaty in 2002. The consensus may be to leave it “on the shelf,” where it might be invoked when needed, while crafting other instruments that address pressing, present-day issues.

**US Roles**

There is also no question that the US presence in the institutions of the Inter-American System and as an actor in the hemisphere has an important impact on the discussion of the Hemisphere Security framework. US military resources far outweigh the resources of civilian agencies in Latin America and the Caribbean and military diplomacy occurs alongside and often more visibly than civilian agency diplomacy. The military fills a vacuum, but the result is an imbalance in the US presence—the iron fist of US power, rather than the soft glove of US diplomacy—in a region that is struggling to build civilian democratic government, and to demonstrate civilian leadership in matters of defense and security.

**Obstacles and Options for Moving Forward on the Security Agenda**

The Hemispheric security agenda has expanded dramatically since 1991. Starting from discord and with a focus almost entirely on disarmament, demilitarization and avoidance of State on State conflict, the security agenda now encompasses a full range of traditional and new threats, concerns and other security considerations. It has taken a clear turn in the direction of democratic and human security as reflected in the multidimensional concept first introduced by the Caribbean countries in 1992. The new security agenda is consistent with the human security focus.

Under the new agenda, Security is no longer the exclusive subject matter of the military or of Defense Ministries, but the responsibility of a number of ministries and agencies. Execution of this security agenda is diffused. Different elements of the agenda have been assigned to a variety of OAS organizations. Many initiatives are hampered by lack of funding and lack of people to effectively carry out programs at the sub-regional, national, and local levels and there are few mechanisms to account for progress, communicate lessons learned, or identify weaknesses in one or another organization’s capacity to execute. Many of the positive accomplishments are lost amongst the often negative headlines that capture the daily press.

There are at least four underlying obstacles to moving forward with a comprehensive security agenda. The first is a continued failure, despite the 2003 multidimensional security declaration, to acknowledge the expanded security definition. This contributes to the continuing debate over the “securitization” (read “militarization”) of the agenda that focuses more attention on possible military roles than on the roles and capabilities of the many other key elements of the security sector.

Second, but related, are continued tensions in civil-military relations and a pervasive failure to “turn the page” following past military governments that impede dialogue. In a number of Latin American countries, the ghosts of the past have not yet been put to rest, despite considerable progress and general acceptance, on the part of the military, for subordination to civilian leadership. This persisting distrust translates into a reluctance to open channels for collaboration, or call on the military for assistance, or to recognize the useful contributions that the armed forces can make to specific situations. More specifically, it has translated into an unwillingness to bring the discussion of the role of defense and the military within the hemispheric system to closure.14

Third, there has been a failure of imagination in defining purpose, roles and missions for the defense sector, represented in part by the Board, but also at the national level around the region. Civilians remain reluctant to assign roles to the military, while the Board has been unwilling or unable to carve out roles for itself. At the hemispheric level, the IADB has a minimal role in most of the multi-dimensional security issues, though, to its credit, it has frequently delegated personnel to OAS civilian agencies to work on their issues, thereby addressing one of the agencies’ major, budget induced, constraints. Under the new statute, the Board may be called upon for advice. This is where new ground will be plowed: what advice will be sought? How will it be used? While sub-regional organizations like the Central American Conference of Armies (CFAC) send observers to Board functions, the Board has not taken, nor been given, any mandate to encourage or facilitate collaboration on security issues at the sub-regional level. This is where many national leaders would like to focus in the near future.
As the security agenda has expanded, civilian institutions have gained responsibility for most if not all of the new issues. The OAS coordinates these in part through CICAD, CICTE, CIFTA, its new Multidimensional Security Department, and other agencies. Some of these agencies work well, others less well. Inadequate resources, both financial and personnel are on-going challenges that limit their effectiveness. The Ministries of Interior, Justice, Finance, Trade, and national and local police, to name only a few of the agencies involved, all play their appropriate roles in promoting security, and most meet together regularly under the different OAS committee or sub-regional auspices. Defense Ministries and the armed forces need to be folded into the overall multidimensional security architecture.

In sum, the Hemispheric system now has a comprehensive security agenda. What is still missing is the political will to advance the security agenda. It is no longer sufficient to debate; the subject matter calls for action and results. With the important first step of folding the Board into the OAS, both organizations should begin to consider how best to restructure and refocus their activities to achieve results in appropriate subject areas.

However, greater political will is needed to move beyond debate on definitions to focus on integrating the various elements, organizations and actors with responsibilities in the multidimensional approach to security in the hemisphere. The new security agenda opens a new chapter for regional cooperation, but it will require strong, committed leadership to create an effective hemispheric institutional structure capable of transferring creative energy from the international arena to the sub-regions and from nations and sub-regions to the region-wide forum. Leaders in this new architecture will need to focus on real security issues, rather than arcane debates over definitions, who is in charge, or whose agenda will take priority. Security priorities will vary from region to region. No single ranking of issues is likely. This should not be an obstacle to moving forward on different issues and agenda in different regions. Each will contribute to greater hemispheric security.

2. I am very grateful to the many persons who assisted me in understanding the evolution of the new security framework. It was agreed that their observations would be “not for attribution.”

3. The Figure is based on the research conducted by Captain Alvaro Martinez, Argentine Navy, while he was Fellow in Residence at the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies 2002-3. Issues identified in the chart are based on the speeches and presentations to the OAS, the Defense Ministerials, Summits, and other forums by Presidents, Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Ministers of Defense and other national representatives.

4. Hernan Patiño Mayer served as chair of the Committee on Hemispheric Security from 1991 to 1996, that is, through the period of working group and Special Committee. He is the only chair to have served longer than one year.


7. See the Committee on Hemispheric Security, Special conference, Reports of Rapporteurs for the text. http://www.oas.org/CHS.

8. In fact, the Rio Treaty is not formally related to the OAS or to the Board.

9. These meetings took place over the first half of the 20th century, beginning in 1902. See Atkins (1999).

10. It should be noted that the Treaty is non-binding with respect to the use of force.

11. Central American peace was implemented in a combined OAS-United Nations effort.

12. This was a position expressed to me by Brazilian Ambassador Rubens Barbosa in the aftermath of September 11.

13. The Rio Treaty in fact permits countries of the hemisphere to respond collectively to “any fact or situation that endangers the security of the Americas” (See Morales, 2004)

14. This is not a purely Latin American issue. Rivalries between the State Department and Defense Department are long-standing in the United States, too, and similarly preclude collaboration and coordination.

15. The department lacks assigned personnel or resources.
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If interagency cooperation within the United Nations (UN) is a challenging endeavor, cooperation between the UN and regional organizations such as the Organization of American States (OAS), is even more difficult.

During the Cold War, collaboration was virtually precluded by the Monroe Doctrine that, explicitly or implicitly, Washington enforced in the hemisphere. The OAS was defined by all under that logic.

Founded in Bogotá in 1948, the OAS, a regional organization under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, is an integral part of the Inter American System, the oldest and one of the most institutionally complex Cold War regional security arrangements. Over the years the OAS has become increasingly Intricate and multifaceted. It covers a number of issues and issue areas, including trade, electoral observation, human rights, anti terrorism, migration, the environment, violence against women, indigenous populations, Latin American Afro descendants, education, health, corruption and many others that might or might not be subject of OAS-UN cooperation.

In this paper I will only refer to on the ground cooperation using as examples two UN peace keeping operations in the region: UN peace missions in Nicaragua and El Salvador and that in Haiti.

The cold war years: the OAS a US diplomacy tool?

In 1954 in Caracas, a plurality of western hemispheric countries agreed—under intense US pressure to incorporate to the OAS Charter “communist ideology” as one of the acts of aggression to be considered as threats to the security of all signatories. Although interpreted by each US administration according to its specific circumstances, the definition of hemispheric security agreed upon at the Caracas meeting led to a pattern of systematic US intervention in Latin America.

During most of the Cold War, the OAS was the multilateral arrangement to which Washington went in order to legitimize its policies towards the region. Despite the important Latin American presence at the UN, the global organization was absent. However, as the Latin American countries began developing proactive foreign policies during the 1970’s, the OAS became a forum where differences between the North and the South of the hemisphere would be played out. While Washington tried to maintain controversies within the Inter American framework, Latin Americans tried to air their disagreements with the US at the United Nations. The forerunner of this was the establishment of the special Commission for Latin American Coordination better known as CECLA, its Spanish acronym, as a substitute for the OAS’s Economic and Social Inter American Committee. The purpose was to have a forum where Latin Americans could establish a common position vis-à-vis the industrialized world at the 1964 UN Conference for Trade and Development without having the US in the room.

In June 1979, the OAS General Assembly became once more the theater of US and Latin American divergent views, this time concerning the Somoza dictatorship’s imminent overthrow. The Sandinista Liberation Front had
been the leading force of the struggle against 40 years of Nicaraguan dictatorship. Despite the Sandinistas’ well documented ties with Cuban revolutionaries, the Latin American countries led by the civilian governments in power at the time in Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Costa Rica opposed the Carter administration’s last minute effort of creating, under the OAS umbrella an Inter American force—which would deny the Sandinistas their victory, avoid the dismantling of the National Guard and allow for a more “controlled” transition—and paved the way for a complete Sandinista victory.

By once more trying to use the OAS as an instrument of its policies, Washington disqualified the regional organization to serve as a mediation agency in the US-Nicaragua conflict. The establishment of military bases in Honduras, the development of a war machine in El Salvador, the military and naval maneuvers in the zone, the economic blockade and mining of the Nicaraguan ports—declared illegal by the International Court of Justice—, and the covert and later overt support for the national Resistance rebels known as contras—also condemned by the Court—were elements of an all but declared US war against the Sandinista regime.

Confronted by Washington’s relentless attacks, the Nicaraguan government first sought bilateral negotiations with the US. The Reagan administration adamantly refused them. Counting on the support of the Latin American military still in power in most countries it proposed instead the OAS as mediator. The Central American revolutionaries refused as expected, and with European and non-aligned support were able to “internationalize” the conflict and bring it to the UN. During the 1982 UN General Assembly, debates were dominated by the war in Central America. The majority of the governments of the world voiced their concerns over the Reagan administration’s policy towards the countries of the isthmus and one after another called for negotiated settlements.

Responding to the international community’s support for negotiations, and in order to avoid the escalation of violence in the region—wary of conflicts spilling over their territories, the governments of Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela—three Caribbean Basin regional powers—and Panama, launched a diplomatic initiative which became known as the Contadora Process. In their first declaration, the Contadora Group’s foreign ministers set the tone of their diplomatic initiative by dismissing the argument which considered the region’s instability as a product of East-West confrontation as Washington argued, and instead espoused the thesis that the root causes of the conflict were chronic social and economic injustice.

Under extreme US pressure, the Central American governments except that of Nicaragua continued seeking international backing within the Inter American system. While the Costa Rican government repeatedly urged the OAS to invoke the Rio Treaty to assist in defense of its border with Nicaragua—that anti Sandinista combatants used as rear base—Nicaraguan authorities periodically took the debate to the UN Security Council and General Assembly.
Despite US opposition, Contadora prevailed for several years and the group was able to produce a comprehensive peace agreement blueprint that the four US Central Americans allies refused to sign. By July 1985 its mediation efforts seemed exhausted despite the support group constituted by Peru, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay and the participation of the UN and OAS secretaries general in the collective mediation effort. Taking advantage of the void left by the failure of the Contadora mediation effort, Oscar Arias, as Costa Rica’s newly elected president, presented a new Peace Initiative in February 1987. His proposal called for the demilitarization and democratization of the region under specific rules. The plan implicitly, but clearly recognized the Sandinista regime and the validity of the Nicaraguan constitution. Moreover, like the Contadora proposal, it did not demand far reaching internal changes in Nicaragua, but explored the demilitarization of the Sandinista regime in exchange for a cease-fire formula—which also applied to other countries fighting internal wars—called for the dismantling of armed insurgencies, and specified disarmament plans for all the nations of the region. However, unlike Contadora, it called for a preeminent involvement of the international community in the peace process.

By signing the Esquipulas II agreement six months later, the five Central American heads of state, voluntarily agreed to relinquish important segments of their countries’ sovereignty. They committed themselves and their governments to hold internationally supervised elections, and to allow the international community to organize repatriation of refugees and relocation of internally displaced persons and also invited the international community to verify compliance with their pledge not to engage in hostilities or support aggression against neighboring countries.

UN-OAS collaboration in Central America

In an effort to build on the Contadora mediation efforts, and with the purpose of eliciting international support, the Central American heads of state called upon the Contadora foreign ministers and the secretaries general of the UN and the OAS to form the International Commission of Verification and Follow Up (CIVS). The CIVS would be responsible to verify overall compliance. Their report made public five months after the peace agreement was signed described a dire situation: nobody was complying. However developments outside the region would allow the process to begin bearing fruits.

Weakened by the Iran Contra scandal, the Reagan administration announced in October 1988 that it would not seek congressional approval to renew military aid to the contra rebels. The Bush administration, its successor, soon after its inauguration subscribed to a bipartisan Nicaraguan policy—thus abandoning the Reagan administration strategy of seeking a military victory over the Sandinistas—and decided to support the Central American peace initiative. Instead of asking Congress for military assistance to support the Contra war, President Bush Sr solicited humanitarian aid for the Contras’ eventual demobilization. Congress approved the request and asked the OAS to administer the package.
Facing withering support from its socialist patrons and increasingly criticized by its Nordic and European supporters, in February 1989, at the fourth Esquipulas presidential summit, Daniel Ortega agreed to hold internationally supervised elections no later than February 1990, two years before the end of his legal term. UN and OAS observers were invited to monitor them, but no systematic cooperation between the two organizations was envisioned or achieved.

Concerning the demobilization process, despite the Esquipulas brokered Joint Plan for the Demobilization of the Nicaraguan Resistance and their Families signed by early 1989, the disarmament and demobilization of the anti-Sandinistas warriors did not really begin until after Ortega’s electoral defeat.

Unlike the electoral observation, the demobilization was conceived from the start as an interagency collaborative effort between the OAS and the UN. The OAS would be responsible for disarming, feeding and protecting the former Contras combatants as they left the camps in Honduras, while the UN High Commissioner for Refugees would oversee the repatriation of Nicaraguan refugees. The United Nations mission in Nicaragua (ONUCA) —originally deployed to observe the region’s borders as the international community’s response to Esquipulas’ request—would be in charge of disarming and demobilizing the Contra in Nicaraguan territory. Once the former resistance combatants were back on Nicaraguan soil they would be the sole eligible recipients of US humanitarian aid administered by the OAS. Congress had earmarked US humanitarian aid specifically for ex-Contra combatants which led to significant problems on the ground between them and other refugees, returnees and former Sandinista soldiers all coming back to their places of origin deeply scarred by the war and as poor as ever. Although not conceived as a conflict resolution device, the OAS mission on the ground was increasingly called to mediate local conflicts between all the aforementioned groups.

In El Salvador, the peace settlement was more directly linked to an international process led by the United Nations. The 1989 so-called final offensive led by the insurgents clearly demonstrated that military victory was out of reach of both warring factions. Urged by their external supporters they formally requested the UN secretary general to mediate the peace negotiations. Pérez de Cuéllar named his fellow Peruvian and close advisor Alvaro de Soto as his personal representative at the negotiations. He also called upon the governments of Spain, Colombia, Venezuela and Mexico to act as “friends” of the process. Because of its privileged access to the Salvadoran armed forces the US was also asked to participate. The group became known as the group of four friends plus one.

The OAS did not participate in the peace keeping and peace building operations in El Salvador. It did send however, an electoral observer mission to the 1992 elections held immediately after the signing of the Chapultepec Peace Accords.

It is interesting to note how the informal mechanisms which the Latin Americans had put in place at the height of the crisis were—to a certain
extent-formalized by the UN Secretary General with the formation of the group of friends, a mediating mechanism which was subsequently invoked to foster the negotiations leading the president Aristide’s restoration in Haiti, to end civil war in Guatemala and to encourage peace negotiations in Colombia.

Inter-agency difficult cooperation in Haiti

In February 1990, Haiti’s provisional government sought assistance from the OAS and the United Nations. Since then both organizations have engaged in a broad range of activities supporting democracy in Haiti, often collaborating more or less successfully, particularly in the promotion and protection of human rights and in election monitoring.

Haitian voters elected a former Catholic priest and at the time partisan of the Liberation Theology, Jean Bertrand Aristide, in elections that were considered a genuine triumph for democracy by observers from all quarters. But democracy does not develop instantly. In September 1991, the Haitian Armed Forces, fearing mass revenge violence against the old order protagonists overthrew the democratically elected government. Aristide fled to Venezuela.

The international community unanimously condemned the coup. The OAS imposed a trade embargo which although highly porous in the last analysis ended up crippling the Haitian economy and hurting mostly the poor. At the time the UN relied on diplomatic pressure from the Secretary General’s group of friends, the governments of Canada, France, United States and Venezuela. On January 13, 1993 Dante Caputo, Argentina’s former Foreign Affairs minister, was named Special Envoy to Haiti of the OAS as well as the UN, an innovation in cooperation between the UN and a regional organization. Caputo and the Group of Friends laid the groundwork for the deployment of a much praised joint OAS/UN human rights monitoring mission, known as the International Civilian Mission in Haiti (MICIVIH) that lasted until 2000.

By mid-1993 consensus emerged that mandatory sanctions were needed in order to get General Cédras to the negotiating table. On June 16, the Security Council imposed a universal embargo on weapons, oil and petroleum products against Haiti. Twenty days later Cédras and Aristide were negotiating at Governors Island in New York. Thanks to Caputo’s mediation, an agreement (GIA) was reached to successively establish a civilian interim government, suspend sanctions, deploy UN peacekeepers, declare an amnesty, Cedras to retire and Aristide to return. Despite the GIA’s uneven application, sanctions were suspended and a UN peacekeeping mission, UNMIH, was established with US, Canadian and French troops at its core. The UN soldiers were prevented from landing at Port au Prince’s harbor by armed militias. The Security Council responded by reimposing sanctions and ordering a naval blockade on Haiti.

On July 31st, 1994 the Clinton administration requested UN Security Council authorization to lead a multinational force under Chapter VII, followed by a Chapter VI UN peace keeping operation once a “secure and
stable environment” had been established. It was the first time in history that the US had sought UN authority for the use of force in its own “backyard”. UNMIH was redeployed in March 1995. In November 1997 the last UNMIH military personnel, leaving a small international police force aimed at building a domestic police capacity.

Haiti’s problems are manifold and run deep. However, none has been as pervasive and corrosive as rampant insecurity that was exacerbated by President Aristide’s decision of disbanding the Haitian Armed Forces and his attempts at creating militias loyal only to him. The disbanded soldiers soon became a powerful opposition force to Aristide and its militias as well as to the newly created Haitian National Police. Despite it all, René Préval’s administration ran its course and he was able to hand down the reins of government back to Aristide in 2000. In 2004 they had once more plunged Haiti into chaos.

Under intense internal and international (mainly US and French) pressure Aristide fled Haiti on February 29, 2004. That same day, the UN Security Council (UNSC) authorized a 3,000-strong multinational interim force comprised of American, French, Canadian and Chilean troops, to restore order. The multinational force was soon replaced by a new UN peacekeeping mission established on April 30 by the UNSC under chapter VII mandate. MINUSTAH’s mandate was to carry out police reform, assist in comprehensive disarmament, demobilization and reintegration measures, and to promote the political transition process.

It is interesting to note that MINUSTAH is the first UN peacekeeping operation of any size to be mainly composed of Latin American contingents. It has been led by Brazilian commanding officers. Juan Gabriel Valdez, a Chilean diplomat and well known political figure in his country, was the first Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of Mission. Edmundo Mulet from Guatemala has been MINUSTAH head of mission since July 2006. The mission is constituted of a 6662 military contingent—4016 of which are Latin American officers and soldiers coming from 9 countries—and a 1742 policemen and women of which only 22 are Latin American.

Haiti faces very real security challenges-fuelled by the active drug transshipment trade and increasingly violent crime including widespread kidnapping. After some months of relative inaction, UN forces began raiding gang strongholds and killing two prominent gang leaders. However, although security is a key concern, many have emphasized that more attention should be paid to the problem of poverty: not only security and poverty are closely linked, but as a practical matter it will also take time to build up security forces.

In 2006, the OAS expanded its mandate to include the promotion of economic and social development, in addition to the strengthening of democratic governance. Specific OAS initiatives focus on electoral and judicial reform, institution and capacity building, tourism development, trade and investment, and combating human trafficking.
Despite it all the OAS response in Haiti is still weak and the only real interagency link is that Valdez is now the liaison for the OAS Secretary General to Haiti. Having served as SRSG, he understands the terrain. Because MINUSTAH is an integrated UN mission that embraces a wider set of interventions beyond the military/security component, it leaves little space for the OAS operation. Furthermore financial constrains, and little political will, makes it difficult for the OAS to compete with the overwhelming presence of the UN. Things could be worse; all observers agree that the fact that MINUSTAH is predominantly Latin American, communication between the UN mission and the OAS on the ground is good.

Another good news is that the friends’ process is active, and Ambassador Ramdin, the OAS Assistant Secretary General is taking his mission of working on Haiti very seriously, sometimes acting as a de facto additional friend.

**Final thoughts**

Central American countries and Haiti are not fully stable yet. Civil wars are not a threat any longer, but violence is rampant, insecurity is threatening governance and the demands of the population for increased police or armed forces presence on the streets risk jeopardizing the very incipient rule of law.

Unfortunately possible hot spots are nowadays present not only in Central America and the Caribbean. The Andean region is going through difficult moments as well. In Colombia, both organizations are already on the ground: the OAS has been an observer to the negotiations between the Uribe government and the paramilitaries and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has an office in Bogotá. The OAS secretary general has expressed his preoccupation with the state of democracy (as defined in the Charter) in Venezuela. He is closely looking to the constitutional process in Ecuador, and to the regional crisis in Bolivia.

Finally, if process of political succession in Cuba derails, the international community would have to act through the UN, since Cuba is not an active member of the OAS.

In any event, no international organization can do significantly more than its member states wish. The United States, for example, the most powerful nation in the hemisphere, has its Department of State’s International Organizations Bureau focused itself exclusively on the UN, leaving regional organizations to appropriate regional or functional bureaus which means that the lack of cooperation and communication starts “at home” so to speak. Something similar seems true pretty much everywhere.

Many think that regional organizations are the most important building blocs for increasing security. In theory everybody agrees that increased collaboration between them and the UN is desirable. The difficulties arise as a result of different organizational cultures, sizes and financial capabilities.
All that being said, there is no doubt that, particularly in crisis situations, better coordination within the international community at the technical and political levels is needed as is greater cooperation among donor organizations. In our hemisphere we could begin by setting a consultation mechanism between the OAS and the UN secretaries general. The two organizations have different mandates and capabilities that would allow for burden sharing.

Recent efforts by the current OAS Secretary General to make the Inter American Democratic Charter more operational as a crisis prevention mechanism could give the regional organization an early warning role while the UN would come in if the crisis escalates and a more robust international intervention is required.


Interviews with Viron P. Vacky, former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Inter American Affairs, Luigi R. Einaudi former OAS Assistant Secretary General and Acting Secretary General, Gerardo Le Chevalier, currently a MINUSTAH official, and Johanna Mendelson, Senior Associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.


Introduction

With the end of the Cold War and the conflicts in Central America, Latin America has become progressively one of the most peaceful regions in the world. Major transformations have occurred in the relations among the countries of the region that have for the most part improved the prospects for peace, in terms of traditional concerns of international security and peace (Domínguez, 1998:4-11). Moreover, since the 1990s there has been a shift in favor of multilateralism, an approach to issues in which states act co-operatively and by consensus based on shared interests and norms. Conversely, the countries of the region confront new types of security challenges that they have been hard-pressed to tackle effectively, rendering traditional issues of war and peace irrelevant to cope with intermestic problems of national and international security (such as drug trafficking, migratory flows, transnational crime, and political and economic instability).

One novelty of the newer structures of governance, cooperation, and integration in Latin America, including the Rio Group (since 1986), Mercosur (since 1991), and the most recent South American Union (since 2004) is the way in which politics, economics, and security are increasingly interdependent and intertwined. Even where economic integration or free trade have been the major motives behind the regional action (as in Mercosur and the SAU), or political cooperation has been the rationale (as in the Rio Group), political bargaining and security spillovers inevitably result, establishing clear links between economic gain, democracy, security cooperation, regional integration, and geopolitics (IDB, 2002:3-4; Fawcett, 2005:43; and Pion Berlin, 2005:212-213). As we have moved into the 21st century, multilateral schemes of regional and sub-regional cooperation have become a more important component of the overall national policies, and the stakes have become higher. In this sense, regional integration can be used as a geopolitical tool to fortify international bargaining positions and promote cooperation in achieving “neighborhood” objectives such as peace, democracy, the resolution of border-related problems, and the development of regional infrastructure. At the same time, it is less evident and clear how these multilateral frameworks of cooperation can cope with the new challenges of regional security.

The purpose of this paper is to briefly examine two Latin American sub-regional and multilateral forums, the Rio Group (since 1986) and the South American Union (since 2004) and their respective missions and roles regarding security. Are they effective? How do they adapt to the new security challenges of the post-Cold War order and the 21st century? How do they insert themselves within the general security framework of the region, and within the context of the broader Inter-American (Western Hemispheric) security relations? Despite a certain overlapping between these two organizations, there is also a “division of labor” in terms of security-related matters: the Rio Group has emphasized since its inception political cooperation, mediation in conflicts, and cooperative, common security. The SAU, as an amalgamation of Mercosur and the Andean
Community, focuses on economic cooperation, infrastructures (including energy and communication), moving in the direction of an embryonic pluralistic security community and a supra-national future.

In the following pages, I discuss the historical background for the creation of the Rio Group and the South American Union. This background is followed by a discussion of the changing concept of security and the new landscape of regional security. Finally, I assess the role of the Rio Group and the SAU as (potential?) tools of regional security.

Background and Emergence of the Rio Group and the South American Union

Until the 1980s South America was considered a zone of “negative peace” only. However, with the spread of democracy, the Southern Cone of South America especially has been moving in the direction of stable peace and perhaps even an incipient pluralistic security community among the member-states of Mercosur. The return to democracy in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile has clearly improved the quality of the peace among these three countries and the level of rapprochement between Argentina and Brazil since 1985, and Argentina and Chile since 1990 (Kacowicz, 2000:200-201; Hirst, 1998:102).

The positive diplomatic transformations in the Southern Cone of South America, together with the “intermestic” transformation in Central America following the end of the civil wars and the unfolding of peace processes have closed as well as opened chapters of insecurity and violence in the history of these sub-regions (Dominguez, 1998:28). Especially in Central America and the Caribbean, but also in the Northern Tier of South America (with a particular focus in Colombia), non-state and domestic sub-state violence have risen dramatically to threaten international and internal stability.

Nowadays, it is possible to identify both integrative and disintegrative forces affecting the political and security dynamics of Latin America. Integrative forces are linked to the democratic concert in the region (epitomized by both the OAS and by the Rio Group after 1986), the dialogue between Latin America and other regions (summit meetings with Europe since 1999, Iberoamerican summits since 1991), transnational integration, increasing investments, and a widespread support for multilateralism. Disintegrative forces include domestic violence and political disintegration, low levels of institutionalization of the regional institutions (from Mercosur and the Andean Community to the new SAU), relative economic stagnation (as institutions) of the Andean Community and Mercosur, and increasing preference of extra-regional bilateral trade agreements (Muñoz, 2006:38-40).

Ideological Background: Bolivarianism vs. Panamericanism

As a basic theme in the formation and evolution of the Latin American international society, the supranational aspirations for regionalism and regional unity have been developed by two overlapping and sometimes
opposing ideological movements: Bolivarianism and Panamericanism. Bolivarianism has been expressed in the Latin American congresses of the 19th century, the regional efforts to resolve the Central American civil wars in the 1980s (by the Contadora and Rio Groups), and the invigorated schemes for economic integration throughout Latin America, culminating in the recent South American Union. Conversely, Panamericanism has been reflected in a series of Inter-American Conferences (like this one!) held since 1889, the work of the OAS since 1948, and numerous Inter-American institutions, including the Presidential Summits since 1994 (Kacowicz, 2005:49).

Bolivarianism—that is, Bolivar’s basic concept of a loose confederation of Hispanoamerican states—derived from the external threat posed by European powers to the nascent South American states. According to this view, the political solidarity, cooperation, and integration among the Latin American states were inherently defensive and externally driven. However, the 1826 Congress of Panama convened by Bolivar ultimately failed, so that the political union among the new Latin American nations never materialized. While the formal institutions sponsored by Bolivar and his successors remained ephemeral, the principles and norms underlying them became a permanent part of the Latin American landscape of regional international law, well after the initial failure of the political schemes of integration. Those were national-populist ideas that rejected imperialism and the Panamerican system, defended sovereignty, self-determination and non-intervention, and encouraged Latin American coordination and cooperation.

Bolivarianism as an expression of regional (i.e., Latin American) nationalism declined with the ascendancy of the Panamerican movement after 1889. It was resuscitated only with the Central American peace process after 1982, when the Contadora Group, and later on, the Rio Group after 1986, adopted a “concerted diplomacy” of peacemaking in Central America distinctive from the Inter-American framework. Nowadays, the Rio Group includes twenty countries of the region and it has become an effective forum for policy coordination and political cooperation among the Latin American countries (Meyer, 1997:166-167; Espindola, 1998:16; and Fawcett, 2005:41). Even in more specific terms, the new South American Union epitomizes the original tenets of Bolivarianism.

In this context, it is interesting to mention that the realm of international security traditionally remained outside the scope of regional Latin American groups, especially during the Cold War. In other words, Panamericanism, formalized through the Rio Treaty, left little room for maneuver or sub-regional initiatives. One exception to this rule was the emergence of a Latin American nuclear-free zone, initially established in Tlatelolco in 1967 and completed in the mid-1990s with the accession of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile (and ultimately Cuba in 2002) to this regional regime.

In 1986 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, eight Latin American countries established a permanent mechanism for regional political cooperation known as the Rio Group (GRIO). It nowadays includes 20 participating members from Latin America and the Caribbean: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The formation of the Rio Group resulted from the fusion of the Contadora Group (Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama) and the Support Group (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Peru) that had met hitherto to assess and frame solution to the civil wars in Central America (O’Toole, 2007:291). This was the first time since the 19th century that Latin American countries institutionalized a concerted political dialogue and forum of political consultation.

The main objectives of the GRIO were established in the Declaration of Rio de Janeiro in 1986. These included: expanding political cooperation and improving inter-American relations; reaching common positions on international issues; fostering integration initiatives; and conflict resolution. In 1999 the GRIO reiterated the major principles that it stood for, including: the defense of democracy; the protection of human rights; peace, security, and disarmament; the establishment of viable institutions throughout the region; and the strengthening of multilateralism (O’Toole 2007:291).

Since 1986 the Rio Group has taken many political, economic, and security issues in its agenda, including: political and economic issues; peace, security, development, and democracy; the struggle against drug-smuggling; peace processes in Central America; democratization; Latin American integration; promotion and protection of human rights; disarmament; actions against terrorism; corruption and the drug problem; regional institutionalism; strengthening of multilateralism; regional integration; trade relations; financial flows and investments; overcoming poverty; sustainable development; and educational cooperation. The Rio Group played an important role in mediating between Ecuador and Peru after their last war in 1995, and in providing the framework for a peace agreement between the two states in late 1998, alongside the “guarantor states” (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and the United States).

Emergence and Evolution of the South American Union, 2004-2007

On December 8, 2004, representatives from the twelve South American countries signed an agreement to create a political and economic bloc modeled on the European Union, the South American Community of Nations, SACN (later it changed its name to the South American Union, SAU). The SAU seeks to establish, among other things, a common currency, parliament, and passport by 2019. It is the result of the convergence of two main integration frameworks of the region—the Andean Community (CAN) and Mercosur, alongside Chile, Suriname, and Guyana.
The SACN has been established based on the work of two summits: 1) the Cuzco Declaration on the SACN (as the Third South American Presidential Summit); it was meant to establish the goals and the framework of the new institution; and 2) the Presidential Declaration and Priority Agenda at the First Meeting of Heads of State of the SACN, held in Brasilia on September 30, 2005; its purpose was to work out some of the mechanisms and mechanics of the organization (Huelsemeyer, 2006:14).

The Cuzco Declaration of 2004 stated as the main goal the creation of a “South America area that is integrated politically, socially, economically, environmentally, and in infrastructure.” It also noted that the Community should develop on the basis of “cooperation and concerted political and diplomatic action,” as the convergence of Mercosur and the Andean Community.

The summit also approved the launching of thirty-two infrastructure and construction projects, emphasizing the need for greater interconnection of highway, energy, and communication systems in South America. Although the focus of the new integrative framework was economic, based on the agreement for commercial complementation between the two former sub-regional blocs, it has a clear political vision, transcending the existing integrative frameworks in a more supra-national direction.

The Brasilia Declaration of 2005 included six major themes: (1) coordination of political and diplomatic efforts; (2) construction of a free trade area among the Andean Community, Mercosur, Chile, Guyana, and Suriname; (3) physical integration and integration of energy and communication through the South American Regional Integration Initiative (IIRSA); (4) agricultural development; (5) horizontal transfer and sharing of development and scientific, educational, and cultural cooperation; and (6) encouragement of the civil society and corporate interaction within the South American space, leading to a potential free movement over the South American territory.

It could be argued that the major force behind the launching of the SACN has been Brazil, in order to create a political and economic counter-balance to the U.S. hegemony in the region and its proposal of establishing the FTAA, and to increase the collective bargaining power of the region vis-à-vis the North (Europe and the United States).

Security and the New Landscape of Regional Security

Defining Security and Regional Security

The context of regional security has been the major framework of reference for the management and resolution of territorial disputes among the Latin American states. Although Latin America has been an integral part and parcel of the Inter-American system, security concerns have referred first and foremost to the immediate neighborhood rather than to extra-regional, or global, contexts.

In a region with a long history of insecurity, mistrust, border disputes, unequal levels of economic development, and broad disparities in the
distribution of power, the main traditional security issues have focused on sudden attempts at military resolutions of long-standing border disputes and diplomatic stalemates, as well as the spread of revolutions and counter-revolutions across borders, at least until the 1980s. Despite the relative absence of interstate wars, border control, sovereignty, and national security have remained relevant symbols and important rhetorical elements that have guided key political actors, including the armed forces, in national debates and in the formulation of foreign policies, as stumbling blocks in any substantial supra-national project (Mares, 1997:195 and 202).

As a whole, Latin American states have been more concerned with their own domestic political problems than with confronting external security threats. Traditionally, the Latin American armed forces took upon themselves paramount domestic political roles since there was less need to defend their nations from outside aggressors (Varas, 1985, 1-2; Glick, 1965:1979). Moreover, during the period of harsh military dictatorships in the 1960s and 1970s, the Latin American armies became a threat to many of their own citizens. Since the processes of democratization in the late 1970s and early 1980s, we have witnessed efforts of regional security cooperation toward a better understanding among the countries of the region, a gradual transcendence of perceptions of mutual threat, and a consensual recognition toward the strengthening of confidence-building measures (Velit Granda, 1992:89).

By the early 1990s, the traditional concept of international security and the old concept of a continental collective security (as sponsored by the OAS and the Rio Treaty) became somehow obsolete. Although the end of the Cold War facilitated the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts, such as that of Central America, there remained fluid and dangerous domestic situations, within the context of serious political and economic changes that could generate regional tensions in the 1990s and well into the new millennium, especially in Central America and in the Northern Tier of South America (Colombia, Venezuela, Guyana, and Suriname). Hence, there is a need nowadays to transcend the concept of hemispheric collective security and build a more stable framework of cooperative security among the Latin American countries (as epitomized in the rhetoric of the Rio Group), or at the sub-regional level (as included in the goals of the new South American Union).

New and broader concepts of security, such as “common,” “mutual,” “comprehensive,” “cooperative,” and “human” have added a multidimensional character to traditional security relations. A broader concept of security might include, in addition to the obvious military dimension, diplomatic, political, economic, and cultural aspects. The diplomatic dimension is subordinated to the idea of national sovereignty within the context of a regional vision of security. The political aspect refers to the type of political regime; for instance, nowadays, a threat to democracy is considered a threat to regional security. With the structural economic reforms of the 1980s and 1990s and the current plans for economic integration at the regional and sub-regional levels, the economic dimension
has been reincorporated into the general scheme of security. Finally, the cultural dimension refers to the normative dimension of sharing common values within the Latin American international society.

The adoption of the more complex and ambiguous concept of “common,” “cooperative,” or “mutual” security both incorporates and transcends the traditional idea of collective security. One important difference between the two is that while collective security tries to harness the force of the community to deal with the potential transgressor, common security attempts to shy away from the use of force at all (Mares, 1994:271-272). A system of cooperative security is based on several elements, such as a defensive configuration of the national armed forces, a myriad of CBMs, the establishment of a multilateral forum for the prevention of future conflicts, and a coordinated participation in an organized international response for the prevention or deterrence of aggression (Patino Mayer, 1996:7).

The Changing Landscape of Regional Security

With the reduction of the old “conventional” security threats, the countries of the region are facing new security risks and more diverse threats. By broadening the concept of security we might include issues such as increasing unemployment and poverty, marginality of many sectors of the population, drug trafficking, terrorism, organized crime, violations of human rights, environmental degradation, and threats to democratic development and economic well-being. Political and economic instability, which served historically to legitimize military interventions in the region, has reappeared as a potential threat to regional security, as illustrated by Colombia’s war against guerrillas, that threatened to spill over into Venezuela, Panama, Ecuador, and Brazil, with US policy towards Colombia also threatening to expand the conflict. Furthermore, violence and citizen insecurity have reached epidemic proportions, making some areas of Latin America among the most violent regions of the world today (O’Toole, 2007:287; Tulchin and Espach, 2001:12; Atkins, 1997: 273-274; Druetta and Tibiletti, 1993:54; Tickner, 2007:1).

The changing landscape of Latin American regional security is also characterized by transnational threats, such as drug trafficking, migration, international crime, and arms trafficking. Migratory flows have been a source of tension between several Latin American countries, such as the worsening relations between the Dominican Republic and Haiti in 2005. Terrorism and illicit transnational drug trafficking have posed new challenges to sub-regional security collaboration schemes, such as those existing in Mercosur. A case in point is the so-called “Triple Border area,” a duty-free zone where the borders of Paraguay, Brazil, and Argentina converge, which has been identified as a terrorist “hotspot” for Islamic groups (Pion-Berlin, 2005:216; Tickner, 2007:7). Paradoxically, these new security threats and challenges make the existing inter-national frameworks of peace and security look irrelevant or obsolete. As in the case of the Southern Cone of South America, if neighbors are no longer considered potential enemies neither there is a clear sense of who the common
external foe is, and how to cope with it. This is even more disturbing due to the perceptions of threat of the US vis-à-vis the region in the post-9/11 period, calling for military responses against these security threats, as in the case of Colombia (Pion-Berlin, 2005:216; Duarte Villa, 2007:6-7).

The Rio Group and the South American Union as Tools for Regional Security

At times, Latin American states have found their own solutions to regional security problems, such as the resolution of the Central American civil wars in the late 1980s through the Contadora Group (and later on the Rio Group). Progress has also been achieved in specific areas, such as drug-trafficking. Integration has also eased tensions and competition between historical rivals, such as Argentina and Brazil, and Mercosur and the most recent SAU have helped to foster stability and security in the Southern Cone (O’Toole, 2007:288).

Yet, the hemisphere’s current security architecture, consisting of multi-level agreements and ad hoc arrangements to confront emerging problems, is deficient and at a low level of institutionalization, with a common security agenda remaining elusive (Tickner, 2007:9). As for Latin America in particular, there are no clear institutional mechanisms that allow for a co-operative and prompt response to security crises, thus enhancing the unilateral or overwhelming role of the United States (Tulchin and Espach, 2001:13-14).

At the subregional level, schemes of cooperation and integration, such as Mercosur, have fared somewhat better, although there were not designed in the first place to enhance international security. Yet, in relative terms, security and defense cooperation between Argentina and Chile, and between Argentina and Brazil have been quite successful, in comparison to similar rhetorical commitments in the Andean Group (Kacowicz, 2000:202-210; Tickner, 2007:10-11). In this context, we should evaluate the roles of the Rio Group and of the South American Union as (potential?) tools for regional security.

The Rio Group: Political Motivations and Security Implications

The norms of cooperative and common security overlap with the Latin American initiative of concertación, which provided the basis for the Contadora/Esquipulas process and the larger Latin American cooperation on political and security matters since 1986, within the context of the Rio Group. Security concerns were one of the key matters that gave rise to the formulation of a Permanent Mechanism for Joint Political Action (Mecanismo de Consulta y Concertación Política Latinoamericana), commonly known as the Rio Group. Regarding security, two main goals have been promoted: “To seek solutions suitable to the problems and conflicts that affect the region,” and “to promote initiatives and actions intended to improve, by means of dialogue and cooperation, Inter-American relations” (Rio Group Declaration, December 18, 1986, quoted in Aravena, 1994:183). In this sense, the concept of a common security approximates,
though it does not overlap, with the idea of a pluralistic security community and the creation of a Latin American zone of peace.

Since its creation, the Rio Group has been active and relatively successful in mediating between and within countries, from the peace processes in Central America (in the late 1980s) to the successful mediation between Peru and Ecuador in 1995-1998. In addition, the Rio Group has sought the prevention of the introduction of WMDs in Latin America and the Caribbean and the enhancement of security and cooperation among the states of the region. The completion of the Tlatelolco regime, including the accession of Cuba in 2002, has been sponsored by the Rio Group, though it has not been the sole responsible for this remarkable success.

In recent years, since the Veracruz Act of 1999 through the Cuzco Consensus of 2003 the Rio Group has addressed in its agenda the new security threats of terrorism, corruption, drug trafficking, organized transnational crime, illegal trafficking in small arms and light weapons, and money laundering. In 2004, it has also emphasized the importance of multilateral approaches to international security. With the exception of some coordinated efforts in the struggle against drug-trafficking, there have not been clear-cut results on the ground.

At the level of general frameworks of international security, the Rio Group maintains institutional links and cooperative efforts with other regional and even global institutions, including the OAS and the UN.

Finally, it should be stressed that due to the political character of the organization, the Group has focused over the years upon a myriad of subjects transcending narrow definitions of national and international security, such as democratization of the international system, international economic governance, the strengthening of democracy, and a social focus on domestic reforms.

**The South American Union: Economic Motivations and Security Implications**

If the Rio Group was conceived primarily as a mechanism for political consultation, the South American Union emerged as a political-economic package that included geopolitical integration through the enhancement of regional infrastructures in roads, communications, and energy; free-trade agreements linking Mercosur and the Andean Community; and an overall commitment to cooperate on security, poverty, and other related issues. But while the Rio Group has remained an inter-governmental project, the South American Union is premised in a long-term supra-national project that might carry far-reaching security implications in the long term.

In the first place, if domestic security concerns were a motivation behind the integration between Argentina and Brazil (in 1986), and the formation of Mercosur in 1991, it is possible to extrapolate a similar argument for the formation of the SACN in 2004 in order to cope better with domestic threats and to strengthen the democratic regimes in South America.
Second, the stated aim of the SACN is the creation of an “integrated South American space” with more long-term goals being the creation of a EU-style union and even the accomplishment of Simon Bolivar’s goal of a pan-South American federation. The logic here is clearly the building of a pluralistic security community, beyond the rationale of just inter-state cooperative security.

Third, the movement from political to economic agreements, in the issue-areas of energy and communication, through the physical integration envisioned in the South American Regional Integration Initiative (IIRSA) carries clear geopolitical implications. The stated objective of this initiative is to improve the competitiveness of the regional economy and its integration into the global economy, and to promote sustainable socio-economic development in the South American countries, especially through the modernization and integration of their infrastructure and logistics in the transport, energy, and telecommunications sectors.

At the same time, the new South American Union does not sustain an explicit agenda on how to cope with the new and non-traditional security threats in the Hemisphere, nor does it have a clear blueprint about its insertion within the general security framework of the Americas. It is a work in progress that does not allow us to assess its relative success (or failure) as a tool of regional security. Table 1 summarizes the comparison between the two institutions.
**The Rio Group and the SAU as Tools of Regional Security**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rio Group</th>
<th>South American Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Creation</strong></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>20 countries (LA + Caribbean)</td>
<td>12 countries (all of the SA countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main motivation for creation</strong></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security model</strong></td>
<td>Cooperative security</td>
<td>Pluralistic security community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>Inter-governmentalism</td>
<td>Supra-nationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missions Regarding Security</strong></td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Geopolitics through geoeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediation in conflicts</td>
<td>Political integration (peace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arms control and non-proliferation of WMDs</td>
<td>Easing border disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Some (Peru-Ecuador; Tlatelolco; promotion of democracy)</td>
<td>Hard to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptation</strong></td>
<td>Rhetorical adaptation</td>
<td>New agenda?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insertion in the Security Framework of the Region?</strong></td>
<td>Overlapping with OAS and UN</td>
<td>Security as a by-product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security Issues Addressed</strong></td>
<td>Peace, security, development, democracy; struggle against drug-smuggling; peace processes in Central America; disarmament; actions against terrorism; nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament</td>
<td>Geopolitics; infrastructure + energy; physical integration; domestic threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Security Issues</strong></td>
<td>Political economy issues; Latin American integration; democratization; promotion of human rights; cooperation; multilateralism; trade relations; financial flows; sustainable development; educational cooperation.</td>
<td>Democratization; infrastructure; coordination of political/diplomatic efforts; free trade area; agricultural development; cooperation (epistemic communities); corporate interaction in the South American sphere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1*
Conclusions

This brief analysis of the Rio Group and the SAU as potential tools for regional security point out to an interesting paradox: both organizations seem more capable of dealing with keeping international peace and security in the traditional sense, than coping with the non-traditional security challenges that affect the region. In this sense, they might be successful, but at the same time irrelevant for certain issue-areas of security.

It is certainly more difficult to struggle against drug trafficking, transnational crime in general and terrorism, where there is no consensus, than keeping international peace and security. The most threatening security problem in the region—the drug trafficking—was never confronted through an effective regional policy (Hirst, 2003:2). Human security issues are even more difficult to deal with, including the necessity to improve personal security, economic security, and food security.

The fact remains that most of the Latin American countries, even the twelve South American countries together, do not have a common security policy. Due to this lack of initiative, the United States remains a more pro-active actor in sponsoring and initiating security moves in the region. While it is clear that the Rio Group and the SAU sustain far-reaching security implications, their role as tools of regional security has been so far insufficient and incomplete. The challenge remains as to what extent security cooperation can be institutionalized in the Western Hemisphere through a more fruitful and effective dialogue among the Rio Group, the SAU, and the OAS.
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Part 3
Other Actors and the Future of the Security Framework

The main topic of this section concerns the actors of the new security framework in the Americas. Authors examine the role of the military, the business sector, and civil society regarding the new security threats in the hemisphere, and how they cooperate with other actors. The future of hemispheric security arrangements is also analyzed.
Introduction

In the 21st century, what do, or should, militaries in the Americas do? The differing responses to that question when applied to the North and the South reveal the very considerable contrast in how military roles tend to be determined. In the North, especially the United States, the changing nature of security threats tends to dominate discussions of defense. When the topic is South America, however, discussions of military roles and missions tend to be focused on the impact or implications of these with respect to civilian control of the military (See, for example, Pion-Berlin & Trinkunas, 2006). This paper seeks to explain why different militaries adopt or are assigned different kinds of military roles. I argue that military roles are strongly shaped by these historically-determined differing perspectives, combined with shifting political needs and access to resources. In other words, only in wealthy, politically stable countries with well-entrenched patterns of political-military cooperation do governments and militaries have the luxury of defining roles primarily on the basis of security threats and needs. In most of the Americas, more limited resources mean both that militaries may be used more selectively, and that they may often be utilized to fill public needs other than defense. Histories plagued with military intervention in politics and military repression have also affected military roles, as political leaders in these countries have tended to be more concerned with preventing the military’s capacity to intervene than augmenting the military’s capacity to serve.

The Changing International Security Environment

Since the end of the Cold War, analysts concerned with defense and security—especially those in the United States—have focused much of their attention on “new” security threats such as narcotics-trafficking and terrorism, as well as relatively newer military missions, such as international peace-keeping. While not supplanting roles such as traditional defense, civic action, disaster assistance and, in a few remaining cases, counter-insurgency, these newer military roles reflect both the impact of globalization and the shifts in the international system following the end of the Cold War. Borders have become relatively softer, and security threats much less clearly linked to specific governments and nation-states. Just as legal commerce flows across international borders, so do illegal products such as narcotics and weapons, with producers and distributors often dispersed through multiple countries. Terrorism, while far from a new phenomenon, has metamorphized from a primarily domestic phenomenon—associated with revolution and nationalist movements—to a method that frequently assumes a transnational form, with an organization and actions independent of either national boundaries or state sponsorship (Hoffman, 2006) More recently, some analysts have even added global warming—another globalized phenomenon—to this growing list of new international threats (Calle, 2007).

Much of the emphasis on these new security threats reflects the priorities of United States’ policy-makers. U.S. foreign policy has naturally focused on U.S. interests when interacting with Latin American allies, with both...
diplomatic efforts and resources directed towards encouraging Latin American countries to adopt military missions compatible with US concerns. Thus, during the Cold War, the United States encouraged anti-communism within the region and, focused on averting or combating leftist revolutionary movements, helped train Latin American militaries for counter-insurgency. Following the end of the Cold War, U.S. priorities turned first toward counter-narcotics, considered a national security threat for the United States since the mid-1980s (Diamint, 2003), then, after the terrorist attacks on New York of September 2001, toward counter-terrorism as a focus (Barrachina and Rial, 2006; Rojas Aravena, 2004).

However, narcotics trafficking and terrorism directly threaten Latin America less than the United States. To be sure, in Colombia, both the extensive narcotics industry intertwined with decades of guerrilla warfare do make both of these concerns directly relevant. Drug-trafficking in some other countries, such as Mexico, may also suffice to raise the narcotics issue to a security threat, while in Peru, remnants of the Sendero Luminoso guerrilla movement may warrant retaining armed insurgency as a continuing security concern.

Yet for much of Latin America, especially the Southern Cone, narcotics-trafficking is really more of a peripheral issue, despite its centrality to the U.S. agenda and the U.S. tendency to identify narcotics production and trafficking as a major problem in the region. A 2006 U.S. State Department Memorandum regarding Major Drug Transit and Producing Countries indicates U.S. concerns about three countries from Central and North America-Mexico, Guatemala and Panama—and seven South American countries—Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela (U.S. Department of State, 2006). Although this brief document does not justify the designations for all of these cases, the explanations provided regarding two of the cases, Bolivia and Venezuela, are quite revealing. In each of these cases, the designation apparently derives from U.S. concerns, not domestic concerns with narcotics production and trafficking. With respect to Bolivia, therefore, the document expresses displeasure with the Bolivian government’s rejection of coca eradication, part of a policy of permitting coca production while penalizing the manufacture and distribution of cocaine. Regarding Venezuela, the document states that the decision “comes as the result of Venezuela’s lack of effective response to specific United States Government requests for counter-narcotics cooperation as well as the country’s continued lack of action against drug trafficking within and through its borders...” In sum, in both these cases, it is the governments’ failures to cooperate with U.S. policies that produced the U.S. critique, rather than the scale of narcotics trafficking per se.

With respect to terrorism, U.S. designations and perceptions likewise often seem inclined to exaggerate the extent of terrorist threats in Latin America, whether by choosing the very laden term “terrorist” to refer to groups whose primary methods are guerrilla warfare, or by identifying countries as terrorist sympathizers when they seek alliances with governments deemed hostile to the United States. Even when Latin American
countries have suffered actual terrorist attacks, these have often been perceived domestically as more isolated incidents rather than as indications of an ongoing terrorist threat. For example, while two major terrorist attacks occurred in Argentina in the 1990s, the 1992 bombing of the Israeli embassy, and the 1994 attack against the Argentine-Israeli Mutual Association (AMIA, a Jewish service organization), the first has generally been interpreted as an attack against a foreign government—probably appropriately so—and the second as an attack mostly against a minority population, rather than against Argentina itself.

What, then, are the security threats faced by the Americas? As the above might suggest, this varies considerably from one sub-region to another, and even from one country to another. As will be discussed below, the “threats” faced by the United States, or, rather, adopted by the United States as security concerns include a wide range of issues, including many that stretch well beyond U.S. borders. In Latin America, many traditional military threats, especially the likelihood of inter-state conflicts, have diminished over the course of recent years (Rojas Aravena, 2004), leaving more emphasis on security needs beyond defense. Partly as a consequence, definitions of security concerns have tended to expand. This is exemplified by the 2003 OAS “Declaration on Security in the Americas,” which provides an exhaustive list of security threats, including everything from poverty, disease, transnational crime and narcotics, to “natural and man-made disasters, HIV/AIDS and other diseases, other health risks, and environmental degradation,” just as a start (OAS, 2003; see also Rojas Aravena, 2004, and Barrachina and Rial, 2006). However, in contrast to the national security doctrines of the prior century, this approach emphasizes cooperative security, confidence building and negotiation to deal with disputes, and by no means grants the regions’ militaries the primary responsibility for confronting the vast array of security challenges identified in the document. Which missions governments do grant to their militaries depends on the particular political, historical and economic situation of each individual country.

Constraints of Developing Countries: Limited Resources and Unlimited Needs

A major factor determining the definition of military roles involves resources. In the United States—a very large state with an equally large budget—threat assessment may have more impact on defining military roles, mostly because capabilities suffice to allow the development of multiple capabilities simultaneously. During the post-Cold War period, the United States also developed what Barry Posen refers to as “command of the commons,” essentially, military predominance in sea, air and land, well beyond the scope of the country’s borders (Posen, 2003). But the reality in most of the Americas is quite different from this. In these countries, limited resources, national needs other than defense, and the broader panorama of political priorities may be just as important in determining military roles as defense and security needs per se.
Military Expenditures

The countries in the Americas with the highest levels of military expenditures tend to be those with the most substantial budgets and, in particular, those with the greatest access to foreign currency. Absolute budget size is also a factor. Most notable is the contrast between the United States; the middle income South American countries; and the relatively poorer states in Central America. Overall, since the mid-90s until 2005, the United States has tended to spend between 3 and 4% of its GDP on military expenditures—toward the high end of this beginning with the war in Iraq—while the South American countries have tended to spend between 1 and 2% of their GDPs on military expenditures, while the Central American countries have generally spend under 1% of GDP on this portion of the budget (SIPRI, 2006). With the wealthiest of these countries spending the highest percentage of its gross domestic product on military expenditures, and the poorer countries spending the least, the absolute difference between military expenditures is even greater than that indicated by the percentages.

In South America, two countries stand out as spending a much higher proportion of their budgets on defense than others in the region, Colombia and Chile, with Colombia spending 4.4% of its GDP [PBI] on military expenditures in 2004, and Colombia spending 3.9% of its GDP in that year (Scheetz, 2005). Colombia is the most explicable big spender in the region, given both decades of civil war—in some areas, approaching virtual anarchy—and the substantial foreign aid the country receives from the United States. Chile, however, lacks any serious domestic or foreign threats that might motivate this level of spending. What the country does have, however, is resources to spend on the military budget, both from an overall healthy economy and from the military’s guaranteed share of the country’s copper income. Further north, Venezuela began augmenting its spending on weapons acquisitions toward the mid-2000s (Economist, 9 July 2005; Malamud and Garcia Encina, 2007; Osacar, 2006); as in Chile, Venezuela’s increased expenditures in this area were likely at least partly a consequence of the government’s increased available resources, based in this case on substantial oil profits. As will be discussed, both governments were probably also motivated by the need to placate politically powerful and/or potentially problematic militaries.

Public Needs

Just as resources impact military expenditures at least as much as actual defense needs, broader public and political motivations play a substantial role in determining how militaries will actually be utilized. Often, countries with few funds to spend on defense also lack the funds to spend on public security and other basic public services. Thus, the countries spending least on their militaries may also be those most likely to turn to the armed forces for missions far removed from defense. As David Pion-Berlin explains, “when push comes to shove, some reliance on military deployment, infrastructure, personnel, and technology may be necessary to solve problems that could get out of hand” (Pion-Berlin, 2004:45).
Such problems may include crises such as natural disasters or social disorder, or longer-range challenges stemming from poverty and limited state capabilities.

Thus, most countries permit their militaries to be used for domestic security at minimum when popular insurrection surpasses the capabilities of law enforcement agencies. However, in some cases, levels of crime are so high, and police forces so thoroughly inadequate or corrupt, that militaries—almost always available, given the relative lack of interstate conflict within Latin America—are given more enduring policing roles. Certain policing roles do border on defense, such as counter-narcotics or surveillance related to i.e. the financing and organization of potential terrorist or arms-trafficking organizations. In these cases, the transnational nature of the operations may well go beyond common crime. In other cases, however, it is simply public security that is at issue. Notably, high crime levels often grow from poverty, especially when governments lack the resources to either provide adequate social welfare or to build an adequate police force. Thus, the inclination to involve militaries in conventional policing has been particularly strong in relatively poorer countries of Central America, although more countries, including Mexico and Brazil, have veered towards military involvement in public security at least with respect to counter-narcotics efforts (Fraga, 29 Jan 2007).

Development needs have also shaped military roles. The same logistical capabilities that have always placed militaries on the front lines of disaster relief have sometimes also led to prolonged or even regularized military involvement in provision of basic social services, such as health care and food relief, as well as infrastructure development. In Argentina, expanded military involvement in providing emergency relief occurred in the context of the 2002 economic crisis, which led the government to temporarily provide many basic necessities to the poorest regions of the country (Pion-Berlin, 2004:51, 62; Pion-Berlin and Trinkunas, 2006:17). In Venezuela, however, a country with a longer and deeper struggle with poverty—and, since 1999, a government more consistently focused on the poor—military involvement in providing social services has been more extensive. This was epitomized by Plan Bolivar 2000, which involved the military in everything from “health care for the poor, combating illiteracy and unemployment” (Pion-Berlin and Trinkunas, 2006:19) to “cleaning up streets and schools, improving the environment to fight endemic diseases, and recovering the social infrastructure in both urban and rural areas” (Harnecker, 2003:15).

**Policies Beyond the Barracks**

Development related military missions may also fit into the government’s broader political agenda. Different overall political visions by national leaders may imply different military missions, given that militaries almost inevitably act within a broader foreign policy scheme. Some of the most obvious examples of this come from very different political approaches: on the one side, revolutionary politics, and on the other side, a liberal, internationalist approach to politics. The revolutionary agenda tends to
encourage domestic, development oriented missions for the armed forces, while the liberal, internationalist approach encourages international cooperation and participation in peace-keeping operations.

In most revolutionary regimes, militaries have their roots in the revolution itself and thus, rather than being apolitical, are expected to be firmly imbued with the regime’s political doctrine. This has been the case with both Nicaragua and Cuba, where the militaries became known, respectively, as the Sandinistas People’s Army (Nicaragua, until 1994) and the Revolutionary Armed Forces (Cuba). While Venezuela has not undergone a similar armed revolution, President Hugo Chávez’ efforts to transform the society from above have had a similar result, leading the Defense Ministry to be renamed to be the “Ministry of Popular Power for Defense.” By April 2007, Chávez had pushed this transformation further, demanding that the military pledge itself to “fatherland, socialism and death” (Castillo, 13 April 2007). In each of these regimes, the basic premise of a revolutionary partnership means that militaries are expected to be available to work for the whole of the revolutionary agenda, defending the ideological and developmental goals of the regime, just as much as they would be expected to defend these regimes from armed enemy states.

An alternative approach to military missions comes from a more liberal and internationalist orientation. Governments seeking this approach are likely to seek partnerships abroad for cooperative defense, especially partnerships through the liberal international organizations. Canada has been notable in this respect, with a long-standing emphasis on diplomacy and cooperative defense, while Argentina adopted a similar approach in the 1990s. As explained in “Canada’s International Policy Statement,” the Canadian military emphasizes “three broad roles: protecting Canadians, defending North America in cooperation with the United States, and contributing to international peace and security” (“Canada’s International Policy Statement,” 2005:2). Consequently, Canada has attracted considerable recognition for its leadership in international peacekeeping operations. Similarly, Argentina embraced international peace-keeping as a major military role during the neo-liberal administration of Carlos Menem, 1989-1999 (Norden, 1995).

The Quest for Civilian Control

The historical position of the armed forces in politics also shapes military missions, however. The recent histories of many Latin American countries are fraught with military coups and rebellions, military governments and not infrequently, harsh military repression. As a consequence, both civilian governments and international organizations promoting democratization have often been more focused on the issue of civilian control than defense—or any alternative military roles—when determining military policies.

This propensity has probably been most noticeable in Argentina, where the military’s post-authoritarian fate was shaped not only by the legacies
of military rule and repression, but also the military regime’s failed economic policies and the disastrous 1982 war against Great Britain. These combined circumstances left the armed forces with very little civilian support, and encouraged civilian decision-makers to act decisively to subordinate the military. Thus, in 1988, a few years after the 1983 transition to democracy, Congress passed a National Defense Law (Law 23.554) prohibiting the military from involvement in internal security.\(^2\) The 1992 Internal Security Law (Law 24.059) created certain caveats to that, for example, stipulating that the armed forces should support the security forces when necessary with services such as transportation, communication, and medical assistance (Art. 27), should defend military bases if attacked in peace-time (Art. 28), and should even help to establish order internally when needed (Art. 31). Argentina’s civilian governments have therefore mostly focused on restricting military roles rather than utilizing the armed forces as a policy tool of the government. Although the Menem administration’s emphasis on international peacekeeping was a partial exception to this, even during that period, civilian direction of military affairs was limited and defense spending even more so. Prior to and after the Menem period, during the mid-1980s and again during the first decade of the next century, the focal point of Argentina’s military policy appeared to be trials for human rights violations, as well as reprimanding and averting the rebellions that resulted from them.

The extent to which military policy has focused on the issue of civilian control varies by country, however. In countries in which militaries retained more political influence and support—often despite past human rights abuses—the armed forces were less likely to lose quite so many privileges, or to have their roles curtailed so thoroughly. According to Mark Ruhl, “The armed forces in the region have had to accept major reductions in their budgets and structures, and have been stripped of many of their customary privileges.” (2004:137) Nevertheless, Ruhl also observes that these militaries have generally retained considerable autonomy, and fulfill roles related to internal security and intelligence that are often considered incompatible with civilian control (2004:138). Likewise, Wendy Hunter notes that Brazil’s civilian leaders made many more advances toward restricting military prerogatives than might have been expected (Hunter, 1997). As in Central America, however, the Brazilian military still retains considerable professional autonomy, as well as continuing to carrying out various roles in internal security. It is in Chile, though, that the military’s sustained political influence is most remarkable. Despite a record of military-executed human rights violations rivaling that of Argentina, the Chilean military regime’s successful economic record meant that the armed forces in this country retained much more political leverage than other post-authoritarian militaries in the region, as evidenced by the level of military expenditures. Nevertheless, throughout Latin America, especially in the arena of international organizations, the extent of civilian control of the military continues to play a significant role in shaping discussions of what militaries should or should not be doing.
Conclusion

Does it matter what roles military’s assume or are assigned? Typically, concerns about military roles revolve around the implications of those roles for civilian control or, more specifically, for the risk of military intervention in politics. According to many observers, military involvement in domestic security constitutes a risk with respect to civilian control (See, for example, Barrachina and Rial, 2006). In contrast, David Pion-Berlin and Craig Arceneaux have countered arguments about the risks of internal roles for militaries, proposing that, as long as civilian leaders give the orders and determine the military’s roles, then civilian control is not really at risk (See Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, 2000).

In this paper, I’ve sought to reverse the direction of analysis, looking at causes of military roles instead of hypothesizing about their potential consequences. Looking at military roles from this perspective reveals that many factors influence what roles and missions militaries assume, including the availability—or lack—of resources, broader policy agendas, and the quest for civilian control itself. Limited government resources and widespread poverty, two conditions that go hand-in-hand, may mean utilizing the military for the kinds of domestic security operations often considered risky for civilian control and, potentially, for human rights. Yet the quest for civilian control may bring its own risks. As Thomas Bruneau and Harold Trinkunas have argued, “The privileging of civilian control... has led many countries to place too little emphasis on developing effective and efficient defence establishments” (Bruneau and Trinkunas, 2006:778). According to their perspective, this neglect “…not only puts national security at risk, it also endangers what is likely a tenuous bond of trust between civilians, the new democratic regime and the armed forces” (Bruneau and Trinkunas, 2006:785). This is because civilian control is, in itself, a somewhat limiting goal. While prioritizing civilian control is a natural response to the troubles of the past, at the same time, this approach may actually delay moving beyond civilian control, toward a situation in which elected political leaders would set political policies, but civilian and military officials would then cooperate in determining how to best execute them. Only then could actual defense and security concerns play a large role in determining military missions.
1. Security threats and needs never completely determine military policy, regardless of the context. Rather, other factors, such as bureaucratic imperatives and the interests of different political players. For example, any number of U.S. military bases have been preserved, not because of security requirements, but because legislators lobbied to retain them due to their economic importance in their communities.

2. Although the law was not regulated until 2006, and therefore not fully active until that time, the principles still guided military roles in the interim, and even served as the justification for Argentina’s military to refuse to support the collapsing 2001 government in reestablishing order. This was despite the provisions in the National Security Law allowing for exceptions to this exclusion.
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Summary

The analysis in this paper aims to show that efforts to lessen security concerns in the Americas have contributed much to building a better environment for business. When investors realize that acting selfishly—and unfairly—towards employees, consumers and government could run contrary to peacebuilding efforts and could undermine countries’ growth expectations, then the foundations will have been laid for a corporate renovation.

A number of examples will be used to demonstrate the harmfulness of the vicious cycle of violence and insecurities in the hemisphere, which generates yet more damage and greater losses to countries and their citizens.

Businesspeople who are firmly committed to the establishment of a cleaner business environment and to collaborating to create public goods that factor in the social, environmental and economic effects of corporate action, and who act with an eye to ethical values, people, communities and the environment, are driving a trend shift that is changing the old, selfish model of doing business. This is the essence of what is known as corporate social responsibility (CSR).

Security, the new twenty-first century obsession

In the last five years, the media have been flooded with startling news: terrorist attacks (11 September 2001 in New York, 11 March 2004 in Madrid and 7 July 2005 in London), panic over anthrax, military invasions, accounting frauds, political scandals, stock market crashes, and so on. The list could easily go on to include innumerable other security-related events in the business world in every country around the globe. There is no doubt, however, that the economic developments brought on, in part, by these landmarks have shaped the business environment and consumer patterns in various countries of the world, especially in the Americas, because of the particularities and political reality of the Latin American region.

Ten years ago, based on the literature of the time, Durán (1997) defined three minimal conditions to guarantee flows of capital and FDI into a developing country: (i) macroeconomic stability; (ii) political stability; and (iii) legal transparency. Now, in 2007 and, perhaps more accurately, since the terrorist attack on the twin towers in 2001, this author’s perception, along with that of many economists and investors, has expanded to include another condition: security. This is now a paramount condition in investment and business decisions.

In a changing world, the national and regional paradigms of security need to be rethought and redefined. Traditional boundary delimitation issues still exist, but the security of the region’s countries is now menaced by internal conflicts and threats, such as the drug trade (narcoterrorism),
kidnappings, youth gangs (maras) and, no less importantly, corruption and unstable governments in some countries.

Although there is still a general consensus on the desirability of preserving democracy, the weakness of the State is a source of insecurity, both for itself and for the population. The absence of governance is a latent threat, but resort to greater militarization has already proved less effective than democratic inclusion and equity-building. Latin America is now in a difficult situation. Although nearly all the countries of the subcontinent could be considered formally democratic, there are clear shortcomings in relation to the stability of institutions, the duration of presidential terms and, in general, social calm.

Briefly, the Americas today have four major sources of crisis and insecurity: institutional and political vulnerabilities; socio-economic problems; internal security; and external security. These security problems are a common denominator for Latin America’s four integration schemes—the Andean Community, the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), the Central American Common Market (CACM) and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM)—and for the countries of the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

All the possible threats to stable business can be summarized in security. A higher rate of return is positively correlated with risk—or with higher security needs—and greater expectations of economic growth. We might well ask, “Why has security become such an important requirement for doing business?” Obviously, foreign investors seek high returns and their risk evaluation decisions are strongly subject to security concerns, even more so if life or personal integrity may be at risk.

But investors and businesspeople must accept the reality: Latin America is what it is, nothing more and nothing less. If business sectors in the Americas accept this, there will be room for investment and for improving peace on the continent, as well as efforts to reduce the enormous disparities between and within the countries. The disparities in South America are enormous. Contrasting annual per capita GDP of each province or region, it was found that approximately 68% of South American subnational entities/provinces have income below the average (US$ 3,260), and the difference between poorest and the richest regions is widening. In 2001, the income of Buenos Aires was 41.7 times that of Potosí in Bolivia (Durán and Masi, 2007). The landscape of disparities has changed little in recent times.

Reports of United Nations bodies (including the United Nations Development Programme) and other international organizations (World Bank and the International Monetary Fund), have showed that Latin America is rivalled only by sub-Saharan Africa as the world’s most unequal region. Poverty, inequality and class discrimination have been at the heart of the security concerns of business sectors in every country of the Americas.
The situation in the Americas: business, security threats and the response of the private sector

The security threats facing business communities in Latin America are generally overlooked because they are not easily defined and attention is focused elsewhere. Yet these threats are real and require regular and consistent identification and monitoring, particularly given the often volatile economic and political environments in the region, as noted earlier. Many of the countries face particular threats of a macroeconomic or political nature, linked to legislative vulnerability or other security-related matters.

The World Economic Forum (2006) shows the results of an Executive Opinion Survey carried out in 2005. From a list of 14 factors, respondents were asked to select the five most problematic for doing business in their country and to rank them between 1 (most problematic) and 5 (least problematic). Results across countries showed that corruption was the most problematic factor, with 15 of 20 countries reporting that corruption was one of the main five obstacles to doing business. The second was political instability (14 of 20), and the third was crime and theft (6 of 20). In other surveys, however, corruption figured as the second greatest problem. Latinobarómetro (2006) shows evidence of growing concern over crime and public safety in the Americas. In this survey, 13 of 18 countries cited crime as one of their two greatest problems, and one that had been increasing recently.

Walking through the streets of some Latin American capitals (Guayaquil, Managua, Lima, Bogotá, Mexico City and so on), it is evident that violence is a matter of concern for many citizens. Unfortunately, it is also a matter that negatively affects the business environment and enormously complicates a country’s governability.

In some cities, it is common to see bodyguards and private security officers in shops and factories and around neighbourhoods, as well as in public places. Houses have protection in the form of security alarms and walls covered with barbed wire. In general, security is a major issue. Among the most violent countries are El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Bolivia (Martinez, 2006). Business people are aware of this information and it concerns them. (see table and box 1).
Other serious problems faced by businesspeople in Latin American and the Caribbean today include the limited freedom to undertake business and financial transactions, along with serious complications regarding property rights in many countries and, as a corollary, the daily struggle with corruption. These four problems are analysed below in the light of indicators presented by the Heritage Foundation in its latest report: 2007 Index of Economic Freedom, which reports on 10 indicators and provides a summary. Here we refer to only four of them:

**Business freedom.** Apart from Canada and the United States, only Barbados, Mexico, Bahamas and Jamaica have levels above the average for the Americas. According to this indicator, in some countries, it takes numerous procedures and many days to start a new business. The countries with the greatest difficulties, and in which business start-up activities are unusual, are Haiti, Paraguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Brazil. On average, in these four countries, it takes over 4.8 months to start up a new business activity, almost five times more than in Chile, El Salvador, Mexico and Panama, where it takes between 19 and 27 days (see figure 1 and table 1), and disproportionately more than the 3 to 5 days it takes in the United States and Canada.

**Investment freedom.** This indicator scrutinizes the country’s policies on foreign investment, as well as on internal capital flows, in order to determine its overall investment climate.\(^3\) In general, countries have encouraged foreign investments, but there are some exceptions: restrictions on the purchase of real estate by foreign investors, for example. But the greatest concerns are voiced over bureaucratic impediments and corruption and certain restrictions on access to foreign exchange and on the transaction of international payments. The countries where most concern is expressed are Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador and Haiti.

---

**Box 1**

**FORMS OF VIOLENCE IN CERTAIN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES**

Latin America is the world’s most violent region, war regions apart. The world average is 8.8 murders per 100,000 inhabitants, but in Latin America and the Caribbean the figure is close to 20.3. However, the manifestations of violence are different within the region. Some Central American and Caribbean countries, as well as the southern part of Mexico, have incidences of violence that are higher, but concentrated in interpersonal youth violence, largely originating in poverty, inequality and exclusion. Obviously, this is fertile ground for organized crime rooted in the drugs trade and in trafficking of people and weapons.

In South America and Mexico, violence and criminality follow two different patterns: (a) the drugs trade and organized crime, of which there is a greater incidence in Colombia, Mexico and Brazil and, to a lesser extent, in Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru; and (b) common crime in countries such as Argentina, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Paraguay and Chile.

Source: Prepared by the author
Property rights. Although property rights are observed in many countries of the continent, much concern is expressed over compliance with legislation to protect private property. The enforcement of property rights is lax and subject to delays, and there is evidence of corruption. The main problem businesspeople face in some countries is that the court system is inefficient and prone to delays. In Haiti the enforcement of property protection has proved impossible.

Table 1 summarizes another serious problem mentioned earlier: political instability, which is strongly related to level of corruption and to failed or weak rule of law. These factors all conspire to make the business environment highly complex. Nine countries of the list have highly negative scores on both political stability and the rule-of-law index. Nevertheless, the less unstable group of countries appeared to have weaker legal systems. Table 1 also shows other threats related to violence and organized crime.
Figure 1
The Americas: selected economic freedom indicators; property rights and corrupt on index, 2007
(Index numbers ranking from 0 to 100)

### Table 1

**BUSINESS AND SECURITY THREATS IN THE AMERICAS: SOME INDICATORS, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>War against terrorism has been a major issue since 9/11 terrorist attack on the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Urban violence. Indigenous conflict with landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Transit and destination country for trafficked persons. Drug-linked violence, guns and narcotic trafficking are still concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Urban violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>War against terrorism has been a major issue since 9/11 terrorist attack on the United States. Migration pressures on Mexican border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>60% of population living in poverty. Violence and discrimination against women. A major transit country for South American drug trafficking to the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>(-0.05)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>Violence from drug wars. Armed groups from Colombia crossing southern border. Drug gangs and street violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>(-0.13)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>Conflictive zones on Amazon borders with Colombia and Peru: drug trafficking; street violence related to control of drugs trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>(-0.14)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>Severe street violence; young gangs (<em>maras</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>(-0.16)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>Young gangs, kidnappings, violence and drug-related crimes. Transit point for drugs from South America towards the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>Urban violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>Drug trafficking; conflict on border with United States (migration), young gangs, kidnappings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>Young gangs, drugs and high murder rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>Urban violence and organized crime on Brazilian border: drug trafficking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>Yonuth gangs (maras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>Paramilitary activities on the border with Colombia. Poor reputation of judicial system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>Young gangs, kidnappings (maras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>Confictive zones in Amazon borders with Colombia and Ecuador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>Poverty (70%-80% of total population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela, B.R.</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>Paramilitary activities on the border with Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>Narcoterrorism; guerrilla and paramilitary activities; drug trafficking; kidnapping and hostage-taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>Wars between rival drug gangs: Explosion of homicides and kidnapping. Haiti’s people are the poorest in the Americas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(a\) The Political Stability and Violence index measures perceptions of the likelihood that the government in power will be destabilized or overthrown by possibly unconstitutional and/or violent means, including terrorism. Index range from around—2.5 to around 2.5. Higher or positive values indicate greater political stability.

\(b\) The rule-of-law index measures the quality of contract enforcement, the police and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.
All these factors are present in some form or another at the heart of the internal agenda of every corporation and business group in the region. Business is seeking a clear commitment to creating an investment-friendly environment, for both local and foreign direct investment. The roots of the problems that are causing such concern now, and that directly influence the escalation of violence and increased insecurity in the Americas, may be summarized as:

(a) **Socio-economic inequalities.** The more inequality there is, the greater the probability of civil war or violent conflict. According to Switzer and Hussels (2004), the inequitable distribution of scarce natural resources is likely to be a key ingredient in a conflict. Deforestation, soil erosion, desertification, flooding and pollution can, in combination with rising demand and unresolved inequity, result in a series of social conflicts, including impoverishment, outmigration, dynamic political power shifts, loss of state legitimacy and, in extremis, State failure or collapse (Schwartz and Singh, 1999).

(b) **Weak public institutions.** Weak institutions prevent societies from building truly credible procedures and initiatives. It is worrying that between 1998 and 2007 there were more than 20 conflicts and institutional crises relating to presidential mandates in the region. A recurrent concern for people in the Americas is the State’s incapacity to enforce laws (Rojas, 2005). The latest Latinobarómetro survey makes it clear that people have little confidence in police forces, judicial powers, congresses and political parties.

(c) **Guerrillas, drug trafficking, kidnapping and hostage-taking.** These problems, which are caused, to some extent, by inequality and inequity, in turn cause other severe tensions in the continent’s business environment. The production and trafficking of drugs (marijuana, cocaine, heroin and so on) funds guerrilla activities and strengthens organized crime and, with it, the wave of kidnappings and assaults (Rojas and Mettzer, 2005). The main consequences are felt in both consumer countries, especially in United States, and in producer countries, mainly Colombia and Mexico, together with Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador, as well as the Central American countries as the main transit lanes.

(d) **Control over national resources within national borders.** Competition between government and private sector for control over petroleum, gas and mineral sources (including water) has often been a source of conflict. Empirical evidence indicates that countries whose income relies heavily on exports of primary commodities are at dramatically higher risk of conflict than other poor countries (Switzer and Hussels, 2004). Here, again, Ecuador and Bolivia are cases in point. When commodity prices fall and macroeconomic conditions worsen, violent conflicts can ensue.

Businesspeople want to know how to do international business profitably and safely. The answer to this is not straightforward, because threats may emerge along the way, and a good business approach must balance two alternatives: (i) invest the minimum without any risk, but assume the ultimate possibility of losses, because threats will be costly in the future;
and (ii) take steps to guarantee rates of return, by investing in lowering projects’ transaction costs and helping to create a more secure business environment. In this connection, the corporate social responsibility (CSR) approach is a good strategy to minimize cost and devise solutions to the problems have made investments unproductive thus far.

In many countries in the region, social responsibility has become an integral part of the business sector, as the main reaction of the private sector to security threats and conflicts. For example, in Colombia, CSR initiatives have been crucial in improving the livelihood of poor populations, helping to prevent people from joining illegal armed groups. In other words, a practical experience has confirmed the existence of a development-security nexus fostered by CSR (Guáqueta, 2006).

The same conclusion may be drawn from case studies conducted for El Salvador and Guatemala, where private organizations such as the Salvadorian Foundation for Development (FUSADES), the pro-business party National Republican Alliance (ARENA), also in El Salvador, and FUNDAZUCAR in Guatemala, have made major contributions to peace-building (see Retberg, 2006; Laurance and Godnick, 2006; and Valdez, Monzón and Godnick, 2006). We will return to some of these cases in more detail later.

The cost of security threats in the Americas

This section discusses security threats in the Americas by country. It gives estimates of the cost of security threats, in order to demonstrate that violence, corruption and insecurity cause losses in countries’ GDP. Conversely, it will show that one of the main outcomes of reducing security threats is to boost GDP.

Comparison of the cost of violence and insecurity in terms of output value, where the exercise is possible, gives some surprising figures. For example, a study conducted by UNDP found that the economic cost imputable to violence in El Salvador in 2005 was US$ 1.717 billion (11.5% of total GDP). Even more strikingly, this figure was twice the health and education budget and equalled the country’s total tax take.

In Honduras, firms spend around US$ 1000 per month on security services, including alarm monitoring and security guards (Houston Chronicle, 9/01/06).

In May 2003, the largest banking scandal in the history of the Dominican Republic broke out on the political landscape when the powerful Banco Intercontinental collapsed amid accusations of a US$ 2.2 billion fraud. The scandal was estimated to cost the Dominican Republic the equivalent of 60% to 80% of the national budget or 11% of total GDP.

In Ecuador, a government report published in 2000 found that corruption cost more than US$ 2 billion, or 12.6% of total GDP. Peruvian prosecutors estimate that US$ 1.8 billion was misappropriated from the State during Alberto Fujimori’s presidency, which ended in 2000.
In Colombia, total private investment in security amounted to US$ 766 million, or 1.5% of GDP in 2003 (Council of the Americas, 2004). In Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, this figure was over US$ 1,200 per month (Monteferrante, 2002). In Brazil, a businessperson’s annual cost is around US$ 80,0005. And in other countries, such as Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, estimates indicate that the business community is being obliged to disburse 0.75 cents more than the public sector on security and business owners are having to allocate 15% of their profits to protection and overall security (Penfold, 2002).

According to the comptroller-general, corruption has cost the Paraguayan treasury US$ 5 billion since democracy was restored in 1989. This is equivalent to over 100% of Paraguay’s GDP in 1990 (US$ 4.9 billion).

Examples abound of the costs associated with security threats for businesses. In all cases, however, there is a consensus that, at the end of the day, the consequences of the lack of security in business comes down to losses, which have to be offset on a number of fronts:

(a) Increased transaction costs, since companies have to spend more on securing their environment, with security guards, cameras, alarms, tracking systems, and so on;

(b) A drop in sales income, due to falling demand in high-risk cities, since consumers are forced to devote a portion of their income to covering such eventualities as property theft;

(c) Impact on the level of investment, since corporations and investors are more reluctant to invest or require higher rates of return;

(d) Productivity losses associated with high staff turnover and loss of motivation. Lastly, all the costs mentioned hurt competitiveness because, the global investment environment being what it is, even a two—or three—percentage-point rise in operating costs can radically change a company’s ability and willingness to invest.

A recent study conducted jointly by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the Latin America and the Caribbean Region of the World Bank found that security threats have a negative impact on growth. In other words, violent crime (a proxy for security threats) substantially reduces economic growth. The study found that a 10—percentage—point decrease in the homicide rate is associated with a 2.1% increase in average annual growth over the five years that follow (UNODC, 2007). The same study simulates a hypothetical situation in which four countries (Dominican Republic, Guyana, Haiti and Jamaica) achieve a reduction in their respective homicide rates—33.8, 33.9, 16.1 and 16.5 per million—to the level of Costa Rica’s (8.1). The econometrical simulations point to very large potential gains for Haiti and Jamaica (a 5.4% increase in annual growth, respectively). Guyana and the Dominican Republic would also benefit substantially from a reduction in violence, with potential gains of 1.7% and 1.8%, respectively, in the growth rate.
Clearly, then, businesses must be in favour of improving the environment in which they conduct their production activities, and should respond by dealing audaciously with the threats they face. That is not to say that the public sector should abandon its efforts to improve quality and public safety. It is, in any case, heartening that there is empirical evidence to show that reducing security threats generates significant economic gains—and not only for institutions. This is borne out by the United Nations study mentioned above.

The following section discusses the role the corporate sector ought to play in improving the business environment. Specifically, it will consider two experiences of the CSR approach in different countries of the region, before drawing some conclusions from the exercise in the final section.

The role of business in solving security threats

In many Latin American and Caribbean countries, social responsibility has become an integral part of the strategies employed by business, as one of the main private-sector responses to security threats and conflicts. Many experiences have showed that conflicts ease when business leaders realize that the private sector needs to assume part of the responsibility for developing the secure conditions for profitable business, and when they engage more actively in addressing the core conflicts and become involved in peacebuilding projects. This work is not intended to give a comprehensive account of all the experiences undertaken, but to shed light on what the private sector is doing and can do in the future in this regard. It will therefore consider two cases that may be described as emblematic and that provide an ample body of evidence to help develop best practices, on the part of the corporate sector, in dealing with security threats on the continent.

The case of Colombia

Large corporations such as Interconexión Eléctrica S.A. (ISA), Compañía Envasadora del Atlántico (CEA), Network Alliance, Corporación Empresarial del Oriente and Proantioquia have engaged in initiatives of public-private cooperation aimed at building and securing peace in Colombia. A good example of a private programme created jointly by the private sector and civil society is the Prodepa programme, which was pioneered by ISA, which had long been a target for guerrilla attacks in Colombia. Prodepa is what is known as a regional peace and development programme (PDP). Since creating Prodepa in 1999, ISA has provided support for 19 other PDPs in Colombia and has sought to convince other companies to do likewise. The programme has benefited some 2,380 families and its main pillars are: (a) Working with the community to identify initiatives and to formulate, implement, follow up and evaluate projects; (b) Helping institutions to coordinate within a particular territory; (c) Promoting the formation of agreements and partnerships within that territory; (d) Identifying the needs of grass-roots communities and building up their capacities; (e) Identify the target territory; and (f) Regaining the trust of the population residing there. In general, the
main activities are about eroding the main causes of conflict (poverty, lack of social capital and unemployment). Basically, the approach adopted by ISA staff and Prodepaaz is to generate local ownership and greater awareness of peace issues among other companies.

Prodepaaz PDPs operate in 325 municipalities in 22 Colombian states, covering an area equivalent to 30% of the country and nearly 8 million people, or 18% of Colombia’s population.

Unlike in the past, today there is a broad consensus in Colombia that the corporate (private) sector has a major role to play in resolving the principal threats to security in the country. And it is clear that where the private sector has made a positive contribution, the tensions between capital and labour have eased and conditions are more conducive to living daily life in a normal manner.

**The case of Guatemala**

Guatemala suffered 39 years of internal conflict (1960-1999), which ended formally with the signature of the Peace Accords at the end of 1996. Now that the conflict is over, 200,000 paramilitary troops have been disbanded and nearly 3,000 guerrillas have been demobilized and resettled and are now being integrated into political and economic life. But the road towards achievement of a lasting peace has been far from smooth, mainly because of the persistence of enormous poverty problems—especially in rural areas—and issues of participation, credit and economic opportunities. Nevertheless, there are a number of interesting experiences that merit examination and that are indicative of the effort the corporate sector is making to improve the security of Guatemala’s business environment.

One of Guatemala’s largest sugar refineries, Pantaleón Refinery, embarked on a CSR project in the late 1980s, with the clear purpose of improving security in the sugar sector, which had been badly hit by disputes and strikes, motivated basically by neglect of some of the workers’ basic needs. The security issue was hampering the industry and undermining its competitiveness. The owners of the Pantaleón Refinery adopted a three-pronged strategy to change the negative environment in the sector:

(i) Establishment of a new philosophy in labour relations, a new technological framework for sugar production and a research centre;

(ii) Development of a privately-administered, world-class system for domestic distribution and export infrastructure.

(iii) Creation of an autonomous foundation to address the social concerns of the industry and its workers.

All three actions were seen as steps toward guaranteeing the industry’s competitiveness for the future. The undertaking coincided with the private sector’s shift towards more systematic engagement in the peace process. Inspired by the Pantaleón initiative, FUNDAZUCAR (the sugar mills’ business organization) also implemented a CSR strategy aimed at reducing conflict. As part of this strategy, FUNDAZUCAR often makes
financial contributions to specific causes, such as the National Cancer Society or anti-tuberculosis campaigns. It is also committed to improving education, health and municipal development in the 56 municipalities where it focuses its work, primarily in southern Guatemala.

At the end of the day, the experience in implementing CSR in Colombia and Guatemala, and in other similar cases,⁷ has been positive as a strategy to reduce internal conflict and improve the business environment. It may be stated with some certainty, therefore, that the private sector has the opportunity to contribute in specific ways to building a better business environment that is less conflict-ridden and, hence, safer from serious security threats.

Some remedies: the importance of corporate social responsibility

The cases cited in this brief analysis show that, when the private sector faces security threats or finds itself amid violent and unstable conflicts, a number of things happen: investment, employment and sales decline and transaction costs rise. And this combination represents a blow to the well-being of consumers and businesspeople alike. This is particularly true for local firms, which are harder put to relocate their investments. In these circumstances, the best alternative for businesspeople is one that seeks to impact positively on conflict reduction and, specifically, peacebuilding.

Promotion of education and better tools for the justice system are key instruments for reducing violence in all its forms, reducing fear and improving the business environment in the region. As the case studies in the preceding section illustrated, CSR is the main and most effective approach to building a better business environment in Latin America and the Caribbean. There follows a list of some of the actions taken by firms and actors involved in CSR networks in the Americas⁸:

• Commitment to comply with international standards and observance of human rights (Principles 1 and 2 of UN Global Compact Initiative).

• Compliance with minimum labour standards to guarantee the rights of workers, by observing the international standards of the International Labour Organization (ILO). Basically, this means respecting international rules and conventions: (i) freedom of association; (ii) the right to organize and to collective bargaining; (iii) abolition of forced labour; (iv) minimum working age; (v) elimination of the worst forms of child labour; (vi) equal remuneration; and (vii) reduction of discrimination between employments and occupations (Pereira, 2006) (Principles 3 to 6 of UN Global Compact Initiative).

• Support principles 7 to 9 of Global Compact Initiative: 7) Business should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges; 8) undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and 9) encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.
• Commitment to workers, social concerns and peace processes is a way to reduce conflict and build peace.

• Production and diffusion of ethical and promotional materials of CSR networks.

• Commitment to work against all forms of corruption, including extortion and bribery (10 principle of UN Global Compact Initiative).

• Development of procedures to verify firms’ observance of ethical norms (good governance, respect for labour standards, and so forth). Some initiatives along these lines are under way in the region.

• Firms in some countries have signed agreements and partnerships with NGOs, government agencies and other organizations, in the interests of sustainability.

• In some countries, chambers of commerce have taken steps to create sectoral business groups, in order to engage in mutually beneficial activities, including CSR. Such action reduces transaction costs, increases efficiency and enhances competitiveness.

• Development of ethics manuals and codes of conduct as a guide to behaviour in particular institutions and industries.

• Signature of agreements with social security institutions to guarantee labour and social rights.

Rather than altruistic or charitable activities, firms have to engage more strongly in activities that involve a greater involvement with the community, making a commitment to solve problems. Innumerable advantages are to be obtained from business cooperation: work and productive activities are organized coherently; the risk of corruption by government entities is reduced; worker satisfaction is enhanced and so, hence, is productivity; and finally, though no less importantly, firms face reduced risk in their business.
1. The views expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions with which the author is associated.

2. The other main problem was unemployment.

3. In general, the measure captures the existence of a foreign investment code that defines the country’s investment laws and procedures; encouragement by the government of foreign investment through fair and equitable treatment of investors; restrictions on access to foreign exchange; equal treatment for foreign and domestic firms under the law; the imposition of restrictions on payments, transfers, and capital transactions; and the closure of specific industries to foreign investment (Beach and Kane, 2007).

4. All costs were considered in this calculation, including intangibles and tangibles related to violence: State funds for preventing and fighting all types of violence, health expenditures, legal costs, labour absenteeism, productivity losses, and so forth.

5. The security cost includes kidnap and ransom insurance, which is a growing business in the country.

6. ISA energy pylons have been bombed over 1,200 times since 1999. The escalation in violence in Colombia led the company to reflect deeply on armed conflict, the possibility of running a sustainable business in such an unstable environment and the need to target its social programmes in order to contribute to long-term peace.

7. Like FUNDAZUCAR, the Association of Non-Traditional Exporters (AGEXPRONT), an organization representing the textile industry, has been involved in promoting sectoral activity through technical assistance, training, public relations, marketing and promotion for the textile business sector (Valdez, Monzón and Godnick, 2006).

8. The main actions are related to the United Nations Global Compact initiative, launched in July 2000 by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, when he proposed a voluntary initiative through which business could work alongside UN agencies, civil society and labor organization to promote and support human rights, environmental and labor right principles.
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Four years ago, within a regional and comparative research project on civil society involvement in the FTAA process and other non-trading issues we argued that the security agenda was the most hermetic and state-centred discussion compared to other Summit agendas, such as such as education and environment (Botto and Tussie, 2004). At that time, civil society organizations had very little opportunity to contribute to the policy making process because of the lack both of information and of organizations dealing with this type of issues (Velosso, 2003).

Today the context has changed a great deal, especially after 9/11, which emphasized the fact that terrorism is a “global problem”. Terrorism has brought back the issue of security, which is now at the centre of the regional debate. As a logical consequence civil organizations want to participate in this regional discussion. This presentation will provide some initial thoughts on how civil society organizations can increase their effectiveness in this debate, thus contributing to the regional and national governance

For this purpose, the presentation will be divided into four parts. First, a definition of two key concepts: civil society (CS) and security agenda (SA), both of which have broad and ambiguous meanings in the academic as well as in the political spheres. Secondly, and keeping in mind both definitions, the potential contributions of the civil society in the definition and implementation of this type of agenda will be analyzed. This is followed by a comparison aimed at analyzing to what extent these opportunities have been effectively used in the regional and national arenas, both in the past and in current times. In the third part-and looking forward to making some action proposals for civil society-we will look into the innovative and successful experience of civil society involvement in the FTAA negotiations. Finally, we will present some recommendations on how civil society can be more influential in the future.

1. Definition of concepts.

As we mention in the introduction above, the two main concepts that structures this presentation are civil society (CS) and security agenda (SA), both of them ambiguous and broad-sensed.

For the first one, civil society, the literature offers a wide range of definitions. However, we will follow Gramsci’s definition, which distinguishes civil society from the State and the market as a political space where actors have different goals, strategies and resources (Cox, 1999).

In operational terms, civil society can be defined as a group of organizations that defend public goods, without any claim of being representative. Civil society organizations can work in global, regional, national and sub-national arenas of policy making, using different collective action strategies, which include either cooperation or confrontational strategies in order to influence the definition of security policies.
Secondly, security is a broad and multifunctional concept which includes international security, national security and human security. Depending on the type of the threat, its scope has changed a great deal during the last 20 years (Buzan, 2006). Initially, security was defined as national defence against military intervention, mostly from abroad. Then, by the end of the Cold War, the securitization of the regional agenda shifted towards the human dimension of the concept where issues such as epidemics and environment protection, together with the lack of control of guns and personal mines, were seen as new types of threats to personal security. Finally, after 9/11 security threats have been increasingly focused on terrorist attacks and other forms of organized crime. In all, the problem of securitizing all issues, including domestic policies or developmental goals—such as poverty, exclusion, MARAS, among others—is the possibility of losing the focus on the debate and the responsibility for affective actions. The security agenda calls for a minimal definition where issues should deal with the control of the force used by the State.

Changes have been included not only in global arena, but regionally as well. Within the Americas Summit, security has been a key issue since the launching of the process (Bonilla, 2004). However, as it is shown in table 1, the discussion has been changing along the Summit process:

- Issues such as AIDS, environment, infrastructure and energy were included in the first meetings and eliminated afterwards.
- Only two issues—namely, terrorism and drug trafficking—have been a hegemonic discussion in all Summit meetings. Both of them, namely pursued by the US.

### Table 1: Regional Security Issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004 Monterrey (Special Summit)</th>
<th>2005 Mar del plata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and drug trafficking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Confidence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Crime</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration from [www.summit-americas.org](http://www.summit-americas.org).
The fact that policies aimed at preventing drug trafficking and terrorism require domestic policies that reduce the idea of personal freedom and the protection of democratic institutions justifies the idea of increasing civil society participation in the implementation of those policies. This preliminary conclusion brings us to the following part of the presentation. What is the role of civil society in the Summit process? And what kind of contributions can civil society organizations make in terms of the security agenda?

2. Civil Society’s contributions to the security Agenda.

Civil Society organizations can develop different types of skills and capacities in the discussion and implementation of security agendas. In order to evaluate to what extent regional civil society have performed those roles, we first identify those roles (potentialities) and then analyze its impacts (effectiveness) either in regional or national arenas.

a) Potentialities.

The literature presents three opportunities an initiative role, an articulation role and a control role. The first one is the capacity of civil society to propose policy alternatives and suggestions regarding new issues or solutions in those areas where governments have no experience. In order to contribute to attaining policy goals, academics should develop practical and empirical research to help governments deal with new challenges. Research analysis can also contribute to raising the voices and interests of those “invisible” actors that are not usually taken into account, such as local communities.

A second skill for academics working on these issues refers to their capacity to articulate public and private organizations around a certain discussion or debate. Quite often, academic institutions are seen as a neutral space where actors speak on behalf of technical expertise and not of particular interests.

Finally, civil society organizations have a well-known skill and a widespread social legitimacy to follow the effective implementation of the commitments governments have taken both at the national and regional arenas. Civil society, especially those NGOs (non governmental organizations) linked to mass media, can also perform well in creating and implementing mechanisms to improve governments’ transparency and accountability.

b) Facts.

Taking into account the previous description of the potential roles and skills of civil society, we should now analyze to what extent regional civil society has performed these roles in the past.

In terms of the initiatives presented, evidence collected from the official web pages of various regional institutions shows a recent and high performance of civil society when considering this first role.
At the regional level, academics, NGOs and think tanks have been very active in informal mechanism of consultation organized by the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS), the Summit Implementation Review Group, and the regional forum during the last five years.

As it is shown at Table 2, we can assume that:

- Initiatives have been improved in quality and quantity as time went on.
- Initiatives have changed substantially in terms of context after September 2001. There is a broad consensus on increasing civil society participation in several ways (Conflict prevention and peace building activities; Decision making through the creation of formal and regular mechanisms of consultation at the national and regional arenas; and Budget control and access to information.
- Civil society initiatives also call for the modernization of defence and security institutions, avoiding the militarization of domestic policies, and the securitization of development agendas (Serbin, 2004)

### Table 2: Civil Society Initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of a Democratic Security Charter regarding people's security</td>
<td>Strengthening CS’s role in peace building and conflict prevention</td>
<td>Improvement of the dialogue among CSOs and the OAS</td>
<td>Improvement of the armed peace as a “public good”</td>
<td>Avoid securitization of the development agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the interaction between CS and the OAS</td>
<td>Call for a “World Survey” on the effects of war &amp; weapons</td>
<td>Establishment of alert mechanisms (prevention) with CSOs influence</td>
<td>Put forward the disarmed concept to prevent violence and democratic instability</td>
<td>Move from a “culture of reaction” to a “culture of prevention”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of an international fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control of public budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforcement of CS capacity building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization of national defense institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevent terrorism policies affecting Human Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the national level, improvements have been achieved in some countries, through the consultation process implemented by national governments to elaborate the so-called white books (libros blancos). However, this informal channel of participation was opened only for academics, and participation in the design of the so-called “White Books” has only been successful in a few countries, such as Argentina, Costa Rica, Chile, etc.

In terms of the articulation achieved, improvements have been achieved through the creation of regional networks. Evidence collected from interviews and publications demonstrates the creation of two regional networks composed of Southern academic institutions. One is based in the Southern Cone, and it is led by FLACSO-Chile. The other, is based in Central America and is led by CRIES. Both of them have institutional and personal experience in preventing armed conflicts and in contributing to the peace-making process in Central America.

Information collected from CRIES in Table 3, illustrated some common features shared by most of the regional networks:

- CRIES is basically composed of Southern universities and academics NGOs. Its main weakness is the lack of non-academic counterparts.

- CRIES works on a sole, specific issue—namely, conflict prevention and peace keeping. This issue seems to lose visibility in other equally important problems such as terrorism and organized crime.

Table 3: Conflict—Prevention Network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fuente: www.cries.org, accessed may 18 2007

At the national level, there also other networks working on issues related to security agendas such as weapons control (Rio VIVO) and epidemics (AIDS). However, most of these networks are well articulated with national governments (vertical links) but have no transnational links with other networks at national level (horizontal links) (Derghousgassian, 2007).
Finally, no achievements have been made in terms of controlling national governments in the implementation of regional commitments, nor in the commitment taken by governments in the Québec Summit regarding to transparency and access to information (see table 4).

Table 4 identifies commitments made by governments throughout the summit process. Governments agreed only on two specific actions: on one hand, actions aimed at building mutual confidence and, on the other hand, those attempted at fighting terrorism. In terms of the initiatives proposed by civil society, the governments’ commitments are coincident in two specific actions. One of them, regarding the promotion of transparency and accountability in defence and security institutions; and another related to the promotion of “security” as a multidimensional concept.

Table 4: From initiatives to Commitments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Confidence</td>
<td>Promotion of a Regional Dialogue to support democracies</td>
<td>Supporting efforts of small-island states</td>
<td>Recognition of the importance of ministerial and high-level officials meetings</td>
<td>Call for a Special Conference on Security (2003)</td>
<td>Ratification of existing conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>Confection of a Plan of Action (starting point for the first Inter-American Conference on Terrorism)</td>
<td>Call for ‘2nd Conference Mar del Plata, 1998 à CICTE</td>
<td>Endorsement of the work initiated by CICTE</td>
<td>Intensification of efforts &amp; cooperation; signature of existing agreements/conventions</td>
<td>Definition of security as a multidimensional concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement on the negative impact on economies &amp; labor markets, e.g. job creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to cooperate, ratify, &amp; exchange info</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration from www.summit-americas.org
According to the evidence shown above, we can argue that some important achievements have been made in terms of civil society participation in the security agenda during last four years. However, civil society participation in the security agenda is still low and only marginal vis a vis other Summit agendas.

3. Lessons form the FTAA Process.

This section will be guided by two questions: why has the process of civil society participation been so important? And, what lesson can we gather from the security agenda?

The FTAA negotiation process has been quite innovative in terms of the inclusion of non-governmental actors. It was the first time that governments agreed to include the private sector in the negotiations table. In previous trade negotiations, such as NAFTA and the building of the European market, non-governmental actors were only allowed to participate once the negotiation process was closed. Additionally, participation channels were opened from above and exclusively aimed at business sectors.

Civil society organizations have rejected the idea of being excluded from this agenda and have pressed on governments by means of transnational networks, led by trade unions and environmental NGOs from both Southern and Northern countries (Bandy and Smith, 2005).

Their collective action has included both confrontational and cooperative actions to pressure both at the national and regional arenas (Smith & Korzeniewicz, 2004).

Interests and goals have differed among sectors and countries. However, their main demands focused on a reduced number or priorities on which all members agreed: mainly, the democratization of the trade policymaking process both at the regional and national levels, including all stakeholders and information disclosure.

Success was finally achieved: civil society forums have been recognised in the last two Summits, and organizations are being consulted at the national level (Botto, 2006).

Preliminary Conclusions and some Recommendations for the Future.

We have compared two different agendas: the trade and security agendas. Both of them began with civil society organizations that were excluded from the discussion and national governments that refused to be held accountable. Nonetheless, the final results were quite different. Today’s trade discussion includes civil society either in the regional or national arenas; and regional commitments, in terms of participation and information disclosure, can be monitored by civil society. In contrast, the security agenda does not include any mechanism for civil society consultation in the national arenas. Additionally, regional commitments cannot be followed by civil society.
Building on the good performance observed in the FTAA process, some suggestions can be put forward in order to strengthen the action of civil society in the security agenda: to be effective, civil society must have more visible participation in the public opinion agenda. In order, to achieve this visibility there are two key issues:

1) To increase the number of sectors and actors currently involved;

2) To identify a policy priority, one involving the interests of MOST of civil society actors; the final aim would be to promote transparency and accountability in the fight against drug traffic, organized crime and terrorism.
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Context and Debates on Hemispheric Security

The political dynamics in Latin America are currently characterized by a remarkable level of volatility (for example, the results of presidential and legislative elections, political crises, and the change in Defence Ministries). In terms of issues related to hemispheric security, the debates and perspectives provide a mixed, complex scenario with rather rigid, opposing, and even intolerant positions regarding the matter.

Different perspectives and situations can be identified depending upon which sub-region is under examination. A clear example of this is demonstrated by the missions and differing concerns of the armed forces. In Central America, the so-called “new threats” guide political debates as well as the focusing of the armed forces primarily on problems related to organized crime and citizens’ security. In the Andean Region, along with other threats like narcotics and guerrilla movements, the armed forces primarily deal with political instability, as this issue largely provides their raison d’être and garners much of the public’s support in addressing the problem. The armed forces are seen as the organized and stable institution, contrasting with the “corrupt” and “disorganized” political elite. The armed forces doctrines and deployment remain linked to preserve order and stability, even to political control if managed by the government. In the Southern Cone, distinctions between internal security and defence missions and effective confidence building measures have defined a clear role for the armed forces. A new scenario seems to be appearing in which the most traditional defence objective (territorial defence) is linked in the doctrines of some armed forces with the consideration of how guerrilla tactics could be useful in the case of an armed invasion by any given military power. This is a rather recent development and is built upon considerations such as the defence of natural resources, the economic constraints in updating the military apparatus, and the need to justify missions, when society continues to look towards the obscure past of dictatorships.

If political contexts vary significantly, and sub-regional differences continue to increase, is it in fact logical to talk about hemispheric security? Is there still room for coincidence?

There is not a great deal of difference in terms of diagnosing security and defence problems that afflict the region. The debate is much more about how to deal with these security and defence problems. The multidimensional concept of security approved by the members of the Organization of American States (OAS) in 2003 brought new approaches to serious regional challenges, such as poverty, development and social concerns. Yet it also brought confusion as to what the State should do about these concerns, particularly regarding the role of the State in solving the economic and social problems. This concern is closely tied to a harsh and painful history; a history that is plagued with examples where the State turned against its own citizens. Any consideration that touches upon memories of this history is basically condemned to failure; societies deal with their past as best as they can. The same could be said of the role of
the United States in hemispheric security. Internal reasons (government survival) guide most of the decisions related to foreign policy.

In thinking more from a regional perspective, one must envision a different approach with different expectations. The region could consider and propose current issues where consensus could be found, instead of seeking a regional agreement where the basis to form a consensus is not strong enough. The Americas need to think of elements that might provide a win-win scenario, in a practical perspective which, although not perfect, are both possible and desirable.

In taking into account the experience of the OAS work on hemispheric security, the Defence Ministerial process, or the different mechanisms operating throughout the region, five axes may be used to describe developments in the region:

– Security Concepts
– Confidence Building and Conflict Prevention
– Sub-regional Approaches
– Civilian Control of the Military
– Citizenship/Involvement of Civil Society

**Issues and Perspectives**

Each axis provides elements that should be addressed regionally, and in which consideration could support further cooperation based on universally shared values throughout the region, such as democracy and pluralism. The OAS’ work on Hemispheric Security has been important in this regard, and has strengthened the development of concepts like cooperative security and confidence building measures.

During the past ten to fifteen years, this type of progress showed that in specific issues, initiatives regarding the Inter-American system may develop. In achieving a value-based consensus goal (despite that it may not appear to be very important to wider politics), the Americas have become the most peaceful region in the world, where despite difficulties, democracy is respected. Could a continuing process be helped by seeking further consensus in potential general issues that are related to areas proven to be effective?

**Security Concepts**

As previously stated, the Declaration on Security in the Americas (OAS, 2003) brought about debates surrounding the inclusiveness of the security concept, and about the relationship between poverty, security and development. Although the multidimensional concept was adopted (and despite that it was seen as a way to further cooperation and common views), a perception of its uselessness remains. The debate has focused on which instruments need to be applied, with little being done concerning the significance of the concept. Perhaps even more important, there has
also been little done on what this multidimensional approach means for each country. Furthermore, it remains difficult to find practical research, even in the academic arena, in order to aid in the theoretical and political discussion which seems to have reached a dead end.

Initiatives such as a compilation and an analysis of national legislation according to what the Security Declaration established, or the promotion of national analyses concerning the relevance of the multidimensional concept for each country, represent the kind of research needed to bring forth practical elements. For example, the type of legislation in place, the sharing of legislation via the OAS structure, and the bringing into the debate of congressmen could be lower cost and effective initiatives.

**Confidence Building and Conflict Prevention**

This may be one of the most salient issues where advances can be observed. The need and importance of confidence building measures (CBMs) has been addressed through several hemispheric initiatives, which have also enabled the changing, through bilateral agreements, of a previously conflictive environment. Most countries have published White Books, and some have implemented measures on military expenditures, such as the CEPAL conducted Methodology between Argentina and Chile. The salience and feasibility of confidence building is apparent in the work of the Defence Ministerial of the Americas (DMA): it represents a regular agenda issue, where for the most part, consensus can be found. Yet, there is room for improvement in a wide spectrum of issues. White Books do not always say enough, and defence budgets continue to be closed and are very complex and not easily understood. How is confidence building translated to political decisions, and to the doctrines and organization of the armed forces?

Promoting political and budgetary transparency (especially for the provision of clear and organized information) can help to further debates between and within countries. It could represent an easily agreed upon area to build consensus, where most of the difficulties are not related to political decisions but to weak institutional capabilities.

**Sub-regional Approaches**

The difference between sub-regions as concerns security matters is also related to geographical and historical dynamics, as well as to national environments and goals. As presented above, the Southern Cone security agenda promotes a focus on conventional threats and sub-regional dialogue; the Andean Region addresses political instability, drug trafficking and guerrillas; Central America reveals its proximity with the US, migration, narcotics and a domestic security tied to economic and social problems, along with natural disasters. It shares this last concern with the Caribbean countries. While the homogenization of these agendas seems improbable, countries have chosen the promotion of sub-regional cohesion, followed by the regional approach. This is demonstrated in the variety of bilateral and multilateral mechanisms, such as the regular
consultations among countries prior to a regional event like the DMA or an OAS meeting. Developing regional approaches using the sub-regional bricks were recognized, for instance, during the DMA held in Quito in 2005, when countries established that sub-regional agreements must be respected and considered when conceiving a cooperative security system throughout the Hemisphere. (VI Defence Ministerial of the Americas, 2004:10)

The promotion of sub-regional agreements on CBMs could be potentially progressive, as they combine the feasibility of a type of CBM with the sub-regional approach currently developing. From a medium-term perspective, sub-regional White Books, for instance, with a clear and common index, do not appear to be an improbable measure.

**Civilian Control of the Military**

The “Williamsburg Principles” established during the first DMA recognized that democracy is the basis for mutual security and—linked to this principle—the need to subordinate the armed forces to democratically elected governments. This recognition is the basis for the development of the DMA process, which has thus far held seven hemispheric meetings. It is widely known that the military played a strong political role throughout Latin American history, and that this situation changed in the 1980s, when the countries readopted democratic rule. Despite different political situations (such as the fall of governments in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia and Ecuador, for example), democratic rule has been respected as society’s choice of political organization. This represents the progressive and developing process that may be observed in the manner in which the principle is discussed. For example, in Williamsburg (1995), subordination should be implemented, while the Declaration on Security (2003) affirms that “Representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace, and development of the states of the Hemisphere”. (OAS, 2003:4 b)

Civilian control is referred to, in practice, as the development of civilian capabilities, which is the stated objective of several programs in the region underway for over twenty years. It is necessary to strengthen these capabilities (and given the will to improve civil-military relations), in order to develop a stronger institutional framework. There has been little done, for instance, in terms of institutional diagnosis, such as focusing on the real dynamics and structures of Ministries, supporting programs for research, and sharing experiences related to civilian training. The following questions could be addressed in the near future: How are civilians being integrated? Which civilian roles could be reinforced? And what are the dynamics that might sustain a political decision?

**Civil Society Involvement**

The last axis that can be observed through the hemispheric security debates is the progressive incorporation of civil society into the agenda. The OAS consults with civil society on a regular basis. During the past
few years, numerous countries undertook national consultations on defence and security, in particular, linked to the process of formulating White Papers. The consultations emerged as governmental initiatives and received immediate and positive support from civil society participants. The role of the international community (UNDP in several cases) proved helpful, as it encouraged the participation of different State institutions in the process. Furthermore, the argument that the involvement of civil society clashes with issues about national security is no longer as valid, as the current hemispheric environment recognizes a commitment “to strengthen civil society participation in considering, developing, and implementing multidimensional approaches to security” (OAS, 2003:33). This strengthening also implies the opening of the national defence sphere to societal consideration, but the provision of proper and transparent information represents a major challenge in the link between State and society. The institutional culture remains generally tied to a closed conception, where citizens need not know about the inner functioning of the defence apparatus, even when specialized sources are publishing on such issues.

The involvement of civil society is also linked to civilian capabilities: developing leaders and staffers also implies inviting new actors to the arena. Countries could share their experiences of national debates on White Papers. The promotion of internal dialogue and the incorporation of other actors (mainly from universities and NGOs), as new civilian capabilities into ministries, congressional staff, and academic structures, should be encouraged by the hemispheric initiatives, as long as educational programs allowing the participation of young researchers (who are not always linked to the State connections that generally open the gates to courses or scholarships). Currently, there are experts ready to deal with defence and security issues throughout the region. This capability could be strengthened by preparing new, future leaders. If institutional building is chosen, then the region must determine how countries will find the necessary human resources required to fill and develop those institutions.

The abovementioned initiatives are only examples that demonstrate the different ways in which the hemispheric security approach continues to make sense. The Declaration on Security expressed questionable issues, but it also took central developments that were operating in the region. Any consideration should take into account flexible parameters for activity plans, and the incorporation of different points of view and analysis on a regular basis. The hemispheric vision, even in the present context, can still be achieved if we look for coincidences, rather than searching for desirable yet unrealistic objectives.
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Since implementing the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), relations between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico have increased immensely and gone way beyond trade. In fact, the three countries have extended their cooperation to broader areas, such as border management solutions. This section analyzes the realities of the post-9/11 period and its impact on North American security. Authors discuss the terrorist threat and its consequences on the inter-American cooperation.
Were such things here as we do speak about?
Or have we eaten on the insane root
That takes the reason prisoner?
Banquo, Macbeth, Act I Scene 3.

To supplement the many specific analyses of North American security at this colloquium, this chapter attempts a continental overview of the ‘how’ of security over the past decade. In short, we argue that risk management has become the dominant paradigm of security, with domestic and international faces. The adoption of risk management implies some significant changes in the ways that dangers are perceived (Campbell, 1998). These changes are particularly striking at the border and in the organization of national security strategies. More areas of social and political life which had been considered private are increasingly securitized, and the national security function has expanded from territorial integrity to something more complex and tenuous—the preservation of an open and interdependent society (Elhefnawy, 2004). As analysts, we should question the continual expansion of governmental powers into personal realms under the justification of security (Waever, 1995). But, also, more serious analysis needs to be undertaken as to how these risks are managed—two questions arise: what is the basis for this assessment of risk? What does the management of these risks obscure (i.e. the root or structural causes of the dangers themselves)?

The major sea-change in North American security over the past decade has been a change in the vocabulary in which threats are framed or expressed towards the language of risk. We may talk of a pre-9/11 and post-9/11 eras, in which the fundamental assumptions about security, and the North American security community, are strikingly different. The orientation towards risk, and consequently risk management, represents a different understanding of the world and the political environment than previous language of threats: whereas threats can be met or avoided, risks are managed. Not all risks are dangers, or perceived as such—and the discussion of security threats to North America reveal as much about the security imagination of states as it does about absolute changes in the objective conditions of security. There has been a fundamental reorientation of the vectors of threat from threats to the integrity of states, expressed as sovereignty, culture, or economic independence, towards threats to the dispersed security of security, represented as homeland security, economic prosperity, and national identity. The war on terror represents a new way of conceiving the strength of military, which pushes even further than the revolution in military affairs (RMA)—pre-emption and special operations (rather than deterrence and second-strike capability). Contrast the “War on Drugs” of the Reagan/Bush I era and the Clinton/Pastrana “Plan Columbia:” both involved America projecting force beyond its horizons to meet the threat of drugs, where the War on Drugs was focused on interdiction and the criminalization of warlords, Plan Columbia involved an increase in policing and development aid to provide alternatives to narco-trafficking. Contrast “Operation Gatekeeper” and “US-VISIT” programs: Operation Gatekeeper was an attempt to
reinforce the material and human policing of the US-Mexico border to prevent illegal immigration, whereas US-VISIT (United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology) is a total system which captures biometric and personal data from the majority of entrants to America. In short, the strategic environment of North America has dramatically changed: instability has ceased to be perceived as a threat to successful, but rather is now understood as a condition in which policies must be formulated.

Within this new global risk environment, we can identify three trends in the North American context which have dramatically accelerated in the past decade. Governments across the continent have securitized a number of issues traditionally outside the security ambit, through the use of military tactics, technologies, or personnel and by invoking exceptional circumstances to justify this change (Bigo, 2002). The international face of this securitization is the increasing delocalization of security, leading to the doctrine of pre-emption which is embedded in policies as diverse as the war on terror, visa and passport applications, and critical infrastructure protection. Finally, exceptional circumstances have come to be seen as the norm, as the paradigm of global risk supplants the paradigm of national security.

Risk Management

The fundamental argument of this analysis is that the paradigm of North American security has become risk management. Hints of this paradigmatic shift can be seen before 9/11, but it is with the war on terror that this approach becomes fully institutionalized. Building on work from sociology, more analysis of the risk paradigm has been undertaken within international relations and political science. A significant group of scholars in Europe have already engaged with the risk paradigm for analyzing security (Rasmussen, 2006; Heng, 2006; Aradau and Van Munster, 2007). We can identify a working consensus that the risk management approach to national security is characterized by:

1) Description of risks as both unavoidable within open, industrial societies;

2) Policy and decision-makers must act within this global environment to accept, avoid, mitigate, or transfer the risk;

3) Objective risk analysis can assess threat, vulnerability, frequency and impact of various dangers, which provides a probabilistic frame for appropriate responses.

Beck is the first to discuss the transition towards a risk society, in which policy comes to be understood as a way of managing individualized risk rather than a way of distributing risk amongst the society (1999, 2002). Classical socialized medicine, unemployment insurance, old-age pension, and workplace compensation were societal forms of providing for social security for populations of the welfare state. With the move towards industrialization and post-industrial economies, a consensus arose within
the governing neoliberal elites that this risk should be assumed by individuals, rather than society as a whole. This has parallels within the traditional fields of military security: welfare societies provided for large military budgets to deter territorial aggression, often participating in costly proxy conflicts. Contemporary military strategy (most particularly in America, but I would argue also in Britain and Canada) is dominated by a doctrine of management and pre-emption. More importantly, the concept of military strategy has exceeded the bounds of its traditional definition. With the (re)invention of homeland security, the spheres of police, security and intelligence agencies, border patrols, and the military have become indistinct. Rather than a specific problem of insecurity to be solved through the rational application of force on a specific enemy or demonstration of capability for a particular audience, contemporary security sees a bleeding of domestic, transnational, and international threats with wide-scale cooperation and collaboration between agencies (Bigo, 2006). The strict division between inside/outside, between internal policing and external military operations is being eroded—and states are increasingly recognizing that industrial or post-industrial societies are by their nature open, complex, and vulnerable. The very increase in efficiency and flexibility renders more and more systems interdependent, which reduces redundancy and thus decreases resiliency. There is no front in the war on terror—no way to ‘win’. Terror has become an environmental hazard, like global accidents.

Many scholars of globalization have demonstrated the diffuse nature of contemporary power and in particular the indirect control of states by the apparatus of the neoliberal economic order. We must acknowledge that in addition to rating agencies and insurance companies having a heavy influence on decisions, governments are adopting risk management as a paradigm for conducting policy (Ericson and Doyle, 2004; Ericson, Doyle, and Barry, 2003). Risk management involves the analysis of the threat environment, and then political decision to avoid the risk (by discontinuing that service or responsibility), to accept the risk, to mitigate the risk (to a point at which it becomes acceptable), or to transfer the risk (through insurance). Examples of this can be seen through the border and national security architecture. To manage the risk of illegal and dangerous migrants, visa officials in foreign countries, air carriers in international airports, and CBSA analysts of PNR/API information all attempt to sort passengers according to risk. Risk is avoided through the disapproval of certain applications for direct flights to Canada. Risk is accepted through an acceptance of other state security screening procedures, over which Canada has no direct control. Risk is mitigated through the off-site examination of documents by CBSA and air carrier employees. Risk is transferred through the analysis of PNR/API data from intelligence based on other agencies, such as the RCMP and CSIS.

The standard analysis of risk analysis attempts to quantify the frequency and impact of security events—such as disasters, terrorist attacks, or cascade failures. CBSA follows this model through data capture—it investigates all documents and entrants on a particular day, and then uses
that raw data to get some idea about number of frauds. CATSA is also attempting to implement this kind of model through statistical analysis of security screening efficacy (either of random sampling or profiles). We would argue that there is a substantial and significant difference between business and safety risk (where these paradigms and methodologies were first developed) and the security sector. Two points are important: terrorists and criminals are faster innovators and entrepreneurs than government regulators and security providers; there is not sufficient data, nor any way to gather or analyse data about security breeches. One cannot calculate the frequency, the probability, or the impact of a successful security breech (Salter, 2007). Furthermore, the way that this risk analysis takes place—either through data captures like the CBSA or the expert panel like CATSA—is inherently conservative. Both approaches are path-dependent and lead to bureaucratic pressures against imaginative thinking.

The adoption of the risk management approach is way that governments, agencies, and other non-governmental actors use to structure their analysis of the contemporary security environment. We can observe three trends that arise concurrently to, if not directly caused by, the emerging consensus around risk management: the growing securitization of greater fields of social and political life; the application of the doctrine of pre-emption; and the conceptual diminution of the importance of borders.

**Securitization**

The end of the Cold War and the resulting growth in the international neoliberal order, without implying a peace dividend, certainly prompted a reconsideration of national security for Canada, the United States, and Mexico. The first ever National Security Strategy issued by Canada, the Quadrennial defence review in the United States, and the development of the war on terror apparatus clearly demonstrate that national security overflowed its traditional boundaries. In both Canada and the US, because the perceived threats emanated from small, diverse non-state actors, more and more areas of social and political life became encompassed under the consideration of national security. Because of the threat of biological weapons and the concomitant rise is the fears of global pandemic, public health agencies were seen as part of homeland security. Because funding for Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups often used charities or informal banking systems, domestic and international financial transactions came under scrutiny. Because of the use of the internet allowed for secret communications and coordination, as well the dissemination of messages, information, and plans, internet and telecommunications have become a legitimate target of security agencies. The USA PATRIOT act even attempted to make public library records part of national security, although this was resisted. Air travel has been radically governmentalized, with the creation of CATSA and the TSA. This expansion of public security into traditionally private areas is called ‘securitization’—focusing on the invocation of emergency and special powers to deal with an existential threat. The securitization of socially and politically private spheres has
occurred before—such the concerns over sympathizers or collaborators in times of war. What is marked over the past decade is the re-appropriation of the national security function by governments in the wake of September 11th. In particular, the invocation of the state of emergency or exception by both American and Canadian commentators can be read as an attempt to shape, if not to curtail, public discussion about governmental constraints on freedoms, in the name of security.

Pre-emption

The international face of domestic securitization is the dominance of ‘pre-emption’—the Bush Doctrine. Pre-emption is a seldom-used state right to provide a defence if an attack is immanent, but not yet underway (used most often when discussing the Israeli attack on Egyptian air force in 1967 Six-Day war). In his speech at the 2002 West Point graduation he states “if we wait for proof, we will have waited too long.” Yugoslavian interventions—including the Kosovo air campaign—can be understood traditional geopolitical attempts to contain state conflicts, rather than simply humanitarian interventions (although this clearly played a role). The invasion of Afghanistan after the 9/11 attacks also can be interpreted within this paradigm. However, the invasion of Iraq (regardless of when it was decided upon) represents the best example of the Bush Doctrine. The pre-emption doctrine has its links to risk management also. In the face of un-provable catastrophic risks, such as global warming or environmental disasters, we can identify a shift towards what risk analysts call the ‘precautionary principle.’ When the possible consequences of a risk are so dire as to be catastrophic, it is the duty of the agency, authority, government to act in the absence of reliable data. The pre-emption doctrine, if we are to interpret it most generously, represents the extension of this logic towards international security. The collaboration of terrorist organizations, weak states, and rogue states—along with the technological capacity of these groups (multiplied by the vulnerabilities of an open and interdependent society)—yields a risk calculus that requires action rather than information. While the pre-emption doctrine or precautionary principle seem to be at odds with risk management, both work within the fundamental assumptions of risk management—that the environment is full of risks and dangers, and that the only options are to manage the risk, rather than eliminate it or change the structure of the environment.

Security without borders

Finally, as is evident from the previous analysis, the geopolitical origin of threats has become less and less significant. While North American states are still investing heavily in actual border infrastructure, there is more emphasis on delocalizing the border and indeed delocalizing national security. This is not to diminish the physical attempts to seal-off the Mexican border through fences, remote-sensing equipment, and the use of military and paramilitary forces. However, we must note that both Mexican border zones are becoming key sites of contestation. The adoption of risk management is clear even here—all proposals regarding
citizenship or immigration reform are tabled and politically contentious, whereas discussions of the leaky border saturate the media. Illegal immigration and criminal penetration of the border is accepted as a ‘fact’ of the bilateral relationship—and the universe of possible solutions is restricted to management of the failed border. Even a border as uncontested as the US-Canada border has become a site for increased security. The new ‘virtual border’ currently includes Predator drone overflights of remote territory, and this will be supplemented with remote sensing, increased hardening of remote crossings, and the intensification of surveillant technologies. But, security is taking place throughout national space: in addition to the virtual examination of travelers and their data—including trusted traveler programs and the vetting of transborder drivers, the SPP and SBA place emphasis on ‘known’ and ‘trusted’ shipper programs—so that companies which adhere to security programs on their own site can enjoy limited screening at physical borders. Airports, transborder trucking companies, ports, travel agents, all become sites of national security. Without wanting to undermine the specificity of the security dynamics at each of these sites, Balibar is right to argue that “the border is everywhere.”

**Conclusion**

The reorientation towards security risk management has already affected relationships between the three governments. The change from the security provisions in the FTA and NAFTA were extremely thin on the ground, whereas the Smart Border Accord and the Security and Prosperity Partnership clearly indicate the coupling of trade and security in new ways. It will come as no surprise that the United States is acting unilaterally with the WHTI to require Canadian, Mexican, and other continental governments change their passport documents to conform to American standards, or that the US-VISIT program captures the information on incoming (non-Canadian) entrants. But, we would argue that the explicit connection of criminal and military threats/risk/reactions is new and significant. The extension of border zones, and the simultaneous strengthening of the physical border and domestic surveillance indicates that rather than attempt to ‘solve’ the problem of migration, terrorism, or public security, North American states have accepted insecurity as a condition of existence—and are intent on managing both the perception and the emergency responses to that insecurity. In the face of an American government that still holds a great deal of political capital from the terror attacks (not to mention continuing threats such as anthrax, the Washington area sniper, the shoe bomber, and domestic al-Qaeda cells), the defence of the homeland remains a great source of rhetorical, and hence electoral and diplomatic power, in North American discourse. Whether or not the new ghosts of insecurity are seated at the table, those apparitions are driving public policy and trilateral relations.
1. My expertise does not extend to Mexican security policy, and so I will focus in this paper primarily on Canada and the United States.

2. The case for intervention in Iraq is a mirror image of the case against intervention in Rwanda during the 1994 genocide. In that case, Western diplomats refused to name the ethnic cleansing as genocide, which would create a legal obligation to intervene. In the Iraqi case, the lack of intelligence and information became a cause for war in itself.
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Is Canada a threat to U.S. Security? Yes, Canada has always been a place from which others could attack what is now the United States. Geography is the root of this threat. In historical terms, this threat may be seen in three periods: from colonial beginnings to the end of the 19th century, World War II through the end of the Cold War, and from the Cold War to the present, a time of greatly expanded economic integration.

In the first period, between 1689 and 1815, North America was one theater among several for a series of European wars. In the North American theater, Canada served as a French base to attack the British colonies to the south. Subsequently, Canada served Britain as a base for attacking the American colonies during the War of the Revolution and the United States in the War of 1812. American fears of British use of Canada for this purpose did not entirely die out until early in the 20th century, and U.S. war planning for such a contingency persisted into the 1930s.

The second period was one when Canada was a possible route for military attack on the United States by third countries, but its government was friendly. This also meant that Canada was at risk because of its proximity to the United States. This period began with World War II and continued through the Cold War. It saw the development of the existing close defense relationship between Canada and the United States.

Now there are two new principal threats from Canada. First there is the infrastructural vulnerability that the economic integration of North America has created. Now the United States may be attacked in Canada itself. While this threat is also one that seeks to exploit Canadian proximity to the United States and is shared with Canada, it is different from the previous one in that it is not one of invasion, air or missile attack. Attacks seeking to exploit critical infrastructural vulnerabilities in Canada to damage the United States can come from individuals or groups present in North America including Canada legally or illegally.

The second threat is the possibility of the movement of terrorists, terrorist devices or both through Canada to the United States. This threat gets the most political attention. It has been aptly described by David Haglund of Queen’s as “the new Fenianism.” (Haglund, 2006:29) Defense against these threats is more complex than military defense and includes law enforcement, migration policy, border control, and intelligence collection and sharing. The United States cannot defend against these threats unilaterally. Cooperation with Canada is essential. Indeed, the United States should seriously consider recent Canadian suggestions for a new North American strategy—one that integrates economic and security issues and increases the institutionalization of their management.

Canada as a French and then British Possession

Until the mid-nineteenth century, the threat from the north came from France and then Britain using Canada as a base in European world-wide wars in which they were on opposite sides.
Fighting in the North American theater of the European wars in which France and England were opposed (sometimes described as the second Hundred Years’ War) began in New England with King William’s War 1689–1697, (known in Europe as the War of the Grand Alliance or the War of the League of Augsburg) and continued with Queen Anne’s War 1702–1713 (or the War of the Spanish Succession).

In these wars, French forces including Indian allies penetrated as far as Albany, coastal Maine (attacking from the interior from Quebec) and Deerfield (the site of a famous massacre) and Haverhill, Massachusetts. The English and colonists unsuccessfully attacked Quebec City by sea and seized Port Royal in Nova Scotia twice.

At the end of these two wars, French territory in North America was reduced by the cession of French claims to Newfoundland, the Hudson’s Bay trading area and Nova Scotia. However, the peace treaty did not draw precise boundaries between the remaining French territory in North America and that of the British colonies. Nor did the treaty signed in Europe end less formal fighting in North America, including that done by various Indian tribes acting as French proxies.

In 1744 war again broke out in Europe and America. This was King George’s War (or the War of the Austrian Succession), and it lasted until 1748. The main event in North America was the New Englanders’ capture of the French fortress at Louisburg, (which the eventual peace treaty handed back to France to the great annoyance of New England). The war also featured French and Indian attacks south as far as Albany and western Massachusetts.

From 1749 to 1754, there was constant friction between the French authorities and forces and the American colonists particularly in the Ohio valley. These skirmishes turned into war when General Edward Braddock unsuccessfully attacked Fort Duquesne (now Pittsburgh). This fighting merged into the next European war—the Seven Years War (1756–1763) and known in North America as the French and Indian War (1754 to 1760). Initially the war went well for France with General Montcalm seizing Fort William Henry at the southern end of Lake George and another French force penetrating western New York as far east as Herkimer. The massacre of Americans at Fort William Henry after its surrender in 1757 by the Indian allies of the French left a lasting impression. A good example of this can be found in James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans* first published in 1826.

A vivid description of the American attitude toward France and Canada in this period is contained in Francis Parkman’s *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*. Parkman lived between 1823 and 1893. He was the author of a monumental and influential seven volume *History of France and England in North America*. His histories are still in print. *The Conspiracy of Pontiac* was first published in 1851.

Parkman describes the situation in New England and northern New York at the outset of the French and Indian War as follows:
The peoples of the northern English colonies had learned to regard their Canadian neighbors with the bitterest enmity. With them, the very name of Canada called up horrible recollections and ghastly images: The midnight massacre of Schenectady, and the desolation of many a New England hamlet; blazing dwellings and reeking scalps; and children snatched from their mothers’ arms to be immured in convents and trained up in the abomination of Popery. To the sons of the Puritans, their enemy was doubly odious. They hated him as a Frenchman, and they hated him as a Papist. Hitherto he had waged his murderous warfare from a distance, asting their settlements with rapid onsets, fierce and transient as a summer storm; but, now, with enterprising audacity, he was entrenching himself on their very borders. The English hunter, in the lonely wilderness of Vermont, as by the warm glow of sunset he piled spruce boughs for this woodland bed, started as a deep, low sound struck faintly on his ear, the evening gun of Fort Frederic, booming over the lake and forest. The erection of this fort, better known among the English as Crown Point, was a piece of daring encroachment which justly kindled resentment in the northern colonies. (Parkman, 1991:423)

In addition, these wars and especially the involvement of Indians gave rise to a small but politically and culturally influential American literature of Indian captivity stories.¹

The results of this war were the transfer of the remainder of New France to the Britain (with the exception of the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon) in 1763 and the subsequent reorganization of North American by the British in the Quebec Act of 1774. From the American point of view, the key outcome of the war was the end of the French and Catholic threat.

In the War of the Revolution, Canada was again a principal route of attack on the 13 Colonies. The British used Halifax as a naval base and Quebec and Montreal as staging bases. Anticipating this danger, the Americans invaded Canada in 1775-1776 in an effort to prevent British military exploitation of that region against the colonies. This policy failed militarily and politically.

In 1777 and 1778, the British attacked from Canada in the west from Fort Oswego on Lake Ontario (near present day Syracuse) east along the Oswego River and from the north down Lake Champlain and Lake George. In 1778, the forces attacking down the lakes were intended to link with a British army advancing up the Hudson River from New York City. The advance from the south was desultory, and the two armies failed to join before the northern force was defeated at Saratoga, New York. This outcome led France to enter the war openly on the American side and ended the prospect of British victory. The war itself dragged on until 1783.

The final war in which foreign forces used Canada to attack the U.S. was the War of 1812. Again Britain attacked from Canada in the Great Lakes and in the traditional Lake Champlain and Lake George corridor.
Although the War of 1812 turned out to be the last time that a government in control of Canada used Canada as a base from which to attack the U.S., this future was not obvious at the time. For example, within ten years of the completion of the Erie barge canal, there were suggestions that it be enlarged to take ships including warships thus avoiding the St. Lawrence River. This idea was proposed again during the Civil War in case of war with Britain—a real possibility at the time. A similar proposal was made concerning the Champlain Canal (Hill, 1900:156-7 and 234-5). Still, the U.S. took this possible threat less and less seriously as relations with Britain improved in the 19th century; although, there was some fear of a United States—British war in 1896 which might have affected Canada (Morton, 2001:144). The British garrison at Halifax did not depart until 1906.

Nevertheless, it was only in 1939 that the U.S. withdrew War Plans Red and Crimson which had been prepared in the 1920’s. They had contemplated a war with the British Empire where the Empire would use Canada as a base for attacking the United States. The U.S. plan was to preempt that possibility by attacking in Canada as a part of its larger effort to defend against the Empire. The withdrawal of these plans marked the bureaucratic end of any lingering expectation that a Government in Canada would support foreign attacks on the U.S. In fact, that fear had probably dissipated many years previously. War Plans Red and Crimson live on as board games.

Canada and the United States as Allies

World War II to the End of the Cold War

The advent of World War II brought the prospect of Japanese and German attacks on North America including the possibility of attacking through or above Canadian territory to reach the United States. Now a friendly Canada was a possible target in an attack against the United States. This was a new situation, and Canada and the U.S. chose to manage it together. That decision was the start of the present basic defense understanding between the two countries—an understanding which has been described as “a security community” (Haglund, 2006:20-22 and 28-29). That has expanded into the broader security sphere and which is fundamental to United States—Canadian relations.

That understanding has three elements: First, Canada and the United States see North America as a single military theater; second, Canada and the United States agree that each has a duty to the other to defend North America; and finally that they agree to do this together as partners.

The first expression of this understanding was an uncoordinated exchange of remarks between President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mackenzie King in 1938. After the President had stated at Queens University that “the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil was threatened by any other empire”, the Prime Minister replied a few days after that “we, too, have our obligations as a good friendly neighbor, and one of them is to see that ...our country
is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably
be expected to make it, and that should the occasion arise, enemy forces
should not be able to pursue their way either by land, sea or air to the
United States from Canadian territory” (Haeyrs, 1959:177-193).

More recently, this view was well stated in 2002 by the then Minister of
National Defence John McCullum when he told the House of Commons
that “…at least since 1940, Canada has entered into a solemn covenant
with the United States to jointly defend our shared continent” (McCullum,
2003). Its latest expression was in a February 16, 2007 speech to the
Conference of Defence Associations in Ottawa by the current Minister of
National Defence Gordon J. O’Connor, who said “Our second responsi-
bility is the protection of the north American continent—a responsibility
we share with the United States” (O’Conner, 2007).

Between those statements in 1938 and the present, the United States and
Canada developed a broad, deep, intimate, and institutionalized defense
relationship with strong binational characteristics. This began in 1940
with the creation of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, Canada—
United States. It continued with the creation of the Military Cooperation
Committee in 1946, the North American Air (later Aerospace) Defense
Agreement and the North American Air (and later Aerospace)
Defense Command (NORAD) in 1957, the separate establishment of U.S.
Northern Command in 2002 and Canada Command in 2006 and new link-
ages between them and the expansion of NORAD’s responsibilities in
1981 beyond air defence to include space warning and in 2006 maritime
warning.6

It is this idea of a partnership in the defense of North America to which
both parties contribute that has led the United States to criticize the
Canadian defense effort and funding from time to time.7 This is also why
the Canadian decision not to participate fully in North American missile
defense was significant: it was a step away from the partnership and
compromised Canadian sovereignty to some degree.

North American Integration

Independently of defense cooperation, the economies and economic
infrastructures of Canada and the United States have become more and
more integrated, a process which appears to be accelerating. The path
of economic expansion and integration is probably best known in trade
where we see such milestones as the Auto Pact (1965), the Free
Trade Agreement (1987) and most recently the North American

But long before those developments, our air, rail, truck and communication
networks were increasingly integrated as were our oil, gas and electrical
distribution systems. Similarly, we share air and watersheds as well as
lakes and rivers. As our prosperity has increased, so have these linkages8
until now our border looks more and more artificial and inconvenient.
Indeed, from a defense management perspective the real border is the
North American perimeter, and from an electronic point of view there is
no border at all. Canada and the United States (and increasingly Mexico) are now largely a single economic, defense, security and environmental space or, as the military would say, a single theater.

It is the extraordinary level of economic integration and its related infrastructure that has created a new threat to the United States from Canada. This integration and shared infrastructure create very large vulnerabilities. (Think of how failures in the electrical grids of each country have on occasion affected the other.) The extent of this shared infrastructure and its vulnerability may first have been seriously and systematically appreciated in the run up to the year 2000 when catastrophic computer failures were feared.

Now, of course, considerable attention is being paid to North American critical infrastructure vulnerability which has turned out to be a vast subject. These vulnerabilities take several forms: danger from natural disasters, from accidents and also from deliberately created disasters. Since their effects can easily extend across the border, United States—Canadian cooperation is essential in the prediction and prevention of terrorist events and in the preparation for and the management of the consequences of all types of disasters in North America.

Added to the natural and accidental vulnerabilities created by integrated critical infrastructure, is the matter of persons located within North America who may attempt to exploit them. These individuals are attracted not only to the opportunities these vulnerabilities present but also to our relatively open borders and the ease of movement within North America. This creates additional political problems because of differing United States and Canadian policies (both real and perceived) on migration, refugees and their enforcement. This is an important matter because it is easy for Americans to conclude that Canadian policy on these matters (if seen as weak or ineffective) can create dangers for the United States.

The danger posed by terrorists within North America and specifically within Canada is a different kind of threat than that previously posed by the possibility of attacking foreign based forces. Managing it requires security cooperation in areas beyond military defense.

Both countries have created new bureaucratic structures and plans to manage, predict and prevent such events. In the United States there are now the Department of Homeland Security and U.S. Northern Command. In Canada there is now Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada and Canada Command. In addition, there are various kinds of joint plans and joint planning endeavors. In the military domain, for example, there are the Continental Defense Plan and the Basic Security Document which in turn have a large sub set of related plans. There is extensive but imperfect cooperation between and among these American and Canadian civilian and military organizations. The basic understanding of 1938 remains but now is being applied beyond the military domain.

It is the possibility of a deliberately caused event that attracts the most political attention. This is probably because such events are at least
theoretically preventable if our information and cooperation are good enough, and if our resources, ability and will to act on that information are sufficient.

Perceptions of the seriousness of this kind of threat are different in the United States than in Canada. In general, Americans seem to feel this threat more keenly than Canadians. As Canadian Frank Graves of EKOS Research Associates put it in Washington in October 2005,

“...although threat and security issues are extremely important in both countries, they are far more powerfully connected to national political affairs in the United States than in Canada. For example, ‘security’ was arguably the determining factor shaping the outcome of the last presidential race, whereas in Canada’s last federal elections, it was simply not on the political radar” (Graves, 2005:14).

Although, U.S. and Canadian threat perceptions may be different, there is no doubt that terrorists exist in Canada and that some have in the past sought to do harm to the United States. Ahmed Ressam is an example of such a person.

Purported Al Qaeda threats to Canadian interests and in particular to its petroleum industry infrastructure illustrate the point that terrorists may well be considering exploiting infrastructural vulnerabilities in Canada to get at the United States. For example, the alleged terrorists were quoted as saying, “We should strike petroleum interests in all areas which supply the United States...like Canada” the idea is “to choke the U.S. economy.”

The fact that Ressam was living in Montréal and that the Canadian Security and Secret Intelligence Service (CSIS) reported in 2000 that it had about 50 organizational targets and 350 individual targets in its counter-terrorism program in (Canada Canadian Secret Intelligence Service, 2000:2) has attracted American attention and concern.

The CSIS report goes on to list the various kinds of terrorist activity that it had detected and acted on in Canada. These included planning terrorist acts in Canada and abroad, fraudulent use of travel documents, procuring weapons and materiel, involvement in nuclear, biological and chemical terrorism, recruitment of members and supporters, manipulating members of émigré communities, providing safe haven, fundraising and support of terrorist activities, illegal entry in to Canada, logistical support, and engaging in terrorist acts in Canada and abroad (Canada Canadian Secret Intelligence Service, 2000:3-4).

More generally, CSIS states that,

“For a number of reasons, Canada is an attractive venue for terrorists. Long borders and coastlines offer many points of entry which can facilitate movement to and from various sites around the world, particularly the United States. As a wealthy industrial society, Canada is an excellent location in which to raise money in the name of causes abroad. The nation accepts large numbers of immigrants and refugees, and consequently has significant émigré communities
which can be a source of haven and support. Many of the world’s terrorist groups have a presence in Canada” (Canadian Secret Intelligence Service. 1999:5).

The Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorists Attacks on the United States identified Canada as a security problem for the United States. The Report said in part “The border with Canada had one agent for every 13.25 miles. Despite examples of terrorists entering from Canada, awareness of terrorist activity in Canada and its more lenient immigration laws...the only positive action taken was that the numbers of Border Patrol agents was not cut any further” (National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, 2004:81).

The idea that Canada presents a security threat to the U.S. for the reasons listed by the Commission is hardly new. For example, the Center for Immigration Studies in a May 2002 report entitled Canada’s Asylum System: A Threat to American Security? writes,

“Canada has the most generous asylum system of any country in the world. Any individual who arrives in Canada or who reaches Canadian territorial waters has the right under law to submit a claim for protection under the U.N. Convention. The lack of an effective pre-screening mechanism enables almost 100 percent of claimants to receive a free formal hearing with free legal advice. No other country has a higher approval rate. Moreover, once on Canadian soil few asylum seekers are sent home even when found not to be genuine refugees...Canada has introduced some far-reaching security legislation since the attacks in the United States, but the weakest link—Canada’s asylum system—has not been addressed (Bissett, 2002:1).

What gets attention in the U.S. is not free lawyers and hearings but alleged ineffective pre-screening and then lax enforcement when a refugee claimant is found to be ineligible.

After the discovery in June 2006 of an alleged home grown terrorist plot in Canada to make and use a large fertilizer-based bomb,12 the potential security threat from Canada attracted still more American attention. For example, Jerry Seper writing in the Washington Times on June 7, 2006 quoted Janice Kephart, described as a lawyer who worked for the 9/11 Commission, as calling terrorist infiltration from north of the U.S. border “real” and “dangerous” (Seper, 2006). And the day before, Representative Tom Tancredo (Republican of Colorado) suggested the need for new border ID requirements and a fence on the northern border and said, “The border is incredibly porous. Whether people like hearing it or not, it’s absolutely true” (Alberts, 2006). More recently in March 2007, Michael O’Hanlon of Brookings testified before a Congressional committee that

“We should always keep an eye on what the Canadian are doing with their immigration controls and their visa policies. Because if they get sloppy, or their civil-liberties concerns get even more paramount in their own thinking, we may need to worry about tightening up that
The possibility of terrorists using Canada to attack or infiltrate the United States has caused the United States to tighten border controls and to insist that in time all travelers entering the United States carry passports or equivalent documents.

But this very effort has also made the United States realize that it must work with its neighbors if U.S. security is fundamentally to be improved. One way to look at this is to say that the best defense is one in depth. Another is to say that the extent of shared critical infrastructure dictates a cooperative approach. After all, much of the critical North American infrastructure is in Canada and Mexico, and United States border control measures do not change that fact.

Thus we see in addition to the new bureaucratic structures created in the United States and Canada and described above, trilateral efforts at cooperation. The best example of this is the SPP or Security and Prosperity Partnership of Canada, Mexico and the U.S. The agenda of the SPP spelled this out on March 25, 2005 saying that the United States, Canada and Mexico had agreed to,

"Prevent and respond to threats within North America

- Develop and implement a strategy to enhance North American maritime transportation and port security.
- Develop and implement a strategy to establish equivalent approaches to aviation security for North America.
- Develop and implement a comprehensive North American strategy for combating transnational threats to the United States, Canada, and Mexico, including terrorism, organized crime, illegal drugs, migrant and contraband smuggling and trafficking.
- Enhance partnerships on intelligence related to North American security.
- Develop and implement a common approach to critical infrastructure protection, and response to cross-border terrorist incidents and, as applicable, natural disasters."

These are important issues and trilateral agreement to work together on them is a significant development. They illustrate the fundamental point noted above that North America is a single security theater and common economic space and that all three governments and populations share this view to some but also differing extent.

These differing perspectives are important. They limit the possibilities of cooperation. They also can create misunderstandings with political consequences. As noted above, Frank Graves of EKOS Research Associates found in 2005 that threat and security issues were a stronger force in national political affairs in the United States than in Canada. In Mexico, as Raul Benitez Manaut recently pointed out at the U.S. National Defense
University, “Mexican nationalists distrust the United States, they do not recognize the changes in the international system of security, they do not accept the transnational character of many new threats...and they reject the participation of Mexico in the international system of security” (Benitez Manaut, 2006:5). It would probably not too hard to find a number of Canadians who agree with nearly all of the Mexican nationalist view.

The political consequences of these differences can be important. On the United States side, such views look irresponsible. They raise such questions as can Canada or Mexico be relied on? These concerns in turn lead to doubts about the wisdom of information sharing, and push the United States. in the direction of unilateral actions. Aspects of post 9/11 United States border control policy are examples of this.

At the same time it must be said that Canada has made an extraordinary effort to work with the United States in improving North America security. Not only has it reorganized as noted above to strengthen its ability to manage the new security problems internally and in cooperation with the United States, but it has also intensified that cooperation. A good of this new level of cooperation is probably the Smart Border Declaration of 200214 and the resulting steps toward modernization and improved border security and efficiency.

The Future

Five years from now, we can expect improved border infrastructure and increased reliance on various smart border techniques to separate persons and goods needing little or no inspection from the rest. Provided that expanded and modernized border infrastructure and systems are present, crossing the border ought to become easier, perhaps faster than it once was in many cases.

But maximizing border security and efficiency in the future is only one piece of a much larger set. The United States—Canada security (including defense) and economic relationship has grown so large and complex and affects so many people on both sides of the border that its management requires new thinking and approaches.

A number of Canadians have made such suggestions. For example Canadian Council of Chief Executives called for a new grand North American strategy in 2003. They said:

“But issues of trade and investment are now inextricably intertwined with those of defense and security. The need for a comprehensive North American strategy integrating economic and security issues led the CCCE to launch its North American Security and Prosperity Initiative (NASPI) in January 2003. This initiative proposes a strategy with five major elements: reinventing borders; maximizing regulatory efficiencies; negotiation of a comprehensive resource security pact; reinvigorating the North American defence alliance; creating a new institutional framework”15
Ambassador Allan Gotlieb made a similar suggestion in 2004 writing that “The national interest requires a grand strategy... whether in the form of a common market, a customs union...greater economic integration should be accompanied by a common security perimeter” (Gotlieb, 2004).

Danielle Goldfarb of the C.D. Howe Institute, Bill Dymond and Michael Hart in their 2003 C.D. Howe publication “Canada and the Global Challenge,” Wendy Dobson in her C.D. Howe paper of 2002 “Shaping the North American Economic Space” and more recently Alexander Moens of Simon Fraser University (Moens, 2007) make similar points, particularly with respect to the need for new rules to govern further economic integration; although Moens also emphasizes defense.

These Canadian observers are correct. North American, and particularly United States-Canadian economic, security and defense integration has gone so far that the situation now demands a new grand strategy—one that takes into account all those factors concurrently.

Ultimately, development of such a strategy is the best way for the United States to protect its economic and security interests in North America.
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I have been asked to say something about how North American trade has been affected since 9/11. I have taken the word “since” seriously—and cast my remarks rather more widely than if the mandate had been how North American trade was affected “by” 9/11. You will see why this is important.

Several factors have affected the movement of goods and individuals across North America’s borders since September 11, 2001. Increased security demands are one, but just one, factor negatively affecting trade. And while demands for greater security have intensified in response to 9/11, other factors have led to increased security demands as well.

Let me lay out my views on this as briefly as possible.

First, some background: North American cross border flows are more about joint production, complex supply chain management and logistics than trade.

The North American economy can best be visualized in the early 21st century as a deeply integrated continental system—a system structured by networks linking production centers and distribution hubs across the continent. These linkages rest on ties to business, communities and local and state-provincial governments. They require an efficient and secure physical infrastructure of rails, roads and bridges, pipelines and wires, ports and border crossings and a coherent and consistent system of regulations that affect individuals, machines, firms and goods.

This North American economic system emerged mainly through a bottom-up process driven by corporate strategies and investment decisions that focused less on national economies. The process began in the 1980s¹, when many major US companies responded to tougher international competition and falling profit margins by rationalizing their operations and reducing excess capacity tied up in Canadian (and Mexican) branch plant operations. They sought to build instead integrated North American production, marketing, and sourcing networks. Changes in North American markets drove this process as well. By the mid-1980s, because of the reduction of trade barriers in the GATT and deregulation distinct national markets in many sectors had begun to blur. Subsidiaries were becoming operations in Canada or Mexico rather than operations producing for Canada and Mexico, and branches that once owned national markets found themselves competing in new continental markets with other divisions in their own firms.

Today, North America is frequently described as the world’s largest trade bloc, with the world’s largest bilateral trade relationships. What is unsaid, however, is that the cumulative result of cross border trade and investment—especially since the implementation of the Canada-US FTA and NAFTA—is for most practical purposes an integrated economy.

This degree of collaboration and complementarity between countries is unprecedented. But for the result—a new system with levels of integration that often surpass that of the European Union—there is no adequate social science vocabulary. Efforts to force this North American system into...
standard trade and economic integration paradigms confuse more than they illuminate.

A fundamental problem with the traditional trade model is that it encourages us to focus on the exchange of finished goods across national borders. But this is simply not a productive way of imagining the substance of the North American economic system. What flows across our borders are not mainly finished goods. We collaborate in complex, cross-border production systems. For example, a quarter of the more than a billion and a quarter dollars of goods cross the US-Canada-Mexico borders daily is automotive. But we don’t sell cars to each other. That’s the key: We build them together.

We also share increasingly integrated energy markets; market to the same customers with an array of financial services; use the same roads and railroads to transport jointly made products to market; fly on the same integrated airline networks, and increasingly meet the same or similar standards of professional practice. This is what economists call “deep” or structural integration.

The existence of this continental network of supply chains that cross national borders is a key differentiating factor of the North American economy. In Europe even today, major economic sectors continue to be characterized by national champions. One could argue, I think, that while Europe has a much more developed superstructure of integration, the economic substructure may well be less deeply integrated than is the case in North America.

This continental network of supply chains that cross national borders also helps us understand the vulnerability of this system.

As a recent report jointly produced by the US CSIS and Canada’s Fraser Institute observes, “The supply chains that span the U.S.-Canada border are unique in the global context. They are heavily reliant on land transportation that travels primarily through just a handful of key border crossings. Major shipments are routinely timed for delivery within hours, and sometimes to the minute” (Webber, vii).

The point here is quite simple—we do not trade finished goods with each other. Our economies are deeply, profoundly, perhaps inalterably integrated. We are three sovereign nations who share what is in many cases a single economy. Interruptions at the border do not simply delay the delivery of a car, a TV or a suit. Border delay is much more dangerous than this. Delays disrupt complex supply chains on which tens of thousands of jobs and the welfare of many communities depend in all three countries.

Many still view North America in terms of a trade block—reality notwithstanding. Why? One reason is that resources have not been devoted to studying how things actually work. Neither firms doing business in North America nor research institutions have perceived that it is in their interest to encourage this kind of in-depth analysis of supply chains and logistics. Nor have governments: Viewing North America as relations among
trading partners shelters perceptions of national sovereignty. Trade is less threatening than the reality of structural interdependence, of three nations sharing a single economic system.

**Does security trump trade?**

The fact is that security concerns particularly since 9/11 intensify North American interdependence. The idea that “security trumps trade” is dead wrong. How could there be security in the economic chaos that would result from locking down our borders with Mexico and Canada? Trying to force U.S. production system back inside national borders would be economically devastating, and the impact on Mexico and Canada would scarcely make anyone more secure.

**Delays at the border post 9/11**

Delays—sometimes massive—along our internal borders resulted from heightened security concerns post 9/11. But regulatory issues and failing transportation infrastructure are equally problematic for the industry’s future. And, along the US-Mexico border, immigration issues and drug smuggling (together with the mayhem that typically accompanies this form of commerce) may become the most serious source of tension and delay.

Much attention has been focused on border issues. From the very first moment after 9/11, as then US Customs Service Commissioner Bonner observed, North America’s integrated production system was in the line of fire. “On 9/12,” he said, “I realized we had to find ways to secure our border, but to do so without ... shutting down our economy in the process. On September 12 and 13 ... at the land border crossings with Canada, wait times skyrocketed from an average of 10-20 minutes-to over 10 to 12 hours. Automobile plants waiting for just-in-time parts were beginning to shut down production by September 14.”

What about the cost of security related border delay? Pierre Martin, from the University of Montreal, has recently written about this. He suggests that one key cost of the recent increase in security—related scrutiny at the US border” might be “as a deterrent to potential exporters to the United States or to investors seeking the best location to invest in a production facility”—especially the small prospective exporter (Martin, 2006). Similarly, he says, just-in-time manufacturing firms operating on a continental scale might be more reluctant to invest in Canada (and Mexico) if they perceive a significant risk of delay in their supply chains.

Martin also tries to estimate the increase in shipment costs directly attributable to security-induced waiting times at the border.

Longer wait-times impose shipment costs that industry has to absorb. In 2004, 6.9 million trucks crossed the border from Canada into the United States. According to a 2005 Canadian trucking survey report commissioned by Transport Canada, security-induced delays increased the time spent at border crossings by an average of 32 minutes per shipment, costing Canadian exporters an estimated $290 million.
The cost of compliance can also be daunting. As Martin notes, “To avoid costly waits or denial of entry, shippers must gain accreditation in the Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program, while exporters and their suppliers must pay for certification in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) program. C-TPAT costs vary from approximately C$40,000 for smaller exporters to hundreds of thousands of dollars for the largest firms. As there are more than 40,000 exporting firms in Canada, the total potential costs are substantial.”

Another study, this one carried out in 2003, estimated that the costs to carriers and manufacturers resulting from border transit times and uncertainty, other border related costs borne by manufacturers and carriers such as duties, broker fees, customs administration and costs for inspection staffs borne by the two governments at US$10.3 billion—about 2.7% of merchandise trade totaling US$382 billion in 2001. After adjusting out non-truck related costs, the authors estimate total border costs related to trucking at US$9.45 billion at the midrange, or some 4.02% of total truck trade totaling US$270 billion in 2001 (Taylor et al., 2003).

For another perspective on these costs, take the particular case of US 93, a two-lane highway that traverses the crest of Hoover Dam. US 93 is a key link in the only major north-south highway system east of the Sierras and west of the Rocky Mountains. This stretch of highway handles 17,000 vehicles daily and was identified as a high-priority corridor in the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. Since 9/11, however, truck traffic over the dam has been rerouted 23 miles away, costing consumers, it is estimated, some $30 million annually. Other commercial four-lane route options require an additional 250 mile detour.

But these numbers really do not tell the whole story. We cannot focus just on cost delay. What is at risk is the erosion of the entire system of cross border supply chains on which so much North American competitiveness rests.

Look at the US. In traditional trade terms, fully a third of US trade with its North American partners. That’s big, but, as we suggest, this doesn’t really tell the whole story. Deep integration in many sectors means that U.S. workers and consumers depend profoundly on this system. This was patently clear immediately after 9/11. Close the borders for a few hours and US firms shut down. Some 9000 trucks cross the Ambassador Bridge each day. Many work on 15 minute just-in-time schedules at auto plants on both sides of the border. Delay at the border, it is estimated, costs each auto assembly plant about $1 million per hour in lost production. And this is not just along the border: if the Ambassador Bridge is blocked, then in hours, auto plants in South Carolina close.

A branch from an ill-kept tree falls across some power lines in Ohio and in moments lights go out across a broad swath of Canada and the US. In the blackout and the mad cow panic, we see the reality of highly integrated networks linking the American and Canadian power grid and the food supply, the stuff that defines our modern societies.
Substantial efforts have been made to improve the physical infrastructure at border crossings, particularly since 9/11. The US-Canada “Smart Border” agreement and the parallel agreement with Mexico represent significant commitments to improve border management. Organizations such as the Border Trade Alliance and the Can-Am Border Trade Alliance and various border communities have initiated dialogues with government agencies that have achieved significant incremental improvement in processes at the borders. Many who work in these agencies understand the problems of complexity and delay and seek better answers.

But the pyramiding of requirements and programs each of which can significantly inhibit quick border processing and all of which together require high degrees of inter-agency coordination (and typically involve federal, state and even local governments) as well as new levels of cooperation with business and border communities has created tumult in some instances and threatens what Stephen Flynn calls “a potential train wreck.” The key problem is the tendency, understandable but increasingly self-defeating, to follow traditional border management practices and concentrate all of these activities—achieving the highest possible levels of security, controlling immigration, and enforcing a widening array of licensing, health and safety standards, all carried out by different agencies with different rules and work practices—at the border itself.

**Two points to bear in mind:**

First, as I noted at the beginning of my remarks, heightened security requirements at the borders are not only a response to the events of 9/11, but also (particularly along the US-Mexico border) to increasing flows of illegal migrants. While efforts were made soon after September 11 to link illegal (and legal) immigration and terrorism, current concerns about illegals focus more on jobs, welfare and crime. And, if current trends continue—both in traditionally unsettled cities such Nuevo Laredo and now even in places like Monterrey—drugs and drug wars will force even more security concerns.

Second, it is vital to understand that border security is not the only source of cost and delay economic actors face in maintaining the efficient flow of goods across North America’s internal borders. Regulatory conflicts and decaying infrastructure also raise the cost of business. Environmental pressures are going to play an important part here as well.

As the scale of integration increases, the impact of dysfunctional regulations has become more important. National regulatory systems affecting transportation systems often work at cross purposes. Dalhousie transportation specialist Mary Brooks counts four particular types of regulation that continue to affect transportation and supply chain management: immigration restrictions; the failure of harmonize vehicle weights and dimensions; cabotage rules; and investment restrictions (Brooks, 2004). To this we should add a wide array of “non-essential border crossing services” many of which pre-date 9/11—the most noteworthy, of course, has to do with cross border trucking services.
The Security and Prosperity Partnership for North America (SPP) may mark a significant step forward to improve this situation. The SPP working group reports suggest that within the NAFTA governments, there is some understanding that the North American economic system is a deeply integrated economic system, and that governments must be more active in creating the conditions for further integration. Certainly an agreement to create a trilateral Regulatory Cooperation Framework and a trilateral Automotive Partnership Council seemed steps in the right direction. But it is not clear if implementation of these agreements has progressed, and the danger remains of stalling integration if transport harmonization is further delayed. Security concerns post 9/11 and regulatory conflict damages the credibility of the just-in-time system. As Brooks concludes, the result will be to boost buffer stocks, and force just-in-time supply chain managers to re-examine their sourcing options.

The deterioration of physical infrastructure—not to mention our inability to plan for future requirements—is as serious a problem as border security. A major transportation institute finds that “America’s long and successful ride to prosperity is threatened by a transportation infrastructure incapable of meeting future requirements. The interdependent network of roads, bridges, and terminals is growing increasingly antiquated, congested and disconnected, and, therefore, incapable of providing the productivity and prosperity support upon which the nation has depended for the last century an a half” (Intermodal Transportation Institute, 2004). Economic growth in North America is forecast to double the freight coming into US ports and to increase freight shipments by 70% over the next decade. However, without significant upgrade the North American transportation system will not meet this challenge.

Border infrastructure, even before 9/11, had fallen behind the increase in volume of goods crossing North American borders. “Building a North American Community,” a report sponsored by leading North American business organizations states: “While trade has nearly tripled across both borders since the Canadian-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (FTA) and NAFTA were implemented, border customs facilities and crossing infrastructure have not kept pace with this increased demand. Even if 9/11 had not occurred, trade would be choked at the border.”

The burden of all of these factors—the search for greater border security, the existence of costly rules of origin, expensive regulations and different standards, and failure to maintain vital transportation infrastructure—threaten to undermine the competitive potential derived from achieving further integration in the North American auto industry. Auto specialist Isabel Studer notes: “NAFTA offered an opportunity that has yet to be fully exploited. This situation begs the question of what strategies the North American governments and manufacturers will pursue to ensure the industry’s competitiveness, investments and jobs in the future” (Studer, 2004).
How companies respond

We do not have much detail here. What research exists has focused on quantifying the cost of border delay or other issues. Little has been written about the impact of all of this on corporate supply chain strategies.

What we know, of course, is that changes in corporate strategies and structures drove the formation of a much more integrated North American economy in the 1980s and that this movement intensified dramatically in the 1990s. No government policy, program or plan created the new cross border supply chain systems that emerged in these years or forced efficiency seeking responses by transport and logistics providers.

What we can assume is that firms will do what they can do to manage in changing environments. We can bet that firms with deep investments in continental supply chains will continue to try to find their way through or around new impediments. But we can also assume that if firms begin to see that delay and costs compromise their ability to generate savings out of these continental systems, they will begin to reduce reliance on JIT systems, build up buffer stocks and look for ways to avoid border vulnerability. The result of such a restructuring would be serious for the US, profound for Canada, and devastating for Mexico.

This is the glass half empty view. From a glass half full perspective, we might see more innovative responses to border delay and cost. For example, does short sea shipping provide relief—assuming that the restrictions of the Jones Act can be reduced? What about the greater use of air cargo or even airships, or new kinds of pipelines for moving commodities such as coal, grain or some forest products? A new Ontario-Michigan tunnel, dedicated to auto use? Will we widen the security zone, moving more processing into factories themselves and thus diminishing pressure at the border itself? Might we think in terms of an expanded North American rail system?

We need to ask—and answer—new questions: How can we build new rail systems in North America? (And, for that matter, who is “we” in this regard?) Who pays for a new tunnel or bridge? Most of all, is there a vision of efficient and secure North American freight transportation for the 21st century?

We must underline, finally, that the situation is not going to become easier, but more complex. There is no reason to believe that flows of goods from Asia will diminish in the near future, and it is a good bet that (1) most of this will continue to be destined for the US and (2) that much of the increment over existing volumes will enter North America by way of deep water ports in Canada and Mexico. So burdens at the borders will be greater—not just security issues but infrastructure.
1. The model for integrated production systems was the Auto Pact signed in 1965, although this was a response to the particular needs of the auto industry. See Blank, Stephen and Jerry Haar. 1998. Making NAFTA Work: U.S. Firms and the New North American Business Environment. Miami, Fl.: North-South Center Press, University of Miami.


4. See Fox et al. (2003).

5. Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America, Report to Leaders, June 2005 “We will also establish an Automotive Partnership Council of North America that will support the ongoing competitiveness of the automotive and auto parts sector. The Council will help identify the full spectrum of issues that impact the industry, ranging from regulation, innovation, transportation infrastructure, and border facilitation.”


7. See David Johnston’s very interesting paper on “The Impact of the Canada-USA Border on the Growth of the North American On-Line Marketplace,” (prepared for the Electronic Commerce Branch, Industry Canada, September 2005) for a perspective on what is becoming a very important dimension of all of this.
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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to offer a general schematic of mobility within North America during the post-9/11 era. The realities of the post-September 11th security environment—namely the threats of terrorists and weapons of mass destruction—lead most observers to conclude that new security measures have become the status quo at most of the continent’s internal and external frontiers. This is indeed the general tenor of what has happened over the last five and one-half years at many of North America’s land, air, and sea borders.

The picture is, however, more nuanced and contradictory than this: the regulation of cross-border movements of goods and people within North America can, upon closer analysis, in fact appear rather differentiated or even somewhat schizophrenic. The United States and Canada, for example, tout concepts such as “Smart Borders” and “Shared Border Management” to facilitate the efficient transit of individuals and goods across their mutual frontier, but Canadians find themselves waiting hours to enter the United States on holiday weekends. Agreements for shared border inspections are not progressing well. Similarly, the US is developing a wide range of high-technology border screening systems for cargo but persistently resists opening its highways to Mexican trucks, as required by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), signed over 12 years ago. Mexican migrants, refugees, certain foreign nationals, and other “exceptions” deemed security threats by the state remain largely excluded from the privileges of fast and secure transit across the continent’s borders. They are increasingly subject either to lengthy immigration proceedings, detention, or are forced to cross illegally in ever more costly, difficult, and dangerous ways; despite this, they continue to come to the US and Canada, in some cases in record numbers. Finally, Mexico’s southern frontier with Guatemala remains a mostly open and lawless region, a gateway for Latin Americans and others seeking access to North America.

These are but a few examples of the complex issues of mobility and border security in the post-9/11 period which this paper will explore. It will focus chiefly on border management within North American and thus not deal extensively with the myriad issues of external border control which include a variety of screening and surveillance methods, intelligence sharing, visa screening, and other counter-terrorism measures. Such external border control efforts, similar in some ways to the internal policies I will discuss, have also importantly included the “securitization” of migration, a process which casts migrants as security threats (Waever, 1993; Bigo, 2002; Rudolph, 2003).

The central research questions driving this paper are as follows: what is the general status of mobility in North America in the post-9/11 period? What central factors or variables help explain state choices regarding internal North American border and movement regulation in the post-September 11th period? In other words, how can we make sense of borders and mobility within post-9/11 North America? What does the future hold for movement within the continent?
To answer these questions, the analyst must first recognize the larger political and economic context of the post-9/11 era. This period presents policymakers, scholars, and citizens with new and challenging dilemmas about border security and movement. In this environment, the need for efficient open trade, liberty and socio-cultural interaction across borders collides with the need to guard against the risks of globalization: transnational crime, terrorists, and weapons of mass destruction. I call this the “trade/security” tension and it is perhaps the central problematic impacting border management in North America today. The stakes are high: there are 500 million crossings annually at the continent’s common borders; trade across these frontiers averages $2 billion dollars per day (Myers, 2003). The sheer volume of crossings means it is difficult to detect and intercept those that might do harm to the US, Canada, or Mexico.

Each state is attempting to deal with this tension, and the dilemmas it presents, somewhat differently; technologies of internal and transnational surveillance are one major response to this challenge, as are new admissions protocols and the developing nexus between internal and external security. Bi-lateral and tri-lateral cooperation are other examples. All can generally be read as cases of each state advancing and balancing its particular conception of national interests, understood in both economic and political terms.

We can make some sense of this process by seeing it as a kind of “bordering/debordering” dialectic: borders in the continent experience sometimes contradictory impulses of regulation and openness. This paper will explore several of these impulses. In the end, this dialectic leads to, in my view, an evolving but uneven and tenuous border and mobility management regime that increasingly favors certain economic classes and trade interests but marginalizes “exceptions” such as economic migrants, refugees, and certain identity-based groups. It remains tenuous for a number of reasons, including the fact that a common and concretely-held definition of “security” remains somewhat elusive for the three NAFTA partners. In addition, the power asymmetry of the region and competing interests complicate matters. This emergent policy regime may thus best be understood by using models of interests (such as economic stakeholders) and state power that can explain why responses are playing out in different ways in each state and for different actors.

The conclusion of the paper offers some thoughts about the future border and mobility regime in North America. I suggest the need for a new labor accord to safely and efficiently facilitate the transfer of skilled and unskilled workers throughout North America. Such an accord would complement the economic integration already underway in the continent. I also argue for additional bilateral and trilateral cooperation on these issues; this is the likely to be the most practical, efficient, and effective means to ensure security, prosperity, and competitiveness for Canada, the US, and Mexico in an increasingly globalized world economy.

The plan of this paper is as follows: I will first discuss the overall status of mobility in post-9/11 North America before dealing with a number of key
unilateral initiatives and international policy agreements on movement and border control there. The next section of the paper discusses some of the important **material** bordering efforts of the post-9/11 period, both physical and “virtual,” which attempt to regulate movement across internal North American frontiers. The paper then moves on to deal with new class and identity-based admission protocols. Each section includes a discussion of some of the key variables which appear to explain the relevant policy formation as they relate to the overall argument. Concluding comments follow.

**Regulating Mobility in Contemporary North America**

This component of the paper provides a brief overview of efforts to regulate mobility within North America during the post-9/11 period. It details several major unilateral and bi-/trilateral policy initiatives on mobility and border management developed and implemented in approximately the last 5 years (although a number of policies have historical antecedents which predate September 11, 2001). The policies under analysis represent the kind of bordering/debordering impulses discussed in the introduction.

Before discussing these regulatory measures, it is important to remember that the overall flow of individuals to and within North America has not changed radically since 9/11. The US granted 1.26 million persons legal permanent resident status in 2006, the most since 1991 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2007). Canada admitted 247,143 temporary residents in 2005, which was down from a peak in 2001 but still well above historical averages (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2006). Permanent immigration flows to Canada are also now increasing. Mexican migration to the US continues. Cross-border flows of tourists and businesspeople generally remain high. Data such as remittances further support these trends; the Inter-American Development Bank estimates a 17% increase in remittances in 2005 over 2004, with funds to Latin American and the Caribbean topping $53.6 billion (Inter-American Development Bank, 2006). Mexico alone topped $20 billion in remittances in 2005.

Accordingly, while the absolute number of individuals moving within and to North America has not significantly declined after 9/11, it is clear that the security measures I have discussed have made it more **difficult** for those that do come to make the journey, prompting many (such as Mexican migrants) to actually stay longer within the US or Canada. Moreover, I argue post-9/11 bordering mechanisms are increasingly **differentiating** individuals (and to a lesser degree, cargo), based on certain characteristics. For individuals, this means such class, skill level, and identity markers such as ethnicity, refugee status, and national origin. For cargo it means point of origin, contents, and shipper information. I discuss this argument later in the paper but for now move on to deal with a number of the regulatory policies which attempt to control how, when, and where migrants, travelers, and cargo move across North America’s internal frontiers.
Unilateral and Bi-/Tri-lateral Measures

Each NAFTA partner has undertaken a number of unilateral and bi- or tri-lateral steps to control its borders in the post-9/11 period. Several unilateral measures are of particular note. With specific reference to US-Canada and US-Mexico relations, one of the US’s border security initiatives which has generated the most controversy is the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI). The WHTI was passed by the US Congress in 2004 as part of a major intelligence reform bill. The policy will require passports for travelers entering the US from Canada or Mexico over land borders by a prescribed date (currently January 1, 2008). Air transit between the countries is already regulated in this fashion. Such a move, if implemented, would add to the economic costs of border security—already significant—which worries Canadian interests significantly (Martin, 2006). This move represents the trade/security tension and clearly illustrates the conflicting national interests at stake regarding cross-border mobility; the US seeks additional regulation for national security reasons, Mexico and Canada resist based on economic concerns.

Canada and Mexico have also embarked on a number of border security efforts on their own terms, although it is clear that both have done so in some cases under direct or indirect pressure from the United States. Such responses of course clearly not framed in such terms for domestic political reasons but are articulated as advancing national interests. Canada, for example, has devoted new resources to border law enforcement, tightened admission standards for refugees, and reformed its anti-terrorism laws. However, as Hristoulas (2003) argues, Canada has generally sought additional cooperation on border control with the US (and to a lesser degree Mexico) through international agreements in, his view, to forestall the potential “Mexicanizing” of the frontier. In Mexico’s case, a number of counter-terrorism efforts have been undertaken by the government. Of particular interest is new interest in its land border with Guatemala. That frontier has received additional attention in the post-9/11 era due to worries it is a ‘soft’ entry point into North America. Despite law enforcement efforts in the region by the Mexican government, the area remains a transit point for a variety of flows for individuals and is an item of concern in US negotiations with Mexico (Castillo, 2003).

Beyond these unilateral measures, two major trilateral agreements signed by the US, Canada, and Mexico attempt to govern border management and mobility in the post-9/11 period. These are the Smart Border Accords and the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP). In 2002 and 2001, the U.S. signed separate 22 and 32 point “Smart Border” agreements with Mexico and Canada, respectively (US Department of Homeland Security, 2002a; 2002b). In the Canadian case, the agreements built on previous bilateral arrangements. With Mexico, many parts of the agreement broke new ground. The accords, somewhat different in the case of each bilateral partner, involve cooperation on a number of policy issues related to border control, including inspections, pre-clearances of goods and people, database coordination, biometric identifiers, and other
areas. In most cases, the items in the agreements involve rather limited, or shallow, cooperation rather than policy harmonization.

The SPP is a follow up international framework for trilateral and bilateral cooperation in North America. While not a formal international treaty, nor an overarching binding legal agreement, it does contain two important agendas relevant for the post-September 11th era: one revolving around national security and the other around economic prosperity. Three key principles support these two agendas: improved security from external threats to North America; strengthened internal security measures; and bolstered economic growth for the region as a whole, particularly in the face of growing global competition.

Scholars have undertaken extensive analysis of the specifics of the Smart Border and SPP agreements (Ackleson and Kastner, 2006; Jimenez, 2006; Koslowski, 2004; Myers, 2003). Both agreements can be read as the larger framework for directing specific bordering/debordering policies discussed throughout the balance of this paper: they represent a means to attempt to reconcile the twin demands of economic interaction and national security in the post-9/11 era. They signal, symbolically and politically, state action and authority on these issues, which is threatened by the post-9/11 security environment. And, they can generally be read as the result of a coalescence of stakeholder and state interests in border management. That being said, they remain problematic because progress on the agenda items beneath both agreements is patchy and key issues, such as labor, are left out of the arrangements.

Managing Border Flows in an Age of Terrorism

As suggested above, the Smart Border and SPP agreements can be understood as a reaction to the 9/11 security environment, as well as a means to try and solve long-standing border and cross-border issues. The need for such initiatives became very clear after September 11, 2001. In the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, tight US border inspections immediately increased crossing times at the US-Mexico and US-Canada frontiers from minutes to hours; in one notable case, trucks were backed up for 36 kilometers at the Ambassador Bridge linking Windsor, Ontario and Detroit (Andreas 2003). Production delays followed. Recent research has probed the depth of the high economic costs associated with these new security measures, concluding that the long-term impact of such initiatives may be so severe as to force trade diversion (MacPherson et al., 2006).

Even on the best of days prior to 9/11, the US-Canada and US-Mexico borders were themselves a major trade barrier. This is largely due to the fact that the vast majority of bilateral trade occurs through a very limited number of ports of entry which straddle economically interdependent regions (such as Detroit-Windsor and Buffalo/Niagara), thus creating a “bottleneck” problem for the transfer of goods and materials.

Recognizing the high economic costs associated with border transit, the US, Canadian, and Mexican governments have embarked on a variety of bilateral initiatives designed to speed the passage of goods through these
corridors and across continental frontiers. Some measures were planned and implemented well before September 11, 2001 but the terrorist attacks of that day accelerated the process significantly. These include the “smart” border technologies discussed in the next section. These trends are compatible with a “regional” and “corridor” vision for border management: as Konrad and Nicol (2004) argue, “in the post-9/11 period, two apparently opposing yet fundamentally integrated forces are emphasized. In a sense the wall between the US and Canada became higher...yet as the border was reinforced, corridors of commodity flow and interaction were expedited.”

Another concept in this area that seemed to have initial traction in the initial years which followed 9/11 was “Shared Border Management” (SBM). SBM refers to arrangements whereby US and Canadian authorities could conduct joint customs and potentially immigration inspections and thus in a sense ‘reborder’ the frontier. The Buffalo-Ft. Erie (Peace Bridge) crossing was targeted as the initial trial port for SBM. Officials were optimistic a SBM arrangement would herald a new way to facilitate cross-border movement. The debordering/bordering dialectic, however, applies: the US government announced in late April 2007 that it was abandoning its SBM plans for the Peace Bridge due to conflicts with Canada over rights protections, inspection protocols, and sovereignty issues. The failure of SBM may thus represent a kind of breaking point where the national interests of the US and Canada simply diverge too significantly for further progress.

Material Bordering Efforts in North America

Material policy efforts to secure North America’s borders may be divided into two ways: virtual and physical. This section takes a look at the key initiatives underway to control, materially, movement across North America’s frontiers. Many of these specific policy steps are embedded in the Smart Border and SPP agreements. These policies too may be understood according to the general thesis of this paper: they represent the dialectical tension of bordering and debordering impulses. Sensing the demands of economic and social interaction, many states are increasingly pursuing technology-driven control systems which attempt to make their borders “smarter” and, in some ways, softer and more open to flows of desired goods and individuals. They may, for example, create “layered” security which involves screening and surveillance well before a person or shipment reaches a physical frontier. Research indicates these efforts advance in the policy process often because of interest group pressure from groups such as the Border Trade Alliance which advocate for efficient economic flows (Ackleson and Kastner 2006). They may also be advanced by international agreements such as the SPP.

At the same time much of these high-profile, high-technology border efforts are promoted, however, what one might call the “old style,” physical bordering policies such as walls, guards, and the military remain highly attractive options for migration control, particularly for the United States.
Virtual Bordering Measures

The more notable “virtual” bordering efforts include elements within and without the “Smart Border” and SPP accords, including, among others, cross-border information and intelligence sharing, cargo preclearance procedures, “e-passports” (biometrically enhanced documents), “e-manifests” (which requires truckers to transmit cargo information electronically to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, now in effect for Mexico and soon most of Canada), and other similar systems. In addition, the governments of the US, Canada, and Mexico have pursued mechanisms for frequent travelers and “trusted” shippers to expedite transfers over their common frontiers. These are known by various acronyms, including NEXUS (for individuals) and FAST (Free and Secure Trade—for shippers). The programs are in place at many ports of entry, now including airports in Canada such as Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver.

These programs can be read, as argued below, as a means to facilitate trade and security efficiently and effectively, particularly for the class of individuals (or type of business) that meets the eligibility requirements and afford the services.

For those not seeking legal entry at ports of entry, the US is attempting to increasingly restrict mobility within North America. The plan for this is embodied in the US’s “Secure Border Initiative,” and specifically its “SBInet” which uses technological border control solutions. SBInet is now in its initial stages of deployment, orchestrated by Boeing Corporation which won the multibillion dollar contract for the system. The US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) recently announced the installation of a 98-foot high surveillance tower of cameras, radar, and communications equipment on the US-Mexico border near Sasabe, Arizona. The tower is the first of dozens planned for the border region. These towers, and other technology, form what is being called a “virtual wall” which US officials claim will detect more than 95 percent of illegal crossings at the busiest crossing points along the U.S.-Mexico border (Aguilar, 2007). Eventually, the integrated system is meant to cover sections along the entire border. Canada, as well as Mexico to a much lesser degree, are exploring and implementing Smart Border-related technologies, such as biometric identifiers, air passenger analysis, and other measures (Salter 2004).

Physical Bordering Measures

In addition to these “high tech” twenty-first century solutions, there are a number of “low tech,” physical bordering initiatives underway to control movement in North America—largely across US borders. These include the construction of border walls and vehicle barriers as well as the use of the military and increased law enforcement resources. The United States and Canada are using Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETS) to cooperatively deal with security issues on their common frontier. The US Border Patrol will grow to nearly 18,000 officers by 2008. The most visible of these kinds measures is the border “wall” plan: President Bush signed
a bill in 2006 calling for a 700-mile border wall; the US Congress has appropriated $1.2 billion for fencing, and 370 miles of “primary fence” are meant to be built before the end of 2008.

Empirical evidence and observations of these bordering efforts indicate that at least among some in the United States, a new kind of paradigm on border security may be emerging. This view operates on a new assumption that “control” can actually be achieved under the Secure Border Initiative, military support, and additional resources. Declines in apprehensions of migrants (nearly 60% in some US-Mexico border sectors and 27% over the entire southwestern border) after efforts such as “Operation Jump Start” which deployed US National Guard troops in support of the Border Patrol indicate to some that a “border enforcement-mainly” policy remains a highly viable option (Customs and Border Protection, 2007). Officials claim that they will achieve “operational control” of the US border with Mexico by 2008 (Lipton, 2006).

Whether or not that claim can be realized remains to be seen; historical evidence would suggest otherwise. It is clear that neither Canada nor Mexico have embraced this paradigm to the degree the United States has; both have, however, devoted additional law enforcement resources to their respective frontiers and to counter-terrorism efforts more generally. We can read this as a reaction to address both US concerns as well as domestic issues (recent events such as the arrests of the “Toronto 18” in Canada, for example, indicate the terrorist threat remains a concern.) However, the question of what constitutes “security” and national interests is again valid: in Mexico’s case, for instance, law enforcement at the frontier is nearly consumed by issues of public security, as that country continues to struggle with narco-trafficking, violence, and corruption. Peter Andreas has explained the general response in Canada and Mexico in slightly different terms, suggesting “Canada and Mexico are like two scared mice next to a neurotic elephant. They are more worried about the elephant’s reaction to terrorism than terrorism itself... the two mice are trying to convince the elephant that they are part of the solution rather than part of the problem” (2003:9-10).

**Class, Identity, and Mobility in Post-9/11 North America**

While the overall flow of individuals and goods in North America has not declined in the post-9/11 period, it is clear that the new bordering mechanisms discussed above are increasingly impacting and differentiating individuals (and to a lesser degree, cargo) based on characteristics including class, skill level, and identity markers such as ethnicity and national origin. I will discuss this argument next, after outlining the general context of labor movement within North America.

**Regulating Unskilled and Skilled Labor**

Labor flows within North America were a feature of life on the continent well before the establishment of the international political borders we know today. Major labor movements of the twentieth century, however,
may be broadly described in two ways. First, the U.S.-Mexico relationship has, in the last century or so, been generally marked by high rates of movement of people from south to north across the US-Mexico border. The chief components of this flow are low-skilled workers from Mexico who, most economists agree, tend to fill relatively low-paying jobs in the agricultural, service, and industrial sectors of the US economy. In addition, the regular channels of permanent immigration, based largely on US policy which pivots on family ties, create consistently large pools of new permanent residents and citizens; the US annually grants citizenship to between 500,000-800,000 individuals, one in seven is Mexican (Passel, 2004). This pattern, to a much smaller degree, marks the Mexico-Canada labor relationship. Of interest in this regard is the Canada-Mexico Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program (CSAWP) which offers migrants temporary positions in the agricultural industry. It should also be noted that Canada’s national immigration policy in general actively promotes the legal settlement of a variety of nationals.

Second, labor was affected by the dynamics of economic integration in North America. This process took root through the latter half of the twentieth century and was accelerated in a several trade agreements, notably the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (CUSFTA) in 1988 and NAFTA in 1994. The case of NAFTA, policymakers sold the free trade regime on the basis that it was meant to eventually discourage additional migration from Mexico to the United States by substituting trade for migration. These agreements shifted and reoriented the production and service sectors of the Mexican, Canadian, and U.S. economies, promoted cross-border investment, created and liberalized trading rules. In turn, economic interdependence was fostered; trade and investment tripled among the NAFTA states since 1994. Scholars, however, noted the uneven impacts of this process, pointing out that after the passage of NAFTA, manufacturing sector wages in Mexico declined some 14% while the rural poverty rate increased—as did wage disparities (Uchitelle, 2007; Pastor, 2001; Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002; Hanson, 2003). These impacts have hit groups that tend to migrate to the United States particularly hard; while economists point out that trade may, over the long term, be substitute for migration, this dynamic has not yet occurred in Mexico. This is because the agreement did not create enough formal sector jobs with competitive wages to reduce out-migration pressures, nor did restructuring occur in key agricultural sectors, such as corn. Mexican farmers soon found themselves at a competitive disadvantage when facing subsidized US corn imports.

Accordingly, as several scholars have noted, undocumented migration actually rose once NAFTA was enacted. Nearly matching the relative percentage increase in trade in the post-NAFTA period, undocumented Mexican migration to the United States dramatically increased, from an average of 260,000 per year during the 1990-94 period to approximately 485,000 per year in the 2000-2004 period (Passel, 2005). As Kathleen Newland, director of the Migration Policy Institute, notes, this migratory flow is part of a historic restructuring of the Mexican economy
“comparable to America’s industrial revolution” (Bernstein, 2005). This restructuring continues today.

Thus we can conclude that the processes of North American economic integration create the structural conditions that partly spur migration (Ackleson, 2006). Despite this foreseeable result, the multilateral agreements that paved the way for integration did not adequately deal with the issue of labor. An accord governing the transnational movement of workers is conspicuously absent from both NAFTA and the SPP (Ackleson and Kastner, 2006).

In terms of mobility, these trends, taken as a whole, suggest growing absolute flows of migrants and, in some cases, labor market interdependence. Because of the economic asymmetry that characterizes the US-Mexico and Canada-Mexico relationships, however, gaps in the available and willing endemic labor pools in the US and Canada mean that Mexican and other nationals will continue to be called upon to fill positions in key economic sectors, such as agriculture. In addition, such workers may be increasingly necessary to support social welfare structures, increase productivity, and place downward pressure on prices in key economic sectors, such as food production.

In addition to these relatively low-wage labor flows, all three NAFTA countries have experienced significant increases of cross-border movement of tourists and high-skilled labor, particularly among elements of the business, technical, and professional classes. This was already captured in skilled-labor visa programs, such as the America’s H-2B program. However, as part of the NAFTA agreement, a “TN” visa class was also created. These visas facilitate employment for professionals from Mexico and Canada in the United States, as do other visa classes in Canada and the U.S. Such programs have historically facilitated labor market integration, particularly between the US and Canada.

Identity-Based Regulation

Increased American scrutiny in the post-September 11, 2001 period, however, has significantly slowed or, in one analysis, even halted this process of labor market integration (DeVoretz and Coulombe, 2003). US border security actions, for example, have in effect made crossing the US-Mexico border more difficult and expensive for low-wage labors who are increasingly inclined to stay in the US or Canada once there. Border security measures have also boosted the transaction costs for skilled laborers, such as those on TN visas. Moreover, US authorities are now differentiating between Canadian-born citizens and foreign-born Canadians seeking these visas. Foreign-born Canadians are now required to obtain an additional visa. In some cases, nationals from the Middle East are required to undergo additional registration and fingerprinting. This example is but one of many which suggests the rise of a identity-based mobility regulation regime within post-9/11 North America.

Various international agreements (such as the Smart Border accords) as well as domestic anti-terrorism legislation, such as the US’s Patriot Act,
have legitimized procedures to screen nationals from states of national security “concern,” both upon entry and within North American borders. These efforts are extensive: as part of the Smart Border accords, the US and Canada have agreed on a “safe third country” agreement which affects refugee movement. Scholars have argued that refugees have, in the wake of 9/11, been cast as “security” threats, becoming grouped with economic migrants as marginalized victims of homeland security in an age of terrorism (Guild 2003). Such a reading is consistent with other work that has framed such individuals within the state’s security construct (Bigo, 2002).

Other border security policies in North America—such as fast transit and commuter lanes at land ports of entry—have also increasingly assisted the movement of the professional class and individuals with resources, but not generally for lower-wage or other workers and individuals (Heyman, 2004). One could thus understand contemporary mobility in North America, in part, as reflective of structural inequality—in a sense, a kind of class-based phenomena relative to the host country. When considered in tandem, these types of “exceptions” thus demonstrate the unevenness of the emergent mobility regime, suggesting a much more identity and economic-based admissions protocol.

**Conclusion**

This paper has argued that border controls in North America during the post-9/11 era can be understood in terms of a “bordering/debordering” dialectic: borders in the continent experience sometimes contradictory impulses of regulation and openness. These impulses manifest themselves in a number of ways, including unilateral and international agreements which attempt to condition border controls, material bordering techniques, and an increasingly an economic or identity-based approach to admissions. I have argued the choices each state makes in these areas are informed by competing visions of national interests, primarily security and economic concerns. Based on how states define these interests, some degree of interest balancing occurs in order to try and mediate the trade/security tension at the border. For the US, national security (primarily counter-terrorism) appears as a primary goal. Mexico’s concerns are more rooted in traditional public security matters as well as political and economic interests represented by its substantial migration outflows. Canada remains concerned about security issues but is particularly keen on maintaining as open a frontier with the United States as possible in order because of the economic benefits its trade realizes. These different articulations of national interests indicate just how hard the three partners find it to commonly define security, particularly in terms that are not as central to the United States.

This complicated picture thus suggests an evolving but uneven and rather tenuous border and mobility management regime for North America. It is tenuous because of the practical limits of achieving a highly secure border in such an interconnected and interdependent region which vast cross-border flows. Moreover, cooperation in this area may soon reach its
limits, or even retreat if a security breech occurs from a terrorist attack executed across North America’s internal borders. Should such an event occur, we can expect movement in North America in the future to be even more restricted as states pursue more unilateral and ‘harder’ border control efforts.

Moreover, because the current regime is so uneven, it may not be sustainable in democratic and economic terms since it tends to favor certain economic classes and trade interests but marginalizes “exceptions” such as economic migrants, particular foreign nationals, and refugees.

Steps could be undertaken to make the current mobility regime less tenuous. Additional measures to speed trade flows, for example, make good economic sense and may forestall potential trade diversion due to the economic costs of strict border policing. Another key area for reform is the labor sector: there are strong economic reasons for liberalizing migration flows and creating a more market-based labor market in North America. Such a deal may, in fact, be critical for the future of the project and, more important, economic competitiveness for the NAFTA bloc as a whole. As Ranis (2007) and other economists have argued, the net economic gains for both the originating and destination countries of migrants are significant. Just as international trade is a positive sum game, the labor market in North America could similarly benefit by facilitating greater flows of both unskilled and skilled workers. These benefits include increased, among others, efficiency and productivity, economic support for the sending nation (e.g. remittances), financial support of state welfare structures, downward pressure on prices and, on average, little effects on native labor wages (Ranis, 2007). These gains, and others, have resulted in Europe which worked out labor migration agreements with its less-developed member states during its integration process.

There are also major potential security gains that would come from such a regime. As argued above, continental border security practices can clash heavily with the demands of free trade. Reducing pressures from economic migrants through a wide-ranging guest worker program and legalization, implementing smarter technology at borders, and fostering greater cross-border cooperation on security with both Mexico and Canada would ease the “needle in the haystack” problem of screening out harmful individuals or items at North America’s ports of entry and land, air, and sea borders. Some of these steps are already underway through international agreements, but much more could be done. In fact, addressing the migration question might pave the way for an embryonic security perimeter for North America. Such an initiative would not erase internal borders but would seek to harmonize third party entries at the continent’s external frontiers. While the political dynamics required to achieve such an agreement do not currently exist, the NAFTA partners may eventually find such an initiative is the only way to balance and realize both their economic and security interests. Even if they come to this realization, the variable security environment and demands of globalization will continue to prompt successive, and sometimes contradictory, waves of bordering and debordering in North America.
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Since the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, Canada, the US and Mexico have discussed and explored ways to develop a common approach to enhance security. This last section offers a summary of the institutional response to the new configuration of the threat while providing a comparative analysis and an evaluation of the different agreements signed between the three countries. Authors also reflect on the evolution of the security framework and on the economy-security problematique that North America may experience in the coming decades.
Introduction:
“How to build a better North American Security Space?”

Since the beginning of the 2000s, many American, Canadian and Mexican pundits and politicians call for the creation of a common security space. Different models and approaches have been proposed to guide or describe the process: “Security Perimeter”, “North American Community”, “Partnership”, “Zone of Confidence”, etc.

In 2002, a question similar to the title of this panel was asked to one of the authors. Here is the answer, borrowed from a text describing four different integration scenarios:

The most likely scenario is certainly the second one [an informal, limited and “à la carte” security perimeter] since it’s the easiest one to implement. My own view […] is that I consider the first scenario [a comprehensive treaty, or a community] probably the most efficient and useful for Canadians. If you look at the history of Canada-US relations, institutions have served Canada very well in the past.2

This assessment left aside the “unilateralist scenario” in which actors are seeking the solution in “national” (rather than bilateral or multilateral) initiatives.

Five years later, in the light of the developments than have take place since 2002, are these conclusions still valid? The purpose of this paper is to offer an overview of these various models and proposals, in order to identify those who best describe the current level of progress in the North American integration process. This will allow us to assess which approach seems to bear the most promising prospects for further development in the coming years.

Our conclusions are threefold:

1. From a normative perspective, the most desirable approach is certainly the “community”. Unfortunately, too many obstacles remain, and this scenario is probably impossible to achieve under current circumstances.

2. The most appropriate concept to describe the current stage of the North American Security integration is the “Defence Against Help” (or the “reluctant integrationist”).

3. Considering the numerous obstacles on the road to a deeper integration, the best approach seems the one inspired by neo-functionalism, namely small initiatives in functional, non controversial (eg. non political) areas.

1. A North American Security Perimeter

The concept of “perimeter security” appeared in the North American vocabulary at the beginning of the 2000s, just after the “Ressam Casel1”. It was coined by Canadian officials in their brainstorming on the best approach to deal with border issues and give some guarantees to anxious
American politicians. It was then recuperated by the US Ambassador in Canada, Gordon Giffin, in October 2000. Giffin gave the following rationale for a security perimeter:

At home we must come to grips with common concerns such as the threat of terrorism and cross-border crime to name just two. Issues such as these, not just the ones involving economics, beg the question of whether—over time—we should consider the development of certain perimeter policies which would have us applying similar standards at the continental borders, thereby permitting more efficiency, yet enhanced security, at the 49th parallel. […]

Done right, this border vision would ease the movement of US and Canadian citizens, as well as legitimate continental trade, while permitting our respective law enforcement professionals to focus more of their attention and resources on the actual bad actors. Furthermore, this initiative requires similar or common policies—that is a process of harmonization, not Canada accepting existing US policy, or vice versa.

The concept was also used by Giffin’s successor, Paul Cellucci, in a speech the following summer, just two months before the attacks on New York and Washington.4

The central idea of this concept is to reinforce control of the flow of people and trade coming from outside North America, in order to create a safe space inside the continent. This is supposed to allow a significant reduction of the controls and choking points between Canada and the US. In Giffin’s mind, four kinds of measures could be adopted to create such a perimeter:

1. Enhancing existing measures, procedures and facilities;
2. Using state-of-the-art technologies as tools of border management;
3. Reinforcing cooperation between agencies of the two states and;
4. Harmonizing American and Canadian security policies.

This logic, as we will see, will be used in the “Big Idea” concept.

For the moment, let’s note that this concept attracted a lot of criticism from Jean Chrétien’s Liberal government. The idea of harmonization, in particular, was perceived as an infringement on Canadian sovereignty, to the point that the term was officially banned from the government vocabulary (Roussel, 2002a:673). Nevertheless, the idea remains, embedded in the “Big Idea”. Not surprisingly, many criticisms addressed to the “perimeter” concept were very similar to those addressed to the “Big Idea” concept.


This concept shares many similarities with perimeter security, but it reflects an economic logic similar to the one that inspired the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Actually, the “Big Idea” (or “big bang”, as some call it) is first and foremost conceived as an
important (if not necessary) phase in the deepening/broadening process of NAFTA, and a first step toward full blown continental integration. By sharing US concerns for security, Canadians could hope to convince Washington to negotiate a customs union or even a common market. The “Big Idea” thus draws a direct link between prosperity and security.

Another incentive behind the “Big Idea” is to avoid another “September 12th” effect. Canadian manufacturers recall vividly the 20 or 30 km long line of trucks waiting to cross the border in the days and weeks following the attacks. In a production world were the “just in time delivery” principle is widely used, such delays are nothing else than a call to the US industry to move their plants back to the US.

The notion of a “deal” with the United States is implicit in the “Big Idea”. If Canadians reinforce (or harmonize) their security measures against foreign threats to the US, Washington would be more willing to take the road of economic integration.

Not surprisingly, the most forceful advocates of the “Big Idea” can be found among the members of (national, provincial and local) Chambers of Commerce. Economists such as Wendy Dobson and Daniel Schwanen are also among the most vocal promoters of this concept.

At first glance, this concept seems to make sense. First, it describes the basic principles that would guide the process of integration, shaping the expectations of each partner and establishing guidelines for their cooperation. Second, it gives certain guarantees to all parties over the long term: For the US, it means that Canada will not be a safe heaven for terrorist. For Canada, it means that the border will remain open whatever happens. This is the same logic the Canadians followed when they signed NAFTA in 1988 and 1992: to keep an access to US markets (Roussel, 2002b:15-22).

The Big Bang approach seems attractive—in theory. In practice, however, numerous obstacles remain to be overcome. While Big Ideas promoters remain vague about the position of Mexico in this scheme, it’s hard to see how Mexicans will passively accept the creation of a “multi-level North America economic space” where they could be treated as “second class passengers”. Any serious integration project must include Mexico. This raises a whole set of issues which are not present in Canada-US relation, i.e. lack of trust, corruption, aggressive anti-Americanism, disparity of resources, differences in the management and organization of internal security, etc (Hristoulas and Roussel, 2004:41-57).

But even if one leaves Mexico out of the picture, the implementation of the “Big Idea” remains problematic. The most important problem is the lack of political will, both in Washington and Ottawa. For the US government, the present arrangements, whereby the United States deals with its security interests vis-à-vis Canada and Mexico on a bilateral basis, seem to satisfy both sides. For Canadians, closer relations with the US simply means adapting their own institutions and regulations to American standards. This is why the Canadian government fiercely banned the concept of “Perimeter”.
Along the same lines, the priorities of all three North American governments also constitute a problem.

Oversimplifying the issue, one can say with some level of accuracy that Washington is mainly worried about the security of the US homeland, while Ottawa is preoccupied by trade concerns. And if one wants to make things more complex, let’s add that Mexicans want some kind of substantial migration agreement. To make matters worse, when the three states deal with security issues, they do so from different starting points, mainly because they have developed distinct strategic cultures. Each partner perceives differently the nature of the threats coming from outside of the continent and the means necessary to face them, especially with regards to the use of force.5

Another frequent criticism points at the risk of establishing a practice of “issue linking”, something that Canadians have usually avoided in their relation with the US because, in the long term, they will always be at disadvantage.

The persistence of nationalism, in Mexico as well as in Canada, also creates some obstacles. Many of the opponents of the Big Idea are “nationalist” in their critiques. For example, Andrew Jackson pointed out “the negative implications for distinctive Canadian values”:

Specifically, the “Big Idea” challenges our necessary ability to shape industrial development, to control our energy sector and move towards a more environmentally sustainable economy; to levy taxes at the level needed to maintain a distinctive Canadian social model, and to limit the impacts of International trade and investment agreements on our social and cultural policies (Jackson, 2003:12-19).6

“Nationalist” authors also regret the economical over-determinism in the Big Idea proposal. While trade is at the heart of the project, social, sovereignty and identity issues are simply brushed aside—if they are considered at all. This is why it remains an economist’s dream, with no support in the public and among politicians.

The very foundation of the Big Idea—the relation between trade and security—remains unclear. On one hand, it seems clear that the bilateral agreements signed in the years before 2001 such as, Canada-United States: Accord on Our Shared Border, Border Vision and Canada-U.S. Partnership Forum (CUSP) were designed to improve the cross-border flow of goods and peoples. On the other hand, as the authors of this paper have argued in another paper, there was no clear “spillover effect” from the trade area to the defence sector (Fortmann and Roussel, 2003). The relation between trade and security/defence is still an “uncharted area”, an issue that is often neglected in discussing economic integration.

Finally, there is no guarantee that a formal treaty will really keep the US market open for Canadian products. If another attack occurs in the US, even a formal treaty cannot guarantee that US security authorities will comply and not suddenly tighten security controls at the border—as it
was the case in the weeks following September 11, 2001. Moreover, as the softwood lumber case clearly shows, there is no guarantee that non-state actors will comply with the provisions (or the spirit) of such an agreement. Hence, the Big Idea is certainly an attractive concept, but considering this long list of criticisms, obstacles and uncertainties, it can hardly be more than that. As stated by the American Assembly a few months ago, practical political constraints “rule out such grand design as a customs union or common currency, which some have called for in the past” (Haglund and Jockel, 2006:6).

3. The North American Security Community

The concept of “security community” was proposed by a research team formed around Karl Deutsch in the mid-1950s. According to Deutsch, “A security community... is a group of states that has become integrated, where integration is defined as the attainment of a sense of community, accompanied by formal or informal institutions or practices, sufficiently strong and widespread to assure peaceful change among members of a group with reasonable certainty over a long period of time” (Deutsch et al., 1957). Deutsch and his colleagues studied the objective conditions favouring the establishment of a security community and, with it, the abandonment of recourse to war: common values, behavioural predictability, and “resonance,” this last being the ability to account for the interests of the other members of the group and to respond to them appropriately (Deutsch et al., 1957:66-68).

Forgotten during most of the Cold War, the notion of a security community has been rediscovered and developed by authors like Barry Buzan, Emmanuel Adler and Michael Barnett in the 1980s and 1990s (Adler and Barnett, 1998). These last two authors distinguish between amalgamated security communities (like the European Community), and pluralistic security communities (such as North America). While an amalgamated security community is the result of a merging process between two or more independent states, a “pluralistic security community” is a community in which the political components remain independent, but ban the use of force in their mutual relation (Deutsch et al., 1957).

The pluralistic security community is based on two central elements: identity and communication. The notion of a “sense of community” is, in the first instance, the product of a process of identification.

The kind of sense of community that is relevant for integration... turned out to be a matter of mutual sympathy and loyalties identification in terms of self-images and interests; of mutually successful predictions of behavior, and of cooperative action in accordance with it —in short, a matter of a perpetual dynamic process of mutual attention, communication, perception of needs, and responsiveness in the process of decision-making (Deutsch et al., 1957:36).
The emergence of a sense of community (and thus of a kind of common identity) results from a “transactionalist” conception of international relations, that is, an approach that places the process of communication at the heart of the analysis. The community is created by the circulation of ideas and of individuals. Factors such as trade, scientific and cultural exchanges, migration, and tourism, generally discounted by the realists, here occupy a central position because they contribute to the forging of a common identity between actors having a sufficiently dense and diversified set of exchanges (Adler and Barnett, 1996:66-67, 74-75). Communities may be identified not only by indicators relating to identity and transactions, but also by their adoption of common practices and institutions. Moreover, the concept, in its common acceptance, implies a diversified conception of security, as well as a multilateral driven approach (in the “Ruggian” sense of the term8) to international security problems. Tight economic relations are important as a form of exchange between societies, but this is not, per se, a definitive condition.

What are the prospects for the development of a “community” among the three members of NAFTA? For authors like Robert Pastor and Alejandro Chanona, North America is progressively becoming a pluralistic security community, “understood as a transnational region formed by sovereign States that maintain expectations of pacific changes” (Chanona, 2005). Chanona specifically argues that North America is growing from a nascent to an ascendant community, this phase being characterized by a “strengthening of bonding networks, by new institutions and organizations, as well as by the coordination and collaboration of the Armed Forces of the states cooperating with one another.

More specifically, Chanona raises several points in support of his argument. First of all, Canada, the United States and Mexico are currently close to sharing a common multidimensional view of security, even if their priorities are far from similar. Most of all, the three governments certainly agree on the fact that the real threat to the region will not take the form of a military attack from another state. As stated in many official documents and public statements, Ottawa, Mexico and Washington understand that the real threats to national security are rooted in global poverty, economic inequality and lack of education. They also take multiple forms (environmental destruction, diseases, illegal immigration, transnational crime, drug trafficking, terrorism), and cannot be tackled on a national basis alone.

Despite their differences, and this is Chanona’s second point, the three North American countries have increased their cooperation, especially in the area of border management. The Smart Border agreements are the most illustrative aspect of the new institutional network being set up along the US-Mexican and US-Canadian borders. One of the most notable Smart Border initiatives at the Canada-U.S land border is NEXUS, a clearance system that uses high-tech cards to allow frequent travellers, mostly businessmen, to cross the border more quickly. SENTRI, which stands for Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection, is the equivalent of NEXUS along the US-Mexico border.
Many other cooperative measures have been adopted in the wake of the Smart Border agreements, which have been updated in 2003 and 2004. Is the North American region evolving from a “loosely coupled” security community, i.e. a cooperative group of independent states, to a “tightly coupled” one, i.e. a community that has adopted the principle of collective security and is building a framework of common transnational and supranational institutions (Adler and Barnet, 1996)? Some observers—Chanoma among them—perceive the Waco Summit of March 2005, where the three heads of states signed the Security and Prosperity Partnership, as the first institutional step toward such a community. The SSP’s long-term purpose is indeed to “create an architecture which would further enhance the security of North America while at the same time promote the economic well-being of our citizens”. Increased economic and security integration is clearly spelled out as a goal of the SPP, and the ambitious scope of the agreement—which encompasses a common Steel Strategy by 2006, a fully integrated auto sector, and a sustainable energy economy—clearly establishes the basis of this integration process.

Many authors however remain sceptical regarding the relevance and applicability of the notion of security community in the North American context. The notion of community implies common identities and values. Is it really the case in North America? Of course, Canada and the US are sharing political values, such as democracy, individual liberties and free market economy. This commonality probably explains, in part at least, the emergence of a “narrow” security community between the two Northern neighbours (Adler and Barnett, 1996:295-332). Mexico also appears to share most of these values, but progress remains to be made to attain the same level of development as its partners. Corruption, an archaic judicial system, lack of social protection and even human rights violations remain too widespread in Mexico.

Even between Canada and the US, the gap widens, as authors like Daniel Drache (2004) and Michael Adams (2003) express it. Canadians simply do not share the same world view as their southern neighbours. They support multilateralism and stronger international institutions. They favour peace and are strongly opposed to the use of force in international relations. Even on domestic issues they are more tolerant and more acceptant of diversity. In the present context, a majority of Canadians favour a more independent approach from US policy, and even the new Conservatives in Ottawa will have to follow the public’s lead (Drache, 2005:123). The notion that Canada, Mexico and the United States are getting closer together is belied by the diverging public perceptions in all three states. As Daniel Drache puts it: “In this post-NAFTA, post 9/11 age, the broadening and deepening of North American integration is largely a dead issue” (Drache, 2005:125).

4. Defence Against Help (or the Reluctant Integrationists)

The concept of “Defence Against Help” was proposed by Nils Ørvik during the Cold War, when attempting to describe the complex relations between
great powers and their weaker allies. He used this notion to suggest a specific approach to US-Canadian security relations (Ørvik, 1973:228-231). In his own words: “[The US] expects Canada [...] to act firmly and effectively to prevent any foreign intruder from gaining control of even the smallest, most desolate part of our nation [...] If we did not so, or even unduly delayed our response, the United States would offer its help in a way that we could not refuse” (Drache, 2005:229). In others words, by taking care of their own security, Canadians can ease the security concerns of its neighbour. This will guarantee Canadian security in case of a crisis and minimize the danger that the US would think it necessary to violate Canadian sovereignty to protect its own interest (Drache, 2005:229).

In the context of the Cold War and NATO, this meant strengthening multilateral ties with European allies who were likely to play the role of counterweights. But in the North American context, “Defence Against Help” is essentially another word for “preventive unilateralism”: By improving proactively its own security against terrorism, Canada hopes to forestall drastic measures that Washington could take in order to reinforce its security at the US-Canadian border. “Defence Against Help” also implies a certain level of cooperation with the US, but a minimal one. Where national measures seem enough to re-assure the Americans, there is no incentive to move in the direction of closer cooperation.

While this concept has been used to describe Canadian policies, it applies very well to the two other North American States. Contrary to what one may think, many of the major initiatives taken by the three North American “partners” are not aimed at reinforcing or deepening the integration process. In many cases, it is quite the opposite.

The US was the first to signal its intentions by creating two major institutions that have a considerable impact on its continental relations. The first is the Office (now Department) of Homeland Security, created in 2001. Among other things, this Department is responsible for Border Security. The second is the Northern Command which was established in October 2002. The latter is responsible, specifically, “for security cooperation and military coordination with Canada and Mexico”. These two “national” institutions dramatically changed the institutional landscape of North America. While they have a direct and unavoidable impact on the two neighbours of the United States (more than any other state), Washington never seriously sought to consult them before moving along. No alternative multilateral security arrangement was considered either in Washington.

Canadian reactions to the creation of the department were twofold. In the days following the announcement of the new Command (April 17, 2002), the Canadian government insisted that Canada would remain outside this structure (as if there was an invitation to participate—which was not the case!). Ottawa repeatedly stated that Northcom did not represent a threat to Canadian sovereignty. During the following Summer, American and Canadian officials negotiated an agreement for the creation of the Binational Planning Group (announced in August and created in
December). Hence, even if Americans and Canadians established an institutional link between the Northcom and the Canadians Forces, they did so reluctantly. The agreement, renewed in 2004, will be discussed again next May. There is no guarantee that this arrangement will be maintained (for the reason described below). No such arrangement exists with Mexico.

The Canadian reaction to September 11 followed a double track. On one hand, two major agreements were negotiated with the American government on border security in December 2001, and a third one, on the “Third Safe Country”, was concluded the following summer. But the bulk of the Canadian efforts was “national”. In 2001-02, these efforts took the form of a dramatic increase in the security budget (December 10, 2001) and the adoption of the four pieces of legislation against terrorism (Bills C-16, C-11, C-36 and C-17). In December 2003, the newly appointed Martin’s government created the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, which is the equivalent of the Department of Homeland Security. In the 2005 International Policy Statement, the government announced the creation of the Canada Command, which is the functional counterpart of the Northern Command.

Canadian politicians and civil servants deny that these administrative reorganizations represent reactions to US initiatives. Leaving aside the issue of their origin, these new departments are now the vis-à-vis of their American counterparts, and their privileged point of contact. Prima facie, it may be good news for North American integrationists. The two countries are now on the same wavelength and they can move ahead by building other institutional bridges between them.

As we argued elsewhere, the facts could be interpreted differently (Massie and Roussel). For example, the creation of Cancom has rendered the Binational Planning Group redundant. This is why it might not be renewed. Hence, the creation of national institutions like Cancom could, in fact, weaken binational cooperation. Since the future of NORAD itself is not guaranteed, the risk is even greater. From that perspective, the creation of the Department of Public Safety and Canada Command are not necessarily good news for continental cooperation. Quite the contrary: they can be perceived as defensive measures against American unilateralism!

Turning now to the relations between Mexico with the United States and Canada, it is true that the period following 2001 has witnessed a rash of bilateral and even trilateral cooperation. The agreement to create a smart border with Mexico, which was signed on March 21, 2002, was updated in 2004. Several organizations and working groups have been set up on issues ranging from the protection of infrastructures to energy, telecommunications, transportation, health and agriculture. Mexico’s Customs Department and its US counterpart are working on common law enforcement and customs procedures (Chanona, 2005:10).

The bilateral cooperation between Mexico and Washington, however, does not extend to the area of defense. Specifically, Mexico does not wish to participate in any bilateral or trilateral mechanism of intelligence sharing or joint military training. The Mexican government also refused
any involvement in Northcom. As Chanona puts it: “Given tradition in the matter of foreign policy and internal conditions, it is clear that, for the time being, Mexico will not risk participating in any security system involving direct armed forces participation” (Chanona, 2005:12).

Thus, unilateralism is still the concept that applies best to describe US-Mexico security relations. Mexican armed forces pursue their fight against drug trafficking, illegal immigration and terrorism to placate as best as they can their northern neighbour. The United States authorities, on the other hand, promote their own security agenda by strengthening controls, militarizing the surveillance of the border area with minimal regard for its southern neighbour’s interests.

Conclusion: A Neo-Functionalist Approach for North America?

The first conclusion of this paper is certainly that the prospects for further integration are not very bright. Technical obstacles, political disinterest, popular sensitivities are probably too numerous to allow the realization of a grand design. Hence, concepts such as Perimeter security, Big Idea, or North American security Community seem way too much ahead of the political reality of North America.

Having said this, one must recognize that some progress has been made over the last years. The two Smart Border agreements (2001 and 2002), the creation of BPG (2002), the Canada-Mexico Partnership (2005), the Security and Prosperity Partnership (2005), etc., are examples of fragile, marginal progress, but progress nevertheless. So the big picture is far from desperate.

The three North American states are reluctant integrationists who seem to practice the “defence against help” approach rather then the “Coal and Steel” one. The fact that they still move in this direction is probably the best clue that some integrationist forces are at play at the economic, political and social levels. In other words, even if they don’t like it, the three governments can’t ignore these forces, and are bound to move ahead. As we have already showed in another paper, the rationale for the security and defence integration remains, no matter what the obstacles are (Hristoulas, and Roussel, 2004). Integration makes sense, even if it hurts nationalist feelings.

In this context dominated by opposite forces, what is the best approach to build a North American space? One solution seems to bring us back to the original “Coal and steel” approach, the functionalist one. Functionalism, as it was described by David Mitrany (1943) in the 1940s, calls for an “indirect approach”. Instead of launching an illusory quest for a Grand design, it seems more promising to start with “baby steps”, i.e. small and discrete initiatives in technical and non controversial areas. The Canada-Mexico Partnership is certainly a good example of this approach, as it entails cooperation in various low-profile or technical sectors (city management, agriculture, student and scientific exchanges, etc.). In the realm of security, a promising area could be emergency preparedness, where
standardization of methods and equipments is crucial (as it is in the military area). Health is another promising sector, especially with the perspective of a bird flu pandemic or a bioterrorist attack. Emergency communication, second language training, and maritime surveillance are other examples of modest and practical steps in the right direction. These kinds of initiatives are more easily undertaken than demanding institution-building projects, such as NORAD, that require long-term cooperation and strong traditions which are lacking between Mexico and its two northern neighbours.

This “neo-functionalist approach” to North American integration is probably one of the only methods to achieve real progress. As Mitrany predicted, it could create a habit of cooperation and be the cradle of a stronger North American solidarity and identity.
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The North American security relationship is complex, fraught with biased analysis by parties with vested interests, and a moving target. Our analyses are destined to be out of date as soon as we write them. Moreover, we discuss North American security without always knowing what we mean. What is a perimeter? Who would it secure, and from what? What would a secure North America look like? The answers to these questions may be different depending on whether you are standing in Ottawa, Washington, or Mexico City, to say nothing of Halifax, Los Angeles, or Tijuana. For instance, a perimeter could mean anything from eliminating the border between the North American states to a broad, over-arching security agreement on the model of NAFTA to a set of linked agreements on technical issues. Survey data which asks about “perimeters” or “integration” is of limited utility when the terms are not defined. Security is viewed through the lens of terrorism in the United States. Canadians are also concerned about terrorism, although Canada’s view of security is also heavily influenced by its need also to protect itself from the economic ramifications of an American reaction to any terrorist attack.

In this paper I seek, first, to provide an overview of the models most often used for thinking about security in North America, and to consider the advantages and disadvantages of each. Second, I turn to a discussion of questions and caveats which should be kept in mind when designing or re-considering any new agreement for improving North American security. I will focus principally on the Canadian-American relationship. I suggest that a focus on the contrast between perimeters and frontiers is something of a false dichotomy, and that a focus on borders is at once foolhardy, because security happens away from the borders as well, and necessary, because sovereignty remains a vital consideration.

Model 1: The Big Idea

The Canadian Council of Chief Executives contends that “Canada’s interests, as well as those of the United States and Mexico, will be served best by a strategy that is continental in its scope, comprehensive in its approach, and coherent in its development and execution” (Canadian Council of Chief Executives, 2007). Big idea models of security integration in North America contend that security is at its most efficient when North American co-operation is undertaken as a unified whole, rather than separated into functional baskets. Proponents generally make implicit or explicit arguments that economic integration will lead to greater security in North America (Gotlieb, Dobson et al., 2005). The greatest threat to Canada’s security and sovereignty in face of a terrorist attack is the loss of prosperity when the United States closes in on itself after an attack; big idea integration, therefore, secures Canada’s prosperity by ensuring that it is on the inside. Moreover, it avoids a border-centric approach to security that might leave important venues for co-operation at the margins.

There are number of problems with this model. The first is that it relies on a misplaced analogy to Europe. A Europe of twenty-five and a North America of three are not the same. Europe’s big powers-the United Kingdom, Germany, and France-balance each other out, and the power
differentials between these and the other European states are not as great as in North America. What we can learn from Europe is that if a big idea for continental security is going to work, it will only work if the states involved enter into the agreement as a deliberate, conscious decision, as happened at several points during the European integration process. Europeans made a conscious decision to integrate for security and economic reasons in the aftermath of the Second World War. The ‘long war’ or ‘war on terrorism’ is unlikely to provide similar imperatives to North Americans. Second, a big idea integration needs to learn from Europe’s “multiple speeds.” Many lament that North America consists of two bilateral relationships instead of a trilateral one. Given the differentials in size and development, this is inevitable. Part of the European Union’s success has been in institutionalizing the relationship so that states can participate in some parts and not in others, and in creating clear criteria for joining co-operative measures. It would be necessary for North America too, but with so few countries involved, it may also destroy the idea of an over-arching agreement.

The most important drawback to the big idea model of security co-operation is that no one in government seems to want it. Even shortly after September 11th, when talk of a North American security perimeter was prevalent in the news, Canadian politicians frequently asserted that erasing the border was out of the question, and that a perimeter did not mean integration (Kitchen, 2004). Mexican and American politicians have been similarly reticent. Moreover, studies show that Canadians do not perceive terrorism to be as great a threat to their own security as Americans do. They are more likely to identify abstract security risks like environmental degradation. Canadians tend to view security through the lens of economics, because for Canadians, responding to terrorism also means responding to the American response to terrorism. These differing perspectives may explain why Canada has tended to use an all-hazards approach to emergency management, while this approach has sometimes been obscured by the overwhelming focus on terrorism in the United States. Different approaches make co-operation harder.

Model 2: Transgovernmental Networks

The North American relationship is characterized by the close personal relationships shared by bureaucrats within the Canadian, American, and Mexican governments. According to Anne-Marie Slaughter, these networks can provide the function of governance without the form (Slaughter, 2004:4). Ideally, such networks can provide the maximum inclusion of affected parties in transgovernmental deliberations; a recognition of legitimate difference deriving from an appreciation that there are many ways of organizing societies; consultation and assistance rather than unilateralism; a system of checks and balances; and subsidiarity or governance at the lowest possible level (Slaughter, 2004:29-30). Relations in the security sector—encompassing defence, intelligence, and diplomacy—are traditionally those which rely most heavily on personal relationships, not just in North America, but internationally. Moreover, it
is in these branches of the public service that officers are more likely to make a whole career, meaning that personal relationships can continue to the senior ranks.

Transgovernmentalism is the analytical model that best describes the North American relationship most of the time. It, too, has drawbacks when used as the basis for an agreement for intelligent integration. While such networks may provide accountability internationally, there is still the fear that decisions about the future of North America are being made by a group of unelected bureaucrats, though one might counter that they often have the support of elected officials. Related to this criticism is the fear that transgovernmentalism means integration without consent. In February 2007, a small furor occurred when documents revealed that at a meeting of the North American Forum which included highly-placed politicians and bureaucrats, revealed that members discussed whether the unpopular idea of a “North American Union” might be countered with “evolution by stealth” (Patterson, 2007).

Model 3: Smart Co-operation

The latest major intergovernmental in the field of North American relations is the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), which grew out of the success of the Smart Border Accords signed between Canada and the United States and Mexico and the United States just after September 11th. The smart model of co-operation combines elements of big idea co-operation with transgovernmentalism to create a hybrid. There are three elements to the smart model of co-operation: bureaucratic co-operation on technical and policy issues; high-level political attention; and implementation across a defined issue area (Kitchen, 2004). Technical and policy co-operation seeks to maximize the gains from co-operation where it is easy. For instance, if policies are different but have the same goals and purpose, they could be re-written to be the same. More importantly, this kind of cooperation seeks to generate the trust necessary to allow for policy divergence: recognition of Anne-Marie Slaughter’s principle of legitimate difference as described above. From the big idea model, the smart model takes the idea that it is necessary to have high-level political attention to ensure effective collaboration. Elected officials need to have a stake in making sure that agreements are implemented. Finally, restricting co-operation to defined issue areas dilutes the fear that co-operation leads to integration by stealth, while at the same time providing a way to measure success and accountability because it is easier to set goals and deadlines.

Nevertheless, this model, too, falls prey to the criticisms of the big idea model and the transgovernmental model. The Security and Prosperity Partnership has been criticized for being integration by stealth, but also for being a disappointment because it is little more than a mess of working groups most of which pre-date it (Paris 26 Feb 2007). The SPP may be too broad to be manageable; indeed, the three government leaders have decided to focus on emergency management, pandemics, and safe and secure gateways as priorities. None of these priorities stops at the borders of North America. These drawbacks aside, the smart model of
Co-operation may succeed in North America because it combines limited comprehensiveness with manageable goals, and, in theory at least, does not threaten the sovereignty of the three individual nations.

In the second part of this paper, however, I want to argue that there are a number of other factors which ought to be considered when evaluating agreements for efficient security co-operation in North America.

1. Co-operation does not require identity

Accounts of a North American security perimeter or a NAFTA-plus rely on the idea that North America forms a values community or has a shared North American identity. These are not quite the same thing; it is possible to share values without sharing an identity. North Americans can believe in the same things without necessary believing that this makes them part of a particular in-group. Whether or not North Americans share values is a point of debate; authors such as Michael Adams suggest that they do not (Adams, 2004). Co-operation, even on security issues, does not require a shared identity beyond the ability to agree on a few shared goals and to develop the mutual confidence and trust to ensure that agreements will be kept. Agreements for security co-operation can be evaluated more soberly if we decouple the idea of a common identity from other imperatives to co-operation.

A more interesting question is whether North American security co-operation requires shared values. Values are part of national identity, and values are central to security agreements in a way which they may not be in trade agreements. Canadians and Americans have differing views of privacy and civil liberties, of the importance of migration, on deportation and many other issues. Friction on the basis of values is evident in negotiations regarding developing common no-fly lists and the Maher Arar case. Security is typically seen as the most difficult realm of international relations in which to sustain agreements because security is about survival. Survival, however, may also mean the survival of an identity, and so disagreements over values may also make agreement harder (Buzan, Waever et al., 1998). This is one of the reasons policy makers focus as often as possible on making agreements on non-controversial or technical matters.

2. Canada is still a mouse sleeping next to an elephant

Decades after Trudeau coined the phrase, Canada and Mexico in North America are still sleeping with an elephant. While relations between the United States and its smaller neighbours run smoothly most of the time, the United States is still a superpower with control over its sovereign territory.

Unilateral American decisions taken outside of co-operative initiatives like the SPP can cause difficulty for its allies. For instance, the United States’ demand to obtain personal passenger data from airlines proved controversial with many of its allies, especially Europeans. In Canada, the American government’s refusal to review the Maher Arar case, long after
the Canadian government absolved him of accusations of terrorism, chafes. Even when institutional safeguards exist, they do not always work: witness the failure of NAFTA’s dispute resolution mechanism in the softwood lumber dispute.

Gotlieb, Dobson and Hart ask, rhetorically, “when the wagons circle, do Canadians want to be on the outside looking in or the other way around?” (Gotlieb, Dobson et al., 2005). But this is a false dichotomy. Short of complete integration, beyond even what exists in the European Union, where there are caveats on the participation of many countries in the Schengen Agreement, there is no guarantee that Canada (or Mexico) would be on the inside looking out in case of a major terrorist attack. In fact, it is almost certain that the United States would act much as it did post-9/11. None of the North American countries, least of all the United States, would give up so much control over its borders (Sokolsky and Lagassé, 2006). In this context it is worth recalling that many of the initiatives which went into the Smart Border Agreements, and subsequently the SPP, existed before 9/11 or at least their foundations did (Farson, 2006:33). They did not prevent the back-ups at the border on September 11th, and would be unlikely to now. Canadians and Mexicans need to be wary of cooperation out of the hope that it will keep the borders open in the event of a terrorist attack, because this hope may be in vain.

3. North America does not exist in a vacuum

It is easy for Americans to become overly focused on their national security, and Canadians to become focused on North America. But the transnational networks on which North American security relies extend beyond North America’s borders. North American security and defensive anti-terrorism do not end at the coastline. This becomes more true if we follow the all-hazards approach to security planning, which holds that prevention and response mechanisms for terrorism must work for other kinds of disasters. The SARS outbreak of 2002-2003 was particularly severe in Toronto, and could not have been prevented by a strict focus on continental mechanisms for disease containment. Avian flu poses similar risks, and similar imperatives to a global response. Even non-global disasters may require a global response: NATO co-ordinated airlifts of aid to victims of Hurricane Katrina in the United States in the fall of 2005.

Terrorist threats follow the same pattern. We know that the 9/11 attacks were planned at least partially in Europe. Cyber-attacks can originate anywhere and responses may not be territorially based. In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, NATO AWACS planes patrolled the skies over the American east coast. Responses to terrorism in Canada and the United Staets may originate in international organizations like the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization. Other defensive initiatives rightly extend around the globe: the FBI shares liaison officers not just with Canada, but with other countries as well (Handelmann, 2002). The NYPD, likewise, co-operates with other police departments around the world (Kelly, 7 July 2005; Finnegan, 2005). North Americans are familiar with NEXUS, SENTRI, and FAST, the projects
for expedited clearance of pre-screened passengers and goods, but the United States’s Container Security Initiative (CSI) operated in 50 ports around the world by the fall of 2006, protecting the most common method of transporting cargo (Customs and Border Protection, 2006). Most cargo today travels by container and may use multiple modes of transportation and visit several ports before reaching North America. Intelligence co-operation is essential to anti-terrorism and operates at various levels of intensity with partners around the world. It is interesting to note that American and Canadian intelligence networks are much stronger with Europe than with Mexico.

For all three North American countries, there is a danger that in our focus on security North America or our national borders we will lose sight of the need to secure the networks we rely on. The arguments which make North American security co-operation plausible operate, albeit to a less intense degree, globally. For Canada, parochialism brings another risk as well. If we focus all of our energy on the United States, we may become unable to fulfill our global responsibilities as we prefer to define them. We may also lose our institutional capacity to make and implement good decisions outside of the United States. We also risk exacerbating the already great dependence on the United States by making it harder to capitalize on opportunities for co-operation with non-American allies, with whom we also share interests, which sometimes contrast with those of the United States.

**Conclusion: There is and there is no frontier**

North Americans can only prepare so much for a terrorist attack, and they can only expect their agreements to protect them in face of the things they have planned for. The North American security agenda is always susceptible to being co-opted, as it was on September 11th, by something it barely considered and planned for. This is not to say that North Americans should not endeavour to co-operate on their security—indeed, they should—but that they must recognize that they can only prepare for so much, and that the best-negotiated agreements may fail to hold in times of great crisis.

No matter what the institutional form of security co-operation in North America, Canadians need to make sure that it protects their interests both in North America and the world, and preserves Canada’s ability to make independent decisions about its foreign and domestic policy. Scaremongering, both about the extent of the terrorist threat to North America (Friedman, 2005) the desirability or inevitability of security co-operation (Bernard-Meunier, 2005) needs to be balanced with sober consideration of Canada’s interests, and the need for Canadian voters to make essential decisions about things which affect Canadian sovereignty. These decisions should be made cognizant of the paradox that there is and there is no frontier. One the one hand, much of the day-to-day stuff of North American security happens away from the border. Goods are pre-cleared, critical infrastructure is protected, airports are major points of entry. Networks extend around the globe. On the other hand, North American
integration is a very long way from being anything other than three states jealous of their sovereignty, even when they pool it. National security and sovereignty starts and ends at the frontier. Americans know this, and Canadians and Mexicans need to remember it when they make agreements for an intelligent frontier.

*I would like to thank Margaret Purdy for her extremely helpful comments on this paper.*
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The social and political implications of regional integration processes have been widely studied. In some cases, economic regionalisation has been driven by political considerations. In Europe, as is widely known, the integration process was explicitly propelled by grand political motivations. In the words of Jean Monnet, “to create Europe” was to “create peace”.

In the early years of NAFTA the political implications of the integration enterprise were also intensely debated. This was particularly the case in Mexico, where a 70 year old regime had resisted internal pressures favoring democratization. NAFTA’s sway over these developments became clear in 1994 as Mexico’s political opening gathered force. Notwithstanding this, integration in North America, whether in Mexico, Ottawa or Washington, remained primarily predicated along economic terms and goals. In NAFTA’s original mandate neither politics nor security were expected to be part of the equation.

Although by the late 1990’s the intensification of licit trans-border flows and rising people mobility in North America had already provided important signs of a new security environment, 9/11 tragically provided a new and unprecedented sense of urgency. Without a doubt, the attacks radically transformed the context of integration between the US, Canada and Mexico, placing security at the fore.1

The terrorist attacks mobilized the NAFTA partners into a series of decisions and measures that are likely to have important consequences for regional security and security cooperation in North America. The attacks prompted all three partners to agree on a basic framework aimed at reassuring the US while attempting to improve regional security in North America. What became known as the Smart Border Agreements were swiftly negotiated and implemented, between Canada and the US at the end of 2001 and soon after by Mexico and the United States. While in the short term these measures may have helped reassure the US, their overall impact remains uncertain.

This chapter attempts to provide a framework of analysis for the role that security has played and will continue to play in NAFTA. As has become painfully clear, in North America, as elsewhere, security has become tied-in with the regionalization process. The paper thus draws attention to the role of economic integration as a producer of regional security dynamics. The chapter looks briefly at NAFTA as a producer of both security and insecurity in the region and reflects on those changes that have transformed NAFTA into an avid consumer of security. The capacity of Canada, Mexico and the US to meet this sudden increase in the demand for regional security may prove central not only to NAFTA’s future, but also to the nature of the overall integration enterprise in North America. The trends that we have recently observed in North America open up a series of questions about the conditions under which security may act as
an engine for, or a brake upon integration and about the role that security is likely to play in future regional dynamics.

NAFTA and the Production of Insecurity in North America

When it was ratified in 1993, NAFTA established the first integration scheme (other than those based on colonial or ex-colonial links) between a developing country, Mexico, and two developed states, Canada and the US (Bulmer-Thomas, Craske, Serrano, 1994:204). A decade later, its success in terms of trade and investment was of such magnitude that the World Bank actively promoted it as a model for developing states. Trade between Mexico and the US had increased four-fold, trade between Canada and the US had more than doubled and trade between Canada and Mexico had also increased by 150%. Between 1993 and 2005 trade between NAFTA partners increased from US$288,530 bn to US$772,172 bn. As important as this absolute increase in trade has been the rise in intra-regional trade in North America. Indeed, in the course of two decades, trade with each other, as a percentage of the three countries’ world trade, jumped from one third to over 50% and evolved along intra-firm and intra-industry lines.

NAFTA’s trade achievements have been unprecedented, but it soon became clear that its success would come with some unprecedented consequences. Notwithstanding this, relations among all three parties remained, for a considerable period of time, based on the assumption that trade and economic integration could and should be effectively separated from the high politics of foreign policy and security (MacFarlane and Serrano, 2005). In all three countries, views about regional integration were heavily shaped by history and by a regional context characterized by deep and widening asymmetries. In both Canada and Mexico, deep-seated unease about US hegemony tempered their wholehearted support for more ambitious forms of integration. Similarly, in the US, a long established preference for loosely institutionalised forms of regionalism appears to have played in favor of free-trade and limited integration. Confidence in their ability to keep integration bounded within the walls of free-trade reflected a common concern with issues related to sovereignty. Yet, the capacity of the NAFTA governments to control regional processes was soon called into question by developments on the ground.

By the mid 1990s, the results were not necessarily those that the three partners had envisaged. Regional integration among the three countries had taken them a considerable distance from their original plans for trade and investment. When NAFTA emerged after its first decade, it did not do so as a tidy free-trade scheme. Societies had been drawn closer together and the three NAFTA partners found themselves embedded and tied together in a complex web of economic and non-economic threads.

The thrust of these changes suggests that government decisions remain vital to the nature and the direction that integration takes, but that they may not always be able to halt or reverse its course. Indeed, the level of
density and “pliability” achieved by economic and non-economic interaction in North America may have well set limits to the capacity of national governments to influence events. The intrinsic character of some of these trends and changes is particularly well illustrated by the contentious issue of Mexican migration. Although the causes of Mexican migration remain the object of intense debate, the ripples produced by this phenomenon now travel across cultural and social norms, and, as the recent debate in the US Senate has also shown, they are increasingly felt in local and national politics at both ends.6

Prior to 9/11, evidence of this new reality was particularly clear at the borders. But trends at the borders also allowed us to see the new and changing security dynamics in North America. The symptoms of disorder were clear: rising congestion at the borders, particularly at the US-Canada border, an increasingly copious illicit migration and a massive overflow of illicit drugs at the southern flank. All these trends raised awareness about the need to address the governance and politics of North American borders. Although no immediate diagnosis emerged, then—as now—many were tempted to charitably characterize these problems as the unintended consequence of tighter integration: mere spill-overs from trade or NAFTA’s negative externalities.

Undeniably, the pressure exerted at the borders by ever increasing volumes of trans-border flows may have well have exacerbated these problems and may have also provided them with a common focus.7 The tightening of cross-border economic ties may have facilitated illicit cross-border flows, but in no way accounts for the rise in the flows of cocaine or undocumented migrants in the 1990s.

As events troublesomely unfolded, the initial reluctance of the partners to accept NAFTA’s security dimension gave way to serious action. The growth of security cooperation in North America from the mid 1990’s, moving as it did from conversations over border management between Canada and the US to closer law enforcement and counter-narcotics cooperation between Washington and Mexico, reflected a common acceptance of NAFTA’s security realities. And while early responses appeared to allow for different approaches to problems originating in separate compartments, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these efforts were, in one way or another, all guided by the negative externality paradigm.

Indeed, the evidence of this period reveals the development of a cluster of ad-hoc, and often technical, responses that are well in line with this paradigm. In other words, when security cooperation eventually emerged in North America, it followed a rather narrow and technocratic approach and was by no means driven by a truly regional security perspective.8 Over the years, an embryonic institutional framework of security regulation did develop in the region. But it was a framework that—inspired in the negative externalities paradigm and in decades of counter-narcotic policies—failed to draw a distinction between the different drivers stirring security problems in North America.
9/11 and the Rise in Security Demand in North America

Al Qaeda’s terrorist attacks on US soil shatteringly confirmed that there were indeed political and security dimensions to deepening economic integration in North America. We can readily see this on two levels. At the most general level, the attacks ushered in a period in which security thinking and security policies in the region were increasingly driven by global considerations. There is little doubt that 9/11 forced security experts and policy makers in all three countries to see regional and local security through the lens of global threats and challenges. The security problems and security externalities associated with NAFTA acquired a new and global dimension.

In the early years of the twenty-first century Canada, Mexico and the US increasingly turned their attention to three main scenarios that allow us to more clearly see these global-regional connections. The first and most obvious concerned NAFTA’s weak flanks and the possibility that Canadian or Mexican territory could be infiltrated and used as a platform from which to plan, organize and conduct a new terrorist attack. A second and to some extent overlapping scenario is the one in which regional “negative externalities” could be transformed into global threats once the techniques and routes now used to smuggle undocumented migrants and illicit drugs become available to extremists. The third scenario includes potential terrorist attacks against US targets on Canadian or Mexican territory. The attacks perpetrated by al Qaeda and its affiliates against German tourists in Tunisia, French engineers in Pakistan, US marines in Kuwait, Australians, European and American tourists in Bali, and Israelis in Kenya bear witness to this potential scenario (Stevenson, 2003; Friedman, 2005).

As the cognitive map of security widened, responses at the regional level were expected to follow the trail of the new globalizing and securitizing logics. In North America, the weight of this global thrust was immediately absorbed at the borders. Although trans-national crime and drug-trafficking had already been framed in this global logic, in the conditions of panic created by 9/11 the US administration was forced to show resolve and determination. The borders that were expected to soften with NAFTA, not only gained a new relevance and presence, but were significantly hardened. The overriding imperative was to develop cutting-edge border control devices to once and for all weed out illicit from licit border flows.

Once a global diagnosis of security threats had been translated into intense security cooperation at the borders, the two levels came closer together. In this new context, the set of ideas developed around the Canadian “Coalition for Secure and Trade-Efficient Borders” offered a simple and attractive blueprint and, equally important, a formula that promised to rescue some vision of future regional integration. The idea of this model, designed in Canada before 9/11, was to remove pressure from the borders by moving as much processing as possible away from crossing points, specifically the 49th parallel (Beatty, 2002:50; Goldfarb, 2005). The architects of the smart border agreements had thus originally
designed a number of procedures to help balance security and increasing licit flows and to decompress, in this way, congestion at the borders. The design included a number of measures to protect licit trade, to facilitate licit flows of people and to stimulate free trade while addressing security concerns at both ends. By working together in a number of mutually agreed measures, the US and Canada were expected to overcome some of the barriers that were holding back free-trade in the mid 1990’s.

Although prior to 9/11 these and other security initiatives pointed to lighter borders—by dealing with threats and security problems before they became security breaches at the border—the subsequent reversal is striking. The measures adopted under the Smart Border Agreements may have extended policing beyond the national borders, but they did not replace the physical border. More profoundly, many of these measures were amalgamated with the existing drug and immigration control infrastructure, and the US visit system, to produce a hybrid institutional framework that has again placed the emphasis on border controls.12

The upshot is that as the most sensitive issues again converge at the border, the hardened boundary becomes the site of political tensions. The logic of the new security framework means that the flows of drugs and undocumented migrants—along with terrorists—can indeed be stopped at the border. The resources and infrastructure are there. If they fail, the problem can only be one of political will on the part of NAFTA’s junior partners.

Hardening the border may provide a ready symbolic means for politicians in Washington to show their resolve, and relaxing border controls may also now represent a risk for them as great as that of appearing soft on crime and/or drugs. In practice, however, while illicit drugs, undocumented migration and terrorists may all meet at the border, none of these problems have their roots there.

Disregarding the dismal record of drug-control and migration control policies (a record that has systematically shown that the borders are not necessarily the site of the most effective policy responses), the security regulation framework has now been hugely reinforced to tighten NAFTA’s internal borders.13 In the new security context US attention has focused primarily on the border, and Canada and Mexico have had little choice but to bow to this. To the extent that economic integration under NAFTA had in fact deepened their dependence on the US, security cooperation became, for both Ottawa and Mexico, a matter of survival. As the new salience of borders appeared to jeopardize NAFTA’s viability, Ottawa and Mexico found themselves with a Sisyphean job on their hands. Once border security cooperation had become the *sine qua non* for uninterrupted cross-border trade, capital flows and the movement of people, Canada and Mexico concentrated ever increasing efforts in order to reassure Washington. While Canada signalled its commitment to the defence of North American with significant financial allocations to this end, Mexico embraced initiatives on border security, intelligence and air traffic cooperation that would have been simply unthinkable a few years before.
The irony is that Mexico and Canada embarked upon all these efforts precisely to avert a situation of border blockade. And yet, border measures have made the border more costly and less predictable, reducing Canadian and Mexican attractiveness to investors.14

Although some observers, including policymakers in Mexico, saw in the new security context an opportunity to propel all three parties towards a more fundamental rethinking of North American security, the results appear to be the opposite (Rozental, 2005:1).15 Rather than acknowledging the limitations of “borderline policing as a meaningful deterrent” of the security problems troubling North America today, most initiatives and policies enacted since September 2001 remain fixated on the border. The paradigm has remained constant, continuing the quest to find the “needle” in a growing “haystack” (Andreas, 2004:2 and 5).16

This was clearly the case of the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) outlined in Waco Texas on 23 March 2005, during the first NAFTA summit of heads of state since 2001. The expectations raised by this summit were soon deflated by Washington’s emphasis on its own security priorities and by renewed reports of Washington’s concern over possible terrorist border crossings.17

In many ways, the security regulation and border control paradigm appeared to satisfy the security needs of the moment, while offering opportunities for all three NAFTA partners to show their commitment to regional integration in North America. Border control ideas appeared to offer not just a simple way to respond to the new security context, but a framework for regional security cooperation. Yet the record of border approaches in meeting security challenges and some deep failures in border control strategies have led experts and policymakers to profoundly question this approach and current priorities.18

Indeed, many of the border control measures now in place were originally designed to tackle problems created by border congestion. In other words, they involve particular methods, designed in a particular context, to achieve, in turn, particular and specific ends. They were tailored and shaped by a particular security environment that has been radically altered by deeper trends—including people movement—that go beyond 9/11.

The deep-seated change in the security environment in which integration now takes place appears to support the case of those who argue for a fundamental rethinking of security and security policies in North America. The new security context, characterized by greater fluidity and higher uncertainty, may call into question the capacity of border control measures to guarantee security by electronically locking and tracing containers, providing frequent travellers with fast lane facilities or exchanging advanced passenger’s lists. In other words, the new security environment—nurtured as it is by market forces, mobility of people, political and social stability and the presence of a putative new species of terrorism—has opened a serious gap between what these border measures were designed to achieve and what they are now expected to deliver.19

The paradox is that while the new security environment might yield a
thorough rethinking of security challenges (including drug-trafficking and undocumented migration), it simultaneously erodes the political incentives for the US to innovate. Any change in US policies suggesting a softening of the borders could also prove politically suicidal.

Security Dynamics in North America

The September 2001 terrorist attacks brought about unprecedented levels of security cooperation and coordination in North America. The ensuing wars on terror and on Iraq acted, in turn, as a powerful catalyst for the break-up of the initial consensus underpinning the emerging security partnership among Canada, the US and Mexico.

As in Europe, in North America, the presence of this alleged new terrorism has had a transformative effect in the regional security dynamic. Yet, while 9/11 appeared at first to add security to the cluster of (mostly) economic incentives for regional integration, the extent to which security cooperation could act as an engine to further integration remained uncertain (Serrano, 2005). For objective reasons related to NAFTA’s distinctive character, best portrayed as a “marriage of unequals” the mismatch between a growing demand for regional security cooperation and rigid national approaches is perhaps greater in North America than in other regions.

But how can we account for this diverging trend while allowing for the intensification of border cooperation among NAFTA partners? One possible explanation concerns the deep and persistent differences that have long characterized the way these three countries perceive and engage with the international system. Another persuasive explanation has to do with the way different countries understand, seek and pursue security. Security refers to a subjective state or condition that tends to vary among states. Although for some, conceiving of security as a matter of degree has proved difficult and analytically cumbersome, Baldwin has powerfully argued that the value of “security” as that “of anything—economic welfare or clean air—is determined not only by one’s preferences but also by how much of it one has”.

Although 9/11, as with the Soviet nuclear breakthrough in the early 1950s, can be seen as the main mover behind the US’ desperate search for absolute or nearly absolute thresholds of security, as Baldwin again reminds us, the pursuit of security and the means used in this quest involve significant opportunity costs. What this means is that when we analyze and discuss security and security policies, we need to look at the trade-offs and opportunity costs of a given course of action. But we also need to compare and assess the utility of all the instruments at hand. In some periods, security experts and policymakers have been generally inclined to privilege military weapons and resources. More recently, these actors have shown an exceptional degree of faith in cutting edge information and surveillance technologies. It is important to remember, however, that economic and diplomatic statecraft have also been of great consequence to security goals.
In its most recent quest for security the US government has been guided by a “new and expansive philosophy” which tends to ignore probability and to easily assume, instead, that “all Americans and all US territory face an equal level of threat”. With the adoption of the homeland security strategy and the major institutional overhaul that ensued, Washington has simultaneously raised levels of threat assessment, enhanced proactive law enforcement and bolstered its capacity for risk management “so as to eliminate as many vulnerabilities as conceivable” (Stevenson, 2005). These exercises in threat assessment have forced US experts and policy-makers to recognize the importance of non-military threats to American security, and to accept the view that military force may have lost some of its utility, in other words, that it cannot by itself guarantee national security. Yet, in the post 9/11 context, the primacy of national security, now defined both in military and surveillance terms, appears to be also unbounded.

Such an unbounded understanding and pursuit of security has important consequences both for the US and for its neighborhood. On the one hand, this approach has set the US government on a security maximization path that tends to assume that “there can be no limit on resources allocated to this purpose” and that forcefully resists arguments in favor of trade-off considerations between narrowly defined homeland security objectives and broader regional security goals. Equally troublesome has been the propensity to maximize the security logic in order to prescribe dangerously large doses of medication. Past experience allows us to see a discernible pattern: the search for security maximization has often been accompanied by security diagnoses that have, in turn, favored extreme forms of treatment. Thus, the recourse to tough control and eradication therapies not only reflects this quest for maximum security, but also indicates a clear preference for the obliteration rather than the regulation of threats. The genealogy of the family of wars—from the war on drugs, to the war on money laundering to the war on terror—brings to light a number of significant logics and connections. Although dispersed in different directions and realms, these wars appear to be banded together by the genes of security maximization.

The magnitude and rising level of resources now devoted by Washington to homeland security bear witness to these trends. In 2005, US Homeland security spending reached US$ 50bn (not including missile defence) and most projections point to further increases in the short and medium term. Yet, some experts have persuasively called for a shift in the focus of Homeland Security from its current fixation with what is possible to what is probable. This would not only involve an exercise in trade-off and utility thinking but also a more rational evaluation of risks. In other words, a move away from suppression to regulation, and a departure from current trends—which have been vividly described as a frantic search “for holes to plug”—and a step in the direction of “threat-based” thinking. In short, a shift towards the more bounded European approaches.

Although in the post 9/11 security environment Canada and Mexico accepted tighter border security cooperation as a lesser evil, these trends
suggest a narrowing scope for realistic accommodation. In the present context it is indeed difficult to advance the thesis of genuine policy convergence on security issues between the US, Canada and Mexico.

Greater dependence on the US economy may have foreclosed most realistic options, but growing uneasiness about US security policies suggests a shared disapproval, if not yet an emerging common defecting front. At the heart of many discussions of regional security cooperation, particularly in Canada and Mexico, is the question of costs and benefits. Although the Smart Border plan and the SPP represent a promising start, they run the risk of becoming hostage to absolute notions of security in which challenges and threats are to be eliminated rather than managed. By entering into intense border security cooperation with the US, both Canada and Mexico have brought upon themselves tangible as well as intangible costs. The logic of maximizing security may push Canada and Mexico to devote increasing material and symbolic resources in order to constantly reassure and meet US security thresholds. We can readily see some evidence of this in the decision of Ottawa in March 2005 to increase in 12.8 bn Canadian dollars its funding allocated to the defence of North America and in Mexico’s decision to deploy the armed forces to Laredo to bring some measure of order in its border zone (Bencivenga, 2005).

Nowhere have the consequences of these logics been more evident than in the record of counter-narcotic policies. Behind the story of over half a century of counter-narcotic pressures and bilateral cooperation lay security and policy dynamics driven by similar considerations. Notwithstanding Mexico’s desperate efforts to preserve minimum margins of autonomy in this contentious area, Washington persisted, and finally succeeded in enlisting its southern neighbor in its futile war. The amount of financial and human resources allocated to this aim bears witness to Mexico’s commitment. And yet, the result has hardly been what the security “maximizers” expected. Indeed, Mexico’s tragic descent into drug-driven instability owes little to market dynamics and a great deal, instead, to the unintended effects of the criminalization and enforcement policies so passionately pursued by security “maximizers”.

Underpinning this chapter is the belief that Canada and Mexico can (and are destined to) play a useful and constructive role in the production of security in North America. Over a decade NAFTA has been mostly driven by economic forces, but as I have argued, regionalization in North America now escapes the control of governments and markets. All these processes have, in turn, produced and exacerbated security dynamics and externalities that have, in turn, given all three countries strong incentives to cooperate in order to mitigate their impact and to secure NAFTA’s future viability.

In principle, the three countries are well placed to achieve this end, but in the absence of a much broader rethinking of regional security and regional security policies, Canada the US and Mexico may soon be confronted with the reality of diminishing returns. We may not yet have a true security community in North America, but there is clearly a complex
“sub-system” in which regular interaction among Canada, the US and Mexico takes place, and in which “a change in one state, causes change in others”.28 Notwithstanding Canada’s effort to prevent the “Mexicanization” of its border with the US, the ripple effects of border politics at both ends illustrate only too clearly the effects of “sub-system” dynamics in North America. At a deeper level, it is important to keep in mind that the security of the three countries (especially that of the US and Mexico) is now more tightly and organically linked than the three governments are able or willing to publicly accept. All three partners, but most clearly Mexico, are now expected to undertake intense surveillance and control measures and to guarantee a stable neighborhood and thus to foster security in North America.

Unquestionably, NAFTA helped guide, if indirectly, liberal economic reform and political democratic opening (especially since 1994) in Mexico, but the pressures now exerted on NAFTA’s junior partner by a narrow and taxing regional security agenda could easily revert this trend. There is a deep irony in all this, given the willingness of successive Mexican administrations (particularly President Fox) to reaffirm Mexico’s commitment to NAFTA, to continue investing in the idea of North America, and, given too, the gravitational pull of identity (government and socially led) towards the north and away from Latin America. In an important sense, the crossing of the US Mexican border by Mexican soldiers to provide humanitarian assistance to victims of hurricane Katrina in New Orleans represented one of the most significant episodes in this storyline.

The actors behind this Mexican move have been many but the decisions have not always been based on a clear-cut consensus. But it is now largely expected that after its initial traumas (i.e. the loss of nearly half of its territory) Mexico would finally leave behind resentments and prejudices and find its way into a region characterised by the presence of mature democracies and good governance. And yet, nothing guarantees that Mexico would follow this linear path as a consequence of NAFTA. While it is true that in the course of over a decade the consensus underpinning this ideational shift has possibly grown stronger, beneath the surface we can still find important disagreements.29

Not surprisingly then, the risks and rewards implicit in this shift will continue to influence the consensus of opinion between NAFTA’s advocates and detractors. And this leaves a host of questions to be addressed. At some point Mexico’s northern neighbours will have to decide how much they value Mexico’s ideational shift and its apparently concomitant democracy. In other words, what kind of assimilation they are prepared to contemplate. While the formal values and norms “governing political conduct” are not that dissimilar in North America, informally developed rules and principles in Mexico are still far removed from established practices in Canada and the US. The ideational shift triggered by NAFTA has undoubtedly helped to reduce this gap, but the process can be easily reversed. Indeed, NAFTA may have been one of the many factors causing democratization to move faster in Mexico, but the country’s current
exposure to pressures originating in North America could also put its democracy in a vulnerable position. On the one hand, as all three partners have learned, the process of integration becomes more and more difficult to manage as economic and political opening take place. As regionalisation processes gather force, pressures and demands also tend to increase. But, on the other hand, competing and different interests in Washington (and Ottawa) have raised doubts about their commitment to supporting democratic stability in North America’s southern flank.

The role of the US (and to a lesser extent Canada) has proved crucial in providing roadmaps and imagined routes for Mexico’s democratic change, but the tensions between US security priorities and democratic consolidation have also come to the fore. The consolidation of democratic institutions is not a linear or automatic process. It requires some favourable conditions and as some observers have argued, a dose of good fortune too (Krauze, 2005). What is clear is that the arbitrary distribution of regional-global events has not proved particularly fortunate to Mexico’s young democracy. Indeed, like the old drug war, the new war on terror has openly competed with other US policy objectives, including democratic consolidation and the respect for human rights. And in the post 9/11 context, as in the Cold War period, Mexican governments are likely to resent the subordination of bilateral and regional diplomacy to global logics. Although successive Mexican administrations are accountable for many of the problems troubling the country, it can also be argued that as in the 1950’s US overtly neglect of Mexico’s most basic needs could easily set off new tides of Mexican nationalism.

Missing from the prevailing security diagnosis is the role of Mexico as a risk factor. Not surprisingly, Mexico remains central to a number of NAFTA’s security preoccupations, ranging from illicit drugs, to undocumented migration, to transnational organized crime. The country now presents a collection of symptoms that could be best described as a condition of critical instability. But the signs and symptoms accompanying Mexico’s present disorder are indicative of a specific syndrome, that of criminally led instability. The problem has remained in this gray zone of symptoms, and is likely to impose a burden on both regional security dynamics and Mexico’s democratic consolidation. This is well illustrated by the effects of an increasingly violent and chaotic illicit drug market on border regions and transit regions. But it is also and distressingly visible in some of the features that have recently contributed to the distinctiveness of Mexico’s democracy. Under the immense stress imposed by the exigencies of a transit-export-drug economy, the armed forces have been pushed to assume control over many areas of public security. Rising levels of enforcement, however, have not allowed Mexican authorities to close the gap between their efforts and their delivery records. Looked at more closely, a long evolving trend becomes increasingly clear: inexact diagnoses—more often based on narrow views imported or imposed by the U.S.—have led to futile and counter—productive responses.

There is, however, a very strong case for an expanded definition of regional security and for a shift in regional security policies to properly
factor in these risks. In other words: to extend the logic of trade-offs from the present confines of military and homeland security to those of “inter-mestic” and regional security goals. This would involve, in turn, a rethinking of the means and/or the methods that are available to all three partners to achieve these goals. Beyond the outcry that has accompanied recent debates over migration, one can see how the motion of interdependence has come to set limits to narrow “security obsessions”. It may be too early to anticipate the outcome of this debate, but what is clear is that the proposed redefinition of migration would most likely force governments to pay more attention to wider trade-offs, to acknowledge that migration flows are now an integral part of the security equation, and to consider alternative techniques and measures. And yet, it is important to acknowledge the paradox here. Borderless problems may persuade governments to embark on bolder policies that extend beyond their borders, but borderless anxieties push electorates to cling to old myths and to hold on to their fences.

Indeed, policies that seek to advance responses beyond national borders become more and more difficult to manage as interdependence and integration deepen. As states integrate more fully and interdependent dynamics take over, the force of domestic politics is more likely to weigh in. This observation may go some way towards explaining the increasing intense interplay observed between regional migration dynamics and domestic political process in both the US and Mexico. What is clear is that North America is in no way an exception to the rules of regionalism and regional integration. Largely because these processes are driven by different and multiple vectors—involving different pairs of losers and winners—their journey tends to follow a rather bumpy and winding course. In view of this, it would be difficult to predict NAFTA’s final destination, but what is already clear is that the way these problems are handled, and their impact on levels of volatility in its southern flank, could significantly affect its direction.

Where does Canada fit in all this? Canada’s International Policy Statement reaffirmed Ottawa’s commitment to a revitalized North American partnership and, equally important, to prosperity and security in North America. The document invokes NAFTA’s achievements, alerts of possible challenges to regional integration, namely those coming from the rise of “new emerging giants,” and explicitly acknowledges NAFTA’s “security dimension”. The policy statement also concedes the importance of NAFTA for Mexico’s democratic consolidation, and proposes a commitment from Ottawa to more actively engage—bilaterally and trilaterally—with its southern partner. This is an interesting document, but it may be unwise to take its promises at face value. Indeed, the recent Canadian record in North America is more complex than this document appears to suggest. Undoubtedly significant progress has been made in relations between Ottawa and Mexico. Canada and Mexico have shared common causes and their respective positions on various international issues appear to be more in harmony than in opposition. But this seemingly commonality of cause has not proved enough to unlock synergies in
and beyond NAFTA, and it has thus not yet translated into cooperative action in North America. Regional rivalries around the idea of a special relationship continue to cast a shadow on constructive Canadian-Mexican efforts. Clearly, Canadian policy after 9/11 placed a great emphasis on resuscitating the old Anglo-Saxon Ottawa-Washington connection. These psychological forces have prompted Canada to resist bolder conceptions of North America, and to compulsively shun from any discussion that may risk “contaminating” its special relationship with Washington. Yet, these efforts do not seem to have as yet produced the expected results. And one could even argue that they have inevitably run into the very intricacies of a rapidly changing North America that they have tried to ignore.

Power politics has been and is likely to remain an inescapable reality in North America. This vision has been more recently translated in the bilateral dynamics just mentioned above. But, as we have tried to argue, the region can now be seen as a fluid and complex milieu in which the forces of economic and non-economic interdependence are very much at play. It is because of the pre-eminence gained by these interdependent dynamics that the “currency” value of power may have shifted to more complex sets of “aggregations”. Indeed, in North America the logics of inter-state relations now appear to oscillate between two different normative geographies and settings.

Canada’s approach to security in North America can persist in its quest for a special relationship and can carry on emphasizing bilateral security challenges, but it cannot eclipse the broader realities. It is true that Ottawa has taken some steps towards adjusting to these changing realities, but its overall approach continues to overlook their implications. Indeed, timid and symbolic concessions to NAFTA’s junior partner cannot disguise the fact that Canada continues to cast its North American priorities very much in bilateral terms.

The explanations for the currency of the idea of the special relationship in Canada’s post 9/11 context have been explored elsewhere. Through the channels provided by the special relationship Ottawa may have enjoyed, at times, privileged access to Washington. Yet, evidence of the limits of “specialness”—whether based on shared war experiences, cultural and normative affinities or on the density of economic and non economic ties—also suggests a great deal of deceptiveness and frustration. Whether success can be measured and whether there is still a strong case for attempting to pursue a special relationship, a number of relevant questions and potential costs still need to be addressed.

At the heart of present discussions about the special relationship and possible foreign policy options is the difficult question of risks and rewards. What seems clear is that what this strategy is likely to achieve will not just be a function of how well designed foreign policy decisions are, but also of the security and regional environment in which they are deployed. We thus need to ask how the special relationship is likely to play out in the post 9/11 context. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this particular choice has not enabled Ottawa to fully take into account North
America in its current state and how things are likely to develop in the medium and long term. But there is also a good deal of evidence to suggest that technological change has also radically altered the options that in the past allowed Canada to crystallize its hopes in the special relationship. According to some experts, technology gaps have already created daunting problems of interoperability and are likely to further widen the gap between the US and its NATO allies, including Canada. Thus, while at present, political considerations may still influence Washington’s decisions to act unilaterally or multilaterally, these experts predict that in the near and medium term they will be largely determined by technological factors. And there is, of course, the final issue of costs. Canada (as Mexico’s) decision to come to terms with the US fixation about borders has not only come at a significant expense, it may also not enable Ottawa to deliver the level of security expected by Washington. And as we have already suggested, Washington’s reactions to stimulus arising from either boundary are most likely to be replicated, in one way or another, at the other continental end.

The arguments developed at both ends of North America lead us to the conclusion that a radically new approach to security is urgently required if NAFTA’s three partners are to meet the security needs that the region now eagerly demands.
As in the past, the combination of free movement of goods and an increasingly mobile population has prompted states in North America and elsewhere to respond with new border controls.


5. Such loosely institutionalised forms of regionalism have long been seen as a formula that allows Washington to maximise its power while avoiding being tied down or constrained. See Andrew Hurrell “Hegemony, liberalism and global order: what space for would-be great powers”, International Affairs, vol. 82, no. 1, 2006, p. 9. See also the chapter by the same author in this volume.


7. By the end of the century 200 million crossings were registered at the US-Canada border and 300 million legal crossings at the US southern border with Mexico. The volume of containers and merchandise arriving into the 301 US ports of entry had also increased dramatically. See MacFarlane and Serrano “Security Regulation or Community? Canada, Mexico, and the borders of identity” p. 229.


9. The disclosure by a US-Canada police investigation of a terrorist plan involving over half a dozen “home grown” Canadian terrorists in early June 2006 provided tangible evidence of this scenario. Although the targets of this operation were mainly located in Canada—attacks on the Parliament buildings in Ottawa and on the headquarters of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service in Toronto as well as the beheading of the Prime Minister, Stephen Harper-police investigations suggest that an external/global logic was also part of the plot. The investigation itself was triggered by the meeting of two men from Georgia with other Muslims in Canada in which targets in the US were also discussed. The arrest of 17 people and the confiscation of fertilizer bomb explosives appear to confirm the views of those Canadian authorities aware of the impact of the presence of Canadian troops in Afghanistan among Canadian Muslims. Most of those arrested were young students who had “sharpened their radicalism over the internet”. Doug Struck “Canada Hold 17 in Alleged Bomb Plot”, The Washington Post 4 June 2006: Doug Struck, “17 Suspected Terrorists Arrested in Canada”, The Washington Post, 3 June 2006 and Anthony de Palma, “Canada Saw Plot to Seize Officials”, The New York Times, 7 June 2006, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/07/world/americas/07canada.html?r=1&th=&oref=slogin&emc=th&pagewanted=print


12. The Smart Border menu includes innovative cargo-tracking systems, inspection technologies and traffic management strategies to release pressure from the borders. The idea is to ease border congestion while enhancing overall security. Other measures include pre-clearance procedures, advance passenger information and special lanes for frequent travellers identified with biometric cards and electronic devices. Container security measures include electronic systems to assure the accountability of drivers and shipments and in-site inspection by US customs authorities. Peter Andreas “US-Mexico Border Control in a Changing Economic and Security Context”, *US-Mexico Policy Bulletin*, Issue 1, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Mexico Institute, 2005, p. 4.

13. During the 1990s the substantial increase in resources allocated to stop the flow of undocumented migrants and cocaine bound to the US market proved to be wasteful. Although the US Border Patrol doubled in size, the flow of undocumented migrants did not abate. Some experts, including Demetrios G Papademetriou, warned that the US was not “winning any wars” and that enforcement efforts “principal redirect, rather than stem the migrant flow”. Similarly, unrelenting efforts by both Mexican and US counter-narcotic authorities proved futile. Estimates of the amount of cocaine bound to the U.S and flowing across Mexican territory jumped from 30% in 1989 to 70-90% more recently. Andreas, “US-Mexico Border Control in a Changing Economic and Security Context”, p. 4; Monica Serrano, “Drug-trafficking and the State in Mexico: Unstable Alliances”, paper prepared for the International Political Economy Crime Workshop, May 2006.


19. The new species of terrorism differs from older, mostly European versions of terrorism. There appear to be significant differences between these two brands of terrorism. European terrorist groups have more often observed restraint and discrimination in their resort to violence. Their disposition to consider and pursue political bargaining has been seen as another important difference, as has the transnational reach of these two types of terrorism. But perhaps the most important distinction concerns Al Qaeda’s inclination to resort to unbound terror and its reliance on suicide missions. See the chapters included in Laurence Freedman et al, *Terrorism and International Order*, London, Routledge & Keegan Paul in association with the RIIA, 1986; Stevenson “How Europe and America Defend Themselves” and Diego Gambetta ed., *Making Sense of Suicide Missions*, Oxford University Press, 2005.


23. It is important to keep in mind how the US has considered military intervention as a dominant component of its war on terror and how the US has thus prioritized intelligence supporting defence efforts.


26. Although the European counter-terrorist approach has recently adjusted to take into account the new variety of risks associated with more recent manifestations of terrorism, it stands in sharp contrast to the US perspective. In it, security tends to pivot on probabilities. Most European countries have traditionally approached terrorism as a problem that can be assessed and dealt with on an emergent basis (i.e after particular threats have arisen. European approaches to counter terrorism are also more cautious and wary of the social, economic and political costs associated with these efforts and more reluctant to confront threats before they “crop-up”. This tradition has also shown greater inclination to discriminate and to exploit differences between the political and more military/extreme wings of terrorist groups. See the various articles assembled in Freedman et al, *Terrorism and International Order*; Adam Roberts, “The ‘war on terror’ in historical perspective”, *Survival*, vol.47, no.2 Summer 2005 Stevenson, “How Europe and America Defend Themselves” and Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon “Zarqawi’s Life After Death”, *The New York Times*, 9 June 2006, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/09/opinion/09benjamin.html?th = &emc = th&pagewa

28. The theme of a security community in North America is discussed in MacFarlane and Serrano “Security Regulation or Community? Canada, Mexico, and the borders of identity”. On the place of Turkey in a sub-system not entirely different to the one discussed here see Philip Robins “A Double Gravity State: Turkish Foreign Policy Reconsidered” British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, forthcoming.

29. The issue of full membership in NAFTA did not quite trigger a debate about its implications for national identity in Mexico. However, the way NAFTA was negotiated and the consequences of this form of integration have become an object of intense debate. Similarly the future role and scope of Mexico’s participation in North America has added another angle to this heated debate. In Mexico important sectors within both the armed forces (namely the army) and the legislative branch continue to act as bastions of the remnants of the country’s old national ideology. Those persuaded of the advantages of deepening integration and tighter security cooperation will have to find arguments to persuade sceptical actors. These arguments should convince reticent sectors in Mexico that security cooperation, as presently determined by Washington, is worth the price the country will have to pay. The disastrous record of anti-narcotic policies and anti-narcotic cooperation will further complicate the efforts of those assigned with this job.


32. It basically recognizes how 9/11 triggered unprecedented levels of cooperation between Canada, the United States and Mexico on border management, asylum and refugee policy, and counterterrorism efforts. The document is available at http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/cip-pic/ips/ips-overview4-en.asp

34. Technology gaps have already created daunting problems of interoperability and according to some experts are likely to keep on widening the gap between the US and its NATO allies, including Canada. In light of this, they tend to hold the view that, at present, decisions as to whether Washington acts unilaterally or multilaterally may still be political, but in the near and medium term they will be largely determined by technological factors. See for example Aldrich, “Transatlantic Intelligence and Security Cooperation”, p. 745.
Introduction

The Canada—United States security and defence relationship is in many ways profoundly different from the U.S. and other nations of the Western Hemisphere. One of its most distinguishing characteristics is that since Franklin Roosevelt inaugurated the bilateral alliance in his speech at Kingston Ontario in August 1938, the focus of defence cooperation between the two countries has been outside of the Americas. As such, problems which have emerged between Washington and Ottawa especially over how much Canada was prepared to support the United States diplomatically and militarily, have arisen for the most part because of crises that did not, in the first instance involve the direct defence of either country or their strictly bilateral security relations in North America. So was during the Cold War, so it is today in the “Global War on Terrorism” (GWOT) notwithstanding the new American emphasis upon “homeland security”.

International crises and controversial conflicts involving the United States have sometimes lead to problems, and indeed acrimony, in Canada-U.S. security relations. This is especially the case when Washington and Ottawa adopt differing views on the nature of the threat and on the proper response. The situation is further exacerbated when the United States looks to and expects Canada to either make a military contribution to an overseas operation or, to at least publicly express Canadian endorsement for US policy. Such military and diplomatic support appears to become the litmus test for Canada’s standing as a good and faithful ally of the United States. In these circumstances, the whole tenor of the bilateral security relationship seems to rest not only on what Canada does to help secure the United States in North America, (what has become known since 9/11 as “homeland security” or the “home game”) but primarily by what Canada does or does not do to support the U.S. overseas, the “away game.”

The most recent such case was the American decision to wage war against Iraq in March of 2003. This crisis came after close security collaboration after 9/11, which included the deployment of Canadian forces to Afghanistan as well as indications that Canada would send forces to Iraq. The Chrétien government’s decision not to participate, and in fact, to initially cast doubt upon the grounds for the U.S. decision to strike at Iraq, was received with much surprise and resentment in Washington. The Bush administration believed that Chrétien had pandered to domestic anti-war sentiment and anti-Americanism in Canada. The security relationship was further strained when the Martin government declined the American invitation to take a direct role in Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD).

The paper begins with an evaluation of the Canada-U.S. security relationship. It then looks at Canada’s close relations with the US in the post-Cold war period (1989-2001) are reviewed. During this period Canada and the United States seemed to be in substantial agreement on the need to exercise power overseas. From the Gulf War of 1991 to the Kosovo campaign of 1999, American and Canadian forces intervened in a range of conflicts.
This unprecedented level of agreement made the Canadian decision not to join the Americans in the Iraq War of 2003 all the more surprising and significant. The paper then examines the bilateral security relationship since 9/11, providing a survey of Ottawa’s contribution to American homeland security in the Global War on Terrorism. Here it is noted that Canada-U.S. security relations in the North American context have become closer, even more so than during the Cold War. As the only ally of the United States that borders on the American homeland, it might be thought that Washington would prefer Ottawa to give the highest priority to its North American security and defence contributions to the GWOT.

Yet the significant undertaking to secure the northern approaches provides no automatic guarantee of American confidence in the Canadian commitment to the GWOT. Even as Canada increases its military and non-military efforts internally and along the border, it seems that Washington judges Ottawa’s contribution to the GWOT primarily by what Canada does outside North America. The paper examines Canada’s decision not to participate in the Iraq War and its implications for bilateral security relations. When Ottawa elected to stay out of the Iraq War, it decided to increase its commitment to the campaign in Afghanistan. Thus the paper then turns to an examination of Canadian Forces (CF) operations in Afghanistan where Canada, for valid reasons vital to its own national security interests shares more fully the objectives, and the methods, of the American-led campaign.

As in the past, so too in the war on terrorism, the global calculus of both Canadian and American national security policies, has meant that the Canada-United States security relationship is not confined to the North America, but is itself global in scope. Indeed, the strong Canadian showing in Afghanistan appears to have done more to assure the United States about Canada’s commitment to the war on terrorism, than the significant and equally vital efforts Canadians have taken to secure America’s northern approaches.

Evaluating Crises and Canada-US Relations

The essence of the bilateral security relationship—what Haglund and Fortmann have called the “Kingston dispensation,” (Haglund and Fortmann, 2002) was established in 1938 when, speaking in Kingston Ontario, President Franklin Roosevelt declared that the United States would not stand idly by Canada was threatened. In response, Mackenzie King pledged that his country would do all that it could reasonably be expected to do in order to ensure that enemy forces did not attack the United States by land, sea or air by way of Canada. While this was the beginning of the close and friendly and highly integrative continental security relationship that would see the two countries through world war and Cold War, behind it was a hard reality; Canada could not become a security liability for the United States. This mean that it was not so much that America defended Canada, but that the United States would, if Canada declined to take what the U.S. judged as necessary, helped Canada defend
the United States. It was a reality that successive Canadian governments have long recognized (Sokolsky, 2006:34).

If the Canada-U.S. security relationship were only confined to North America, then, given the past and present threats to the continent, it is likely that the Kingston dispensation would have satisfied both Washington and Ottawa because America did not demand much in the way of hard military power from Canada to secure the continent and Canadians were happy to oblige. After all, during the Cold War, the strategic defence of the United States was secured by its nuclear offensive capabilities. The United States military did not invest in strategic defence, but rather sought to deter and contain the Soviet Union through an offensive nuclear doctrine and forwardly deployed conventional forces. After the advent of the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) and the Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM) the value of Canadian air and sea space was much devalued. In this sense, when it came to North American defence, Canada was not so much a free rider as an easy rider. And in the post-9/11 period, much of what Canada needs to do in order to assist in securing the American homeland requires non-military security measures.

But as argued here, the bilateral security relationship has always included an important overseas military dimension. Thus while North America may have been a strategic backwater in the Cold War, Europe was not and it was there through NATO that Canada placed the greatest emphasis in its military posture and deployment. Problems arose, when the issue related to a crises or American action “out of area.”

The accepted wisdom is that during times of international crisis, when the United States has taken a position or adopted a policy vis-à-vis the crisis, Washington has expected that Ottawa will go along with its decisions, if not actively support them. Implicit in this perspective is the view that as the subordinate power in a decidedly asymmetrical and dependent relationship, Canada has little scope to create an “independent” Canadian approach to the problem. This is especially the case if the U.S. deems itself to have a vital national security interest in the crisis, thus limiting Canadian options even further. Should Ottawa attempt, however subtly, to adopt a position that diverges from that of Washington, a corresponding “crisis” results in Canada’s relationship with the United States.

A crisis, especially an international crisis, is not the word that comes readily to mind when considering relations between the United States and Canada. After all, the overwhelming majority of the substance of Canada-United States relations is the extensive, yet routine, and most of the time, mundane, exchange of goods and services across the border. The closest the two countries come to a “crisis” usually happens when there is a difference of view about some specific aspect of this trade as is presently the case over softwood lumber. But even then, as US Secretary of State Rice admonished Ottawa, over a year ago, the matter does not rise to the level of the apocryphal. Compared to the myriad of problems and crises that confront Washington across the globe, relations with Canada are closer to the oft-repeated homey and benign clichés of friendship and
closeness rather than the Hobbesian world of international politics that seems to take place everywhere else but along the 49th parallel.

As Charles Doran has observed, the United States tends to look at Canada through the lens of its global relations (Doran, 1984:139). Here, as noted, Canada does not loom large. This is so not only because there are relatively few major disagreements, but also because the Canadian position on matters having to do with vital American interests around the world, is simply not an important part of the global calculus of US foreign and defence policy. Moreover, on the major issues confronting Washington as leader of the Western world, Ottawa’s position has historically not been substantially different.

But as Doran also notes, Canada tends to view its global relations through the lens of its relationship with the United States. Through this perspective, the US looms large (sometimes to the point of exaggeration). Canadian leaders have always been sensitive to the charge that they are simply following the US lead and not adopting an “independent” approach to great international issues and events. Sovereignty and national identity anxieties, sometimes tinged with traditional anti-Americanism (or un-American) sentiments, often place Canada’s leaders in a difficult position. At times, this is the case even when, on the basis of hard realistic calculations, they have no problems and even support how American leaders are dealing with crises in international politics.

These two viewpoints pose a problem for Ottawa when it comes to decisions and making public pronouncements on international crises in which Washington is embroiled. On the one hand, Canada’s leaders want to reassure their American counterparts that Canada is a good ally upon whom the US can rely. This may be necessary either because Ottawa actually does support the American position or simply because the crisis is of little direct interest to Canada and therefore Ottawa sees no advantage to staking out a different position. On the other hand, if the international event is controversial, especially if other countries are openly in disagreement with the US, Canadian public opinion will pressure the government into vocally opposing the US position; “pulling the eagle’s feathers” as a way of expressing differences of opinion, and to assert its sovereignty and independence. As Henry Kissinger once observed, this has sometimes meant that Canadian leaders have a narrow margin for maneuver (Kissinger, 1979:383). For the most part however, Ottawa has been able to navigate between the two audiences with extraordinary skill, thus keeping both Washington and the Canadian equivalent of Peoria (Illinois), happy, or at least not too upset. When Ottawa is unable to bridge the gap between what Washington expects and what the Canadian public demands, it can indeed precipitate a crisis in bilateral relations.

The two-prism/two audience problem is compounded by the nature of public discourse over relations with the United States in Canada. The public’s view, especially that of the informed public, is divided along ideological lines in Canada. Those on the left believe that Canada has followed the American lead too closely and has therefore sacrificed its
sovereignty, independence and international reputation as a country dedicated to the pursuit of peace through multinational cooperation. On the much smaller right are those who believe that Canada’s refusal to support its closest ally at times of international crises has wounded the country’s sovereignty, identity, and reputation where it counts most—in Washington.

For both sides, Canada can be either a sinner or a saint. To the left, Canada sins when it follows the US too closely but is eligible for international sainthood when it openly takes a difference stance. For the right, sin is equated with not supporting the US while rallying around Washington when the Americans call for broad western support of their position is the only path to sainthood.

However, both sides can agree that a Canadian stance does make a difference to the United States and that bilateral security relations are fundamentally affected by what Ottawa chooses to do or say.

The Post Cold War Era: Global Intervention at America’s Side

The decision not to participate in the Iraq war was all the more surprising because, contrary to much of the current wisdom, it stood in stark contrast to the behaviour of the Chrétien government, both before and after September 11, 2001. It was, moreover, largely at odds with the traditional Canadian approach to important world events and crises. Whatever its idiosyncrasies and inconsistencies, Canadian realism has recognized that it is not often afforded the country the luxury of not responding, in word and did to international events.

Since it’s founding in 1867, and even before, Canada has been a player, if only a minor one, in the “great game” of international politics. Moreover, Canadian political culture includes an assumption that wherever there is an international issue or crisis, Canada must somehow be there and indeed, it has been. From South Africa at the turn of the 19th century to Bosnia and Afghanistan at the turn of the 20th, Canadians have, by their own choice, sought to participate in global affairs.

The popular view is that after the end of the Cold War, Canada abandoned its traditions of internationalism both in the realm of collective security and collective defence. The charge is especially levelled at the Chrétien government whose preoccupation with domestic concerns, particularly efforts to help reduce the deficit by cutting funds for foreign affairs and defence, resulted in a retreat from activism and commitment. The Issue has entered the popular media. A Time (Canada) cover story, written just after the bilateral dispute over the Iraq war, asked, “Where Has Canada Gone?” According to the article, “the world’s second largest country is being swallowed up by its own irrelevance,” (Time, 2003:15) and showed a picture of a sad forlorn Uncle Sam looking for the Canadian friend and allied partner America once knew and respected. This view was most thoroughly presented by noted correspondent Andrew Cohen in his recent work, While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World (Cohen,
2003). From the Canadian military’s standpoint, as expressed by the current Chief of the Defence Staff, General Rick Hillier the 1990s were a ‘decade of darkness’.

There is no doubt that budget cuts, (instituted by Paul Martin when he was Minister of Finance) profoundly reduced Canada’s military and Foreign Service. However, it can be argued that critiques of Canada’s international performance in the 1990s tend to distort, exaggerate, and indeed mythologize Ottawa’s global influence during the so-called golden age of Pearsonian diplomacy, and ignored and minimized its post-Cold War activities, especially those carried out in concert with the United States.

Pierre Trudeau sought to get away from the Pearsonian pro-U.S. policies by conducting an active and more independent foreign and defence policy. For his efforts he earned the wrath of the Nixon administration. When, in the latter 1970s, Canada returned to the allied fold, relations with the Carter administration became quite positive. For his part, Prime Minister Mulroney earned the wrath of Canadians when, during the heightened East-West tensions of the late eighties, he gave his friends, Ronald Reagan and George H. Bush, the ‘benefit of the doubt’ when it came to American national security policies. In this sense, Mulroney was essentially emulating Lester Pearson, who Americans liked so much.

All of this is not meant by any means to disparage Canadian efforts. In the context of the Cold War, there were not many middle or medium democratic allies of whom it could be said; ‘they had an impact in Washington or they conducted an influential independent foreign and defence policy which altered the course of events.’ As Linus once said to Charlie Brown about Snoopy, “He is not much a dog. But then again, who is?” In the bipolar nuclear peace of the Cold War, Canada performed well given the interests and values it wanted to advance and the constraints with which it was faced.

In the “unipolar moment” of the immediate post Cold War era, where was the less-than-great power to whom Canada is found wanting in comparison? Where is the country or group of countries that displayed cogent and brilliant foreign policies? Faced with the horrors of Yugoslavia, the countries of the European Union—the same group that was going to take over management of Europe from the United States—proved feeble and divided. Canada may share responsibility for what happened in Africa, but after Somalia, no one else was prepared to make a major sacrifice of blood and treasure. All the while, the Israeli-Palestinian dispute remains unresolved; but it is hardly the fault of a lack of Canadian initiative.

Indeed, Canada has done more than its share in the cause of international peace and stability. It is just not true that Canada has been asleep for the last 17 years. On the contrary, the years since the end of the Cold War have witnessed an active, indeed, hyperactive Canadian involvement in global affairs. If anything, Ottawa, especially when it came to use of the armed forces, was over-committed given its real interests. Indeed, Canada was engaged at a level and scope of activity that both Pearson, and consummate realists, would have shunned.
In the first decade of the Post Cold War era, Ottawa dispatched forces to most of the hot spots in the new disorderly world order, beginning with the First Gulf War and continuing to places such as Bosnia, Haiti, East Timor and Kosovo. This commitment was especially evident with the advent of muscular multilateralism, especially as “coalitions of the willing”, and NATO became the United Nations’ ‘peacekeeping subcontractors.’ At the end of the decade, the CF had almost as many personnel in Europe as it had when the Cold War ended. As Sean Maloney has recently pointed out, despite the continued belief that Canada only participates in peacekeeping operations, during the 1990s the country was heavily and continually involved in what were essentially wars of intervention (Maloney, 2003). With the increased “Americanization of peacekeeping”, Canadian soldiers traded in their blue berets for green helmets (Sokolsky, 1997). More importantly, unlike the previous forty years, the CF became involved in actual military operations, increasingly so, as the decade wore on. Not surprisingly therefore, interoperability with NATO allies developed into the focal point of military planning in the 1990s especially with the U.S.

Canada’s hyperactivity was, on the whole, unrelated to vital national security or economic interests. In the broader geo-strategic context the Canadian contributions, while useful, were not decisive. Nor, during the 1990s, were the issues ones that directly affected vital Canadian strategic or economic interests. Canada was involved, because it felt it “had to be”, as a major industrial country whose fundamental well-being is inseparable from that of the West, as a strong supporter of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treat Organization and, above all as an ally of the United States. Well might it be said, that while Canada’s absence from these operations would have noticed in Washington and other allied capital, its presence was largely inconspicuous and yield no tangible rewards.

What did catch Washington’s attention were the activities and initiatives of former Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy, with his “human security agenda.” This was an approach to international relations, which placed emphasis on the individual rather than the state. It drew criticism from the U.S. (and from within Canada.) Ottawa pressed ahead with what critics charged was nothing more than ‘Pulpit Diplomacy,’ moral posturing for the sake of antagonizing Washington and projecting an independent image abroad. It was the softest of soft power, without any hard power or real assets to back it up. Going beyond what Pearson would have done, Canada took the initiative in championing the Landmines Treaty and the convention establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC).

The problem with the US here of course was not the message of human security, but the messenger. To many in the U.S., Mr. Axworthy presumed to take America’s place as the moral leader and monitor of the international community, but without the ability to back it up with hard power. It was the presumed moral superiority of the powerless pitted against the moral arrogance of the powerful. A case of ‘pulpit diplomacy’ versus the ‘bully pulpit.’ Fortunately, as in many ‘theological’ disputes,
there was more sound and fury here than a clash of real interests and policies. In what looking back after 9/11 were the halcyon days of the 1990s, a reduced Canadian military and Ottawa’s emphasis on human security, posed no substantive problems for Washington. This is especially the case given that the Clinton administration was itself being accused of confusing foreign policy with social work (Mandelbaum, 1995). Moreover, as noted, the 1990s saw a deepening rather than a diminution of U.S.-Canada military and diplomatic cooperation overseas in the face of regional and ethnic conflicts.

For all the emphasis which Mr. Axworthy placed on the human security agenda, and even after all the great efforts Canada made in the 1990s to contribute to peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations, the main thrust of the Chrétien foreign policy and the core of his government’s realist legacy, was economics. The government had, in 1995, explicitly made prosperity and employment for Canadians its top policy priority. While he would, as noted above, actively participate in a broad range of international undertakings in the 1990s, for Jean Chrétien, and especially for Paul Martin, realism in foreign policy began at home. This meant above all, reducing the deficit and the debt and the expansion of trade abroad. It was the “team Canada” trade missions, more than the troops, planes and ships, dispatched overseas that most concerned the Prime Minister and his Finance Minister.

Anchored by the expansion of bilateral trade with the U.S. under the North American Free Trade Agreement, which also helped foster growth at home, Canada went out in search of new markets. In this they were moderately successful and in so doing enhanced Canadian security. It might be said of Canadians in the 1990s, what James Mitchner said of the missionaries who went to Hawaii and later became planters and merchants; they went into the world to do good, and did right well.

The morning of September 11, 2001 ended the post-Cold War era. In its response to the war on terrorism, Canada drew upon the legacies of the Cold War and the heightened cooperation of the 1990s that were undertaken by Chrétien. Immediately, Canadian aircraft took the skies under the NORAD. This was followed by the dispatch of ships to the Arabian Sea and a contingent of troops to Afghanistan. The response also included numerous military and non-military measures to reinforce North American defence. These actions are continuing today with 2,500 Canadian troops in Afghanistan and a continued air transport and naval presence in the region. This comes in addition to maintaining Canadian troops in the Balkans. All of this is out of an army of less than twenty thousand and a navy with sixteen warships (Cheadle, 2003).

Robert Kagan argues that, “America did not change on September 11. It only became more itself” (Kagan, 2003:85). The same is true of the Canada-US security relationship. It, too, did not change but only exhibits more of the fundamental factors that have shaped it since before the Second World War. Canadian concerns about American homeland security—or more specifically, worries about Washington’s perceptions of
Canada’s place in American homeland security—forms a familiar theme that has become more salient since September 2001.

Securing the Northern Approaches

Desmond Morton has observed that Canada’s priorities today are as they were throughout the country’s history: ”... to do what we must do to make the Americans feel secure on their northern border. Americans may remember 9/11; we must remember 9/12, when American panic closed the US border and shook our prosperity to its very core.” (Morton, 2004) The Canadian nightmare is not so much a terrorist attack on Canada, although one is entirely possible, given Ottawa’s active part in the war on terror. Rather, the nightmare is what would happen to the bilateral relationship, and the Canada-US border, if a terrorist strike against America emanates from Canada. Because of this fear, the two countries continue to find common cause, although their motives differ.

As a result over the past six years the Canada-US security relationship has evolved at a pace unseen since the early Cold War. In spite of Ottawa’s decision to eschew roles in the Iraq war and the US ballistic missile defence system, Canada has played an active part in the war on terror. For the United States, security is a stratified endeavour, and Canada has an important role to play. According to the Department of Defense’s National Defense Strategy and Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support, the United States is engaged in an “active, layered defence” of the American homeland.² As seen in Iraq and Afghanistan, the first layer is global. Rather than waiting for a terrorist attack on American soil, the United States aims to defeat terrorists by denying them safe havens overseas. The approaches to the American homeland form the second set of layers. Counted among the approaches are the homelands of American allies, and the countries and waters that border the United States. Guarding the approaches involves negotiating security and defence agreements with allies and neighbouring states. The American homeland is the third layer. Here the terrorist threat is combated using homeland and border security policies, surveillance and law enforcement measures, and prosecution and incarceration. For Washington, therefore, Canada is part of the second layer. As a country bordering the United States, Canada’s territory, airspaces, and waters are approaches to the American homeland.

In May, Washington and Ottawa renewed the North American Aerospace Defence (NORAD) Command Agreement. The two most important changes were giving NORAD new responsibility for “maritime warning” and extending the agreement without deadline. “In perpetuity” is how some officials describe it. There is, however provision in the renewal for a joint review of accord within at least four years or at the request of either government. That review will probably entail the most intense bilateral examination of NORAD since the command began to function in 1957 and the first diplomatic agreement governing was signed in 1958. NORAD is under fairly intense pressure to change that arises mostly in the U.S.; the 2006 renewal simply postponed dealing with this.
At ultimate issue is how much of the command and control of homeland defence in the terrorist era both the U.S. and Canada will want to keep in national structures, and how much they will wish to continue to entrust to the bi-national NORAD. There is a strong element of classic bureaucratic politics affecting how the two countries will deal with the question, now that the NORAD is faced with two recently created national homeland defence organizations, U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) and the Canadian military’s brand new Canada Command (CANADA COM).

USNORTHCOM, which was created in 2002, is discontent with the division of responsibilities between it and NORAD. The two share a commander, currently Admiral Thomas Keating of the U.S. Navy, a headquarters in Colorado Springs, and several staffs. USNORTHCOM has a broad mandate for homeland defence while NORAD remains committed just to the aerospace defence of North American, except for its new role in maritime warning. NORAD was originally created as an air defence command and later also acquired broader, space-related responsibilities during the course of the Cold War as the technology developed with which North America could be attacked. North American air defence still falls operationally to NORAD and not to USNORTHCOM. This includes such sensitive post 9/11 aspects as the air defence of Washington and of the president when he is at home in Texas or traveling to or from there. It is only understandable that USNORTHCOM, as the national homeland defence command, would want the mandate.

At the same time, NORAD’s position, and with it the positions of the Canadians at Colorado Springs, is weakening as the value of the command’s core function, warning of and assessing a ballistic missile on North America, or in NORAD parlance, “ITW/AA” (integrated tactical warning and attack assessment), slowly leaches away. ITW/AA places the Canadians at Colorado Springs at the very heart of the aerospace defence of North America, even though no system to detect or track missile has ever been located in Canada or operated by the Canadian Forces. The U.S. would entrust no other ally in such a role.

It will come as no surprise whatsoever to anyone who has followed Canadian politics over the past two years that the Martin government’s 2005 decision not to participate directly in North American missile defence threatens ITW/AA, and with it, NORAD. It needs to be added immediately that that same government saved NORAD in the short run with its 2004 decision, encapsulated in the form of a amendment to the NORAD agreement, that NORAD (and hence the Canadians in it) could provide ITW/AA-based warning to the U.S. missile defence system, launch authority for which is to be in the hands of USNORTHCOM. Had the Liberals decided in 2004 that Canadians could have no involvement whatsoever with missile defence, including providing warning, there probably would not have been a 2006 NORAD renewal at all. The problem however, is that the U.S. is gradually bringing online new missile detection and tracking systems that are directly linked to the missile defence and not ITW/AA. So they are off limits to Canadians as things now stand.
As a result, ITW/AA will be devalued and at some point in the not so distant future keeping this NORAD role will be open to question. USNORTHCOM sees in CANADA COM, with its fairly broad mandate for the defence of Canada, as a natural partner for trans-boundary cooperation. It is not clear how much CANADA COM will return the interest or when. The new command, headquartered in Ottawa, got up and running only in February and has had to sort out its relationship with a new strategic joint staff created at the same time in National Defence Headquarters, as well as with the navy, army, and air force. How CANADA COM relates to NORAD and to the Canadian NORAD Region headquarters in Winnipeg will have to be carefully worked out.3

Notwithstanding the questions about the future of NORAD bilateral cooperation in the military defence of North America has been intensifying, including in the maritime sphere. For example in the spring of 2007 the two countries conducted “one of the most complex security drills ever staged in Canada” off of Halifax Nova Scotia. It involved nearly 3,000 people, mainly from the Canadian and American militaries, including a major U.S. Navy amphibious assault ship with Harrier jets and landing craft. Also participating were personnel from Canadian and American civilian agencies such as the Canadian Coast Guard, Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Fisheries Department along with the U.S. Coast Guard and Customs. The purpose of the exercise, which for the first time was planned and directed by Canada, was to test the “limits of maritime security and cross-border co-operation” and entailed a simulated “hostage-taking carried out by a criminal organization.” The objective was “to examine how the various agencies work together and to highlight areas for improvement.” (Canadian Press, 2005)

Canada has made significant contributions to ‘fortress America’ since the fall of 2001. Ottawa has launched several counter-terrorism initiatives at home, joined the Americans in dislodging the Taliban in Afghanistan, and worked with Washington to improve security on the continent and at the Canada-US border. On the domestic front, Ottawa passed robust anti-terrorism laws that mirror aspects of the United States Patriot Act.4 These new laws, for instance, allow for rapid deportations and prolonged detentions of suspected terrorists. The Canadian government has also taken steps to keep suspected terrorists out of the country. Canada has a network of Migration Integrity Officers in 39 key locations worldwide, which have stopped approximately 40,000 people with improper documents bound for Canada since 2001. In addition, the Canadian government created a department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, akin to the American Department of Homeland Security;5 established a Financial Transactions Reports Analysis Centre to track terrorist funding networks,6 and improved the counterterrorism capabilities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police,7 Communications Security Establishment, and Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS). In line with Canada’s cooperative approach to the war on terror, these agencies share information and work closely with their American counterparts. Many foreign and domestic critics charge that Canada could be doing more to thwart terrorism within
its borders. Yet accusations of laxity levelled at the Canadian government are similar to those cast at Washington’s homeland security efforts. In relative terms, Canada’s domestic counterterrorism initiatives are comparable with those launched in the United States.

In December 2001, Ottawa and Washington negotiated the *Smart Border Accord*, a multifaceted agreement aimed at bolstering border security while maintaining the flow of goods and people between the two countries. *The Accord* addressed thirty-two areas where bilateral security cooperation could be improved. To date, the *Smart Border Accord* has led to the implementation of pre-screening measures for travelers and cargo, joint Canada-US emergency preparedness exercises, and improvements in border infrastructures and information sharing. *The Accord* also expanded the number of bi-national Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs), and encouraged Ottawa and Washington to sign the *Safe Third Country Agreement* to regulate refugee applications. The IBETs harmonized policing procedures and improved intelligence exchanges between Canadian and American law enforcement and customs agencies. The *Safe Third Country Agreement* denies refugee status to travelers who land in the United States, fail to ask for or receive sanctuary in the United States, but apply for asylum at a Canadian border crossing—or vice versa. Furthermore, to improve continental port security, Canada and the United States implemented the Container Security Initiative and International Ship and Port Facility Security Code to track maritime cargo entering North America, and Canadian and American officials are posted in each other’s harbours to investigate suspicious containers bound for their respective countries.

While Washington has continued to note that Canada-US security cooperation is unparalleled, it is clear that Americans will always want the security of belts-security along the U.S. border—and suspenders-continental perimeter security—and any other protective apparel considered necessary to guard the homeland.

This also means that while in 2005 the United States put forth the idea of a trilateral, North American Security and Prosperity Partnership, (SPP), Washington, especially the Congress, is not prepared to adjust its approaches to security in order bring them more in line with those of Canada (much less Mexico). For example, recently, two-year old talks on plans to improve movement across the busy crossing at Buffalo, New York, which would have involved deployment of U.S. customs inspectors to the Canadian side, were broken off by U.S. Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff. The reason was that the United States “would have had to give up critical inspection tools to comply with Canadian law, including ability to fingerprint travelers who approach the Peace Bridge but decided not to cross” (The Globe and Mail, 2007:A19). For its part, Ottawa pointed out this would violate that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which allowed for finger printing only if an individual volunteered or was charged with a crime (McKenna, 2007:B7). It is not surprising therefore, that as Roland Paris notes, the SPP is, contrary to the fears of “conspiracy theorists” is far from a plan “secret or otherwise”
to achieve continental integration. Indeed, given “an overarching plan... is precisely what the SSP lacks,” and discussions so far, are “little more than a hodgepodge of bilateral and trilateral working group” on a myriad of issues (Paris, 2007).

Ironically, the unattractiveness of a true North American security perimeter is something upon which, both Washington and Ottawa ultimately, but for different reasons, are in agreement. Though the Canadian public appreciates the terrorist threat to the United States and accepts Canada’s role in the war on terror, there is a pronounced unease with the Bush administration’s tact and style. In a recent survey, a majority of Canadians agreed with the statement, “The United States is behaving like a rogue nation—rushing into conflicts without attempting to first find solutions by working its friends and allies” (IRG, 2004:15). Canadian attitudes were well-summarized by Robert Jervis:

Bush’s world gives little place for other states—even democracies—except as members of a supporting cast. Conflating broader with narrower interests and believing that one has a monopoly on wisdom are obvious ways that a hegemon can come to be seen as tyrannical (Jervis, 2003:188).

Fortunately, the bilateral security relationship has been largely shielded from the distorting and debilitating effects of Canadians’ anti-Americanism. Because there was little talk of integrationist schemes after 9/11, Canadians’ sovereignty anxieties were eased and anti-American sentiments were not enflamed. Contrary to jeremiads of critics on both the right and left, Ottawa has found a way to adjust to the realities of American power since 9/11. As a result, the Canada-US security relationship flourished at a time when the American people felt most vulnerable.

At the same time, Ottawa will not be able to escape what Frank Harvey has termed to the “homeland security dilemma,” as it applies to the Canada-U.S. relationship. The measures Canada is taking to secure the northern approaches only increase U.S. expectations that such measures will be successful and will only exacerbate American adverse reaction if they are not:

When the next attack occurs Washington will evaluate Canada’s commitment in much the same way (and through many of the same biases that the U.S. public and media evaluate Washington’s performance. No matter what Ottawa has accomplished so far, the next failure will create the overwhelming impression (even if false) that more could and should have been done (Harvey, 2006:22-23).

In its contributions to the Global War on Terrorism and especially with regard to the initiatives taken to assure the United States about the security of the northern approaches to the American homeland, Canada has done more than its traditional “just enough.” However, even these efforts on Ottawa’s part may not be sufficient to fully satisfy Washington. If asked: “How much security and defence is enough?” the US seems to always reply: “In the post 9/11 world, there will never be ‘enough’”.

**Iraq: This Time We Didn’t Have To**

Just before the Second Gulf War, Canadian historian Jack Granatstein recalled the remarks of Canadian economist and humorist Stephen Leacock in the late thirties:

> If you were to ask any Canadian, he said, ‘Do you have to go to war if England does?’ he’d answer at once, ‘Oh no.’ If you then said, ‘Would you go to war if England does?’ he’d answer, ‘Oh yes.’ And if you asked, ‘Why?’ he would say, reflectively, ‘Well, you see we’d have to.’

If Americans today know anything about Canada, they know that in March 2003 the Government of Canada did not feel it had to support the U.S. in the War in Iraq. It is not that Canadian participation in this war would have had an impact on its outcome or yielded Ottawa any influence over its conduct in the subsequent rebuilding of the country. Canada would have been inconspicuous by its presence. It was however conspicuous by its absence, and this profoundly strained bilateral relations.

According to published reports, the Senior Canadian military leadership, working with U.S. Central Command planned for and told the Americans that Canada could contribute a battle group of 600-800 troops. Then the government abruptly changed its mind and decided to send a force to Afghanistan (Wattie, 2003). The Prime Minister, it appears, was reacting to the strident rhetoric from the President Bush who began to openly speak of “regime change” even while the United Nations inspectors continued their hunt for Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and to public opinion in Canada, which was against the war.

Of course, when it was soon noted that, with thirty-one personnel on exchange in U.S. and U.K. forces in Iraq, ships in the Persian Gulf and aircraft in the region, Canada actually had a larger commitment to Operation Iraqi freedom than other “coalition” partners, the government was somewhat embarrassed. U.S. Ambassador to Canada Paul Cellucci was quick to compound the government’s unease by publicly pointing this out to Canadian audiences. Then President Bush cancelled his long planned visit to Canada where he was to address Parliament. To emphasize the point, while he was to have been hosted by the Canadian Prime Minister in Ottawa, Mr. Bush hosted the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Howard, whose country had contributed troops to the war, at the President’s Crawford, Texas ranch. With the Prime Minister’s coming departure from office at the end of the year, the U.S. government made no secret of the fact that it was looking forward to ‘regime change’ in Ottawa.

Some in Canada contended that the Prime Minister deserved these snubs. Our closest ally, who had been so terribly attacked less than two years before had asked for Canada’s help and support and in return received months of official obfuscation punctuated by nasty and insulting remarks questioning the President’s intellectual ability from senior civil servants and back-benchers. Others simply argued that their country should have given the United States its support for the Second Gulf War if only for the
sake of maintaining good bilateral relations and avoiding the wrath of the present US administration (Granatstein, 2003a).

But worse than being criticized, Canada was being ignored. This, according to the critics was just the latest and saddest chapter in a pattern of behaviour that had reduced Canada, under M. Chrétien to international irrelevancy and that had needlessly strained relations with the United States.

For the United States, Canada’s decision not to go to Iraq was incomprehensible. After all, as Cellucci said in his speech to the Economic Club of Toronto “There is no security threat to Canada...that the United States would not be ready, willing and able to help with. There would be no debate. There would be no hesitation. We would be there for Canada, part of our family” (Cellucci, 2005:139). Canada was expected to support its bigger brother without question or wavering. It did anything but that. “Instead of leadership, there was indecision, mixed signals, and confusion”.12 The US was led to believe that its closest neighbour would come to its aid when the walls of fortress America needed support. So when Prime Minister Chrétien finished his speech in the House of Commons announcing Canada’s decision and taking the moral high-ground, he received a standing ovation, and the Americans received a swift and insulting ‘five across the eyes’.

Canada’s decision was not based solely upon the refusal of the UN to pass a resolution sanctioning a mission to Iraq, as Chrétien’s speech noted. Canada never believed the US claim that Saddaam Hussein was in possession of weapons of massed destruction. It appears that M. Chrétien had conferred with leaders from a number of nations including Chile and Mexico on the matter. His inclination was that the invasion of Iraq did not make sense and he certainly did not believe that Iraq was the stockpiler of weapons of mass destruction.13 Despite reservations in Cabinet, the CF was ordered to develop a contingency plan for a substantial Canadian contribution to the invasion of Iraq.

The plan to send Canadian troops to Iraq existed and the Americans were well aware of it. In fact, Canadian Forces officers stationed in Tampa Bay and under the control of General Cameron Ross were tasked with creating a plan to send up to 800 troops to Iraq (Wattie, 2003). But it seems that General Cameron preferred this option to a mission in Afghanistan, which was seen as unfeasible, and not his first choice (Pankiw-Petty, 2006). The Canadian contingent would have included infantry from the Royal Canadian Regiment and armour from the Royal Canadian Dragoons and was to be stationed with the British Army’s 1st UK Division (Wattie, 2003). It is clear that the United States was quite appreciative of the proposed military and moral support that Canada’s direct participation would lend to the Iraq endeavour. Indeed it is reported that the CF had told Ambassador Cellucci that Canada would indeed be participating in the war in Iraq (Pankiw-Petty, 2006). Cellucci notes “despite the obvious hesitations about the prospects of an invasion, we believed that Canada would be with us even without a second UN resolution on Iraq” (Cellucci,
2005:135). How could the Americans be fully aware of the Canadian military’s objectives?

When the CF was tasked with contingency planning it was already highly interoperable with U.S. forces. For over 50 years Canadian and American troops have been under each other’s command. Notably on September 11, 2001, “Canadian Air Force General Rick Findley was in command at Cheyenne Mountain, exercising operational control over the North American Aerospace Defence Command’s (NORAD) assets” (Cellucci, 2005:135). It was Findley, on orders from the President, who scrambled the jets to intercept the remaining hi-jacked commercial jetliner. It can be surmised that military and strategic planners in both countries are in regular contact. When Canada’s military was developing an initiative to send soldiers to Iraq, US partners must have been well informed, if not part of the planning process. The Chrétien government however, would admit to very little.

The Government’s indirect statements were misleading and only heighten suspensions of possible participation. Minister McCallum was quoted as saying “Many countries are in a position where they are offering contingency co-operation” (Wattie, 2003). As Wattie also notes, Minister Graham would not rule out participation in the invasion even if the UN passed on a resolution. Given all of this information one might be easily convinced that Canada was willing to join the coalition. Chrétien’s public view was that Canada “never went to war without the authorization of the UN”. What was the United States to think about its brother to the north who had told the state department that Canada “would make a decision based on a perception of [Canada’s] best interests”. The signals were undoubtedly mixed and mismanaged. Perhaps the discontinuity in civil military relations was a function of Chrétien’s leadership technique. The Prime Minister’s view on the military was that if you kept them away they would not ask for money (Pankiw-Petty, 2006). It was Chrétien’s style “to keep all options open until the last possible moment and to play the devil’s advocate before making final decisions” (Goldenberg, 2006:7). The last moment came moments before Question Period on March 12, 2003. The PMO received a cable from the British Government asking if Canada was willing to provide political and military support for the war in Iraq. Chrétien answered with a resounding no and as he finished his speech, MPs and ministers rose to their feet and applauded. Celluci was bitterly disappointed as from his perspective the foundation of the Canada-US security relationship was given a massive jolt.

Chrétien’s decision spoke directly to the domestic constituency in Canada who questioned the US invasion of Iraq. It was an exceptionalist move that carved out a legacy like niche for a prime minister at the end of his career. Unlike the war in Bosnia, there was no overwhelming public support for the war in Iraq. There was no multilateral treaty bound group to hide behind and, like Bosnia; there was no UN resolution. Chrétien vehemently supported the multilateral approach in a speech in February in Chicago and sought to warn the Americans about the dangers of proceeding unilaterally in Iraq (Goldenberg, 2006:291). Chrétien’s speech,
like the famous Temple University speech delivered by Lester Pearson during the Vietnam War, was considered in Washington as a crass opportunist intrusion in American politics for sake of enhancing the Prime Minister’s standing in Canada. The speech in the House of Commons rubbed in the stain and won Chrétien the support of an exceptionalist public. In the end, despite the rhetoric, domestic politics trumps foreign affairs and realism begins at home. But it does not end at home, especially when it comes to Canada-U.S. security relations on an issue of the highest importance to Washington. Nor surprisingly, therefore, Canada the mouse was suddenly faced with the fallout of aggravating the elephant.

**Afghanistan: But This Time, We Had To**

In the past, when crises which have created problems in the Canada-U.S. relationship Ottawa’s response has been to take steps to assuage American concerns, not by necessarily agreeing with Washington on the specific issue in question, but by taking measures in other areas that are meant to demonstrate that, notwithstanding any disagreements on one matter, Canada is in fact a good ally. Consistent with this approach, since the refusal to support the invasion U.S. in Iraq, the Canadian government, under Chrétien, Martin and especially under the Harper administration, has tried to regain American trust and confidence, in large measure, by increasing defence spending and following on the original fall 2001 commitment, with an even great military effort in Afghanistan. Indeed, so concerned was Ottawa about getting the message across in the American capital, that the Canadian Embassy in Washington D.C. put up posters in the city’s metro system telling commuters that the Canadian Forces had “boots on the ground” in Afghanistan. In addition, the Embassy launched a new web site, www.canadianally.com, in order to counter some the very negative publicity and commentary about Canada’s contribution to the war on terrorism coming from some American broadcasters such as “Fox News”.

It is important to stress, that, as it the past, Ottawa’s efforts to reassure Washington were more than just an empty publicity campaign, at odds with fundamental Canadian interests and how to achieve them. Throughout the Cold War and into the 1990s, Canada was in broad agreement with the overall objectives and, for the most part, mechanisms of United States national security policy. An America that provided indispensable leadership of the West and global stability was viewed as consistent with Canadian interests and Canadian values. Moreover Washington has always been aware that, despite some rhetoric to the contrary, Canada does share American interests, values and perspectives on global affairs. Because of this U.S. administrations, whether Republican or Democrat, have always pressed Canadian governments to do more.

In the wake of 9/11 Canada has a real and vital national interest in helping to assure that Afghanistan does again become a haven and base for international terrorism that does post a threat to Canadian security. Thus while, as argued here, Ottawa was acutely aware of the need to improve bilateral political relations by making a major commitment to
the war on terrorism in the spirit of the Kingston dispensation, such efforts would not have been undertaken were they not also fully consistent with Canadian security national interest.

Given this combination of strategic and political factors, it is not at surprising therefore that Canada’s overseas contribution to the global campaign against transnational terrorism is focused on Afghanistan. In late 2001, Canadian frigates joined American carrier battle groups in hunting and capturing Al Qaeda and Taliban forces in the Arabian Sea. Since that time, over twenty Canadian ships have deployed to the Arabian Sea to join or lead battle groups and conduct maritime interdictions, forcesupport, and force-projection operations. This naval contribution is one of the largest from a NATO member. In January 2002, a Canadian battalion teamed with the US Army’s 187th brigade to dislodge the Taliban and capture Al Qaeda forces in Afghanistan (Dawson, 2003). Canadian and American forces fought shoulder-to-shoulder at Tora Bora and in the mountains of the Paktia province. Though this Canadian battalion withdrew after a single rotation, the Canadian Forces (CF) returned to Afghanistan in August 2003 to lead NATO’s International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). In late 2005, under the auspices of the US Operation Enduring Freedom, the Canadian military deployed a provincial reconstruction team to the Kandahar region. Canadian special operations forces are also helping the US military hunt and kill Taliban and Al Qaeda near the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. A CF brigade headquarters and an army task force were also deployed to the region in 2006. These initiatives indicate that the Canadian government grasped the link between overseas commitments and maintaining good bilateral security relations.

The drive to regain US trust resulted in a significant Canadian contribution to the post-combat rebuilding efforts in Iraq and a major military deployment to the war in Afghanistan. Immediately following the announcement, the Canadian Government sent a message to the US embassy stating that the “government would say positive things about the United States and negative things about Iraq” (Cellucci, 2005:136). In Iraq Canada dispatched the RCMP to train the Iraqi police force and provided $17.5 million to the Iraqi Security Sector, participated in the NATO Training Mission, kept the Canadian Navy in the Persian Gulf to provide support for the US, and ran the Iraqi elections.

As useful as such contributions were, (and ironic in view of Ottawa’s loud claim that the American intervention and regime change objectives were in and of themselves, illegitimate) they would prove to be insufficient in terms mending relations with Washington. For this, Canada had to be prepared to put “boots (and blood) on the ground. In the end, that is exactly what was delivered. The commitment of 2,500 troops to the war in Afghanistan by Prime Minister Martin was, in part, intended to show the US that Canada was willing to contribute hard power to the US led war on terror (Pankiw-Petty, 2006). The Government had noted that Rumsfeld would constantly mention the war in Afghanistan, reminding the Canadians of the need for military support (Pankiw-Petty, 2006). Cellucci had been pressuring the Canadian government for years to pursue a more
aggressive security agenda, to strengthen the military, and contribute to the defence of North America. Paul Martin appointed General Rick Hillier, who had served on exchange with III Corps, U.S. Army and commanded ISAF in Afghanistan, as Chief of the Defence Staff to do just that. General Hillier asserted strong leadership over the forces and became an outspoken advocate for the mission, especially in its combat dimensions, in Afghanistan.

Ironically, with 2,500 soldiers in Afghanistan and over 50 Canadians dead and with NATO allies appearing reluctant to make a commitment of combat forces, Ottawa, which embraces multilateralism as a fundamental principal of Canadian security policy began to adopt some of the Bush rhetoric regarding allies. A Canadian Senate committee recently recommended that, “Canada should rethink its role in Afghanistan within a year unless NATO countries step in to shoulder more of the burden.” We’re doing the heavy lifting and now it’s time to share it,” said Conservative Senator Michael Meighen, a member of the bipartisan Senate Defence committee that wrote the report. Unless NATO countries send more troops and support to the region within 12 months, Ottawa should re-examine its long-term commitment to the mission, said the report. “We expect our allies to step up. They must know that if they don’t step up, we’re going to take another look at the situation,” said Liberal Senator Colin Kenny. “It’s an alliance. We’re expected to be shoulder to shoulder” (CBC, 2007).

With no foreseeable end to the Afghanistan mission in sight and with the number of casualties steadily increasing, the Canadian government, along with its American and NATO allies, could well faced with the decision to reprioritize goals and redefine success on the ground. This may be especially the case given that despite pledges at the November 2006 NATO summit in Riga, allies are becoming increasingly reluctant to provide more troops for combat operations and “worrisome hints that some NATO members be unwilling to sustain their commitments to ISAF” (De Nevers, 2007:50, 55). Should the allies be unable or unwilling to provide more combat forces for counter-insurgency operations and the situation there become more difficult and given the continued high demand for U.S. forces in Iraq, Washington may seek to settle for stability, rather than democracy in Afghanistan. Ottawa, which has indicated a 2009 deadline for the withdrawal of Canadian troops, would then also have to adjust its more ambitious objectives.

Regardless of the direction of the conflict, Ottawa’s commitment to Afghanistan and outstanding performance of the Canadian Forces appears to have gained Canada new respect in Washington for it has been standing “shoulder-to-shoulder” with its American allies. Combined with very positive and extensive measures on the homeland security front, Canada’s successes in the “away game” have done much to improve bilateral relations as the war on terrorism continues. All told, Canada’s overseas contributions to the global war on terrorism are not insignificant. Indeed, the Canadian presence in Afghanistan reflects Ottawa’s view that a part in the global war on terror’s “away game” is worth as much to Washington as any contributions to the “home game”—even though the home game
may be of greater importance to the direct security and economic well-being of both countries.

To this extent, the policy with regard to Canada-U.S. security relations may be regarded, contrary to much of the accepted wisdom in Canada, to be, for time being, a political success.

At the same time, it is important not to inflate the significance of Canada’s contribution in Afghanistan in the overall context of United States efforts in the GWOT and thus the impact on bilateral security relations. From the American perspective the problem is that few of its allies, including Canada, have been prepared to maintain the level of military spending and the willingness to commit combat forces that would provide the U.S. with real substantive assistance in the war on terrorism. As Renée de Nevers has recently argued, while the NATO allies can and have made significant contributions to the war on terrorism, the Alliance “plays a largely supportive role” with individual members doing so on a bilateral basis with the emphasis on intelligence cooperation and non-military (particularly) non-combat operations that involve law enforcement agencies rather than their militaries (De Nevers, 2007:63). Notwithstanding the quantitative and qualitative improvements in Canada’s forces and its willingness, along with the United Kingdom and the Dutch to undertake more offensive operations, “The lead role in counterterrorism in Afghanistan continues to be played by U.S. special forces...not NATO and U.S. troops are the largest contingent in ISAF” (De Nevers, 2007:64).

As Nevers concludes, in light of the relatively small and in some cases declining contributions of all NATO allies to both Iraq and Afghanistan, “NATO’s military value as a partner to the United States in the war against terrorism...remains in question.” Thus while Ottawa may now be echoing Washington’s demands for other NATO allies to do more in Afghanistan, Canada may still be called upon to spend more and do more, whether in Afghanistan, if the United States decides to sustain the effort there, or whenever or wherever, the U.S. again calls for a coalition of the willing.

Conclusion: No “Democratic Dispensation”

Washington’s concern over allied contributions to the war on terrorism should come as no surprise, especially in Ottawa. Trust has been in short supply in US foreign relations since September 11, 2001. Driven by a feeling of vulnerability brought on by the Al Qaeda attacks, the American government has questioned the counterterrorism efforts of even its closest allies. This scrutiny is justified. Washington is aware that protecting the American people at home and prosecuting a global war on terrorism abroad requires allies’ “wholehearted cooperation” (Jervis, 2003:387). And even when cooperation is forthcoming, the United States will never wholly rely upon the efforts of other governments. This sentiment, so quintessentially American in form and content, is shared by both the executive and legislative branches of the American government, and by both major American political parties. As the legendary Canadian diplomat Charles Ritchie recorded in his diary in December 1963, looking back over his years as Canada’s Ambassador in Washington, “The cast of
thought in Washington is absolutist. It is true that there are a number of incompatible Absolutists, often in embattled struggle with each other, but all are Absolute for America...” (Ritchie, 1983:75).

This applies to the Democrats, as well as to Republicans and thus despite Canada’s strong support for the United States in the war on terrorism, it would be a mistake to believe “regime change” in Washington will fundamentally alter the bilateral security relationship. As Fred Hiatt recently noted in The Washington Post the July/August 2007 issue of Foreign Affairs contained articles by a Republican and Democratic presidential which bore a striking resemblance to each other in their prescriptions for American foreign policy. Both Mitt Romney and Barak Obama offered solutions that were also “striking similar to Bush administration policy” in their call for America to eschew isolationism, maintain and increase its military strength, promote American values, fight terrorism, to “reinvigorate multilateral alliances” and once again provide the world with its indispensable leadership (Hiatt, 2007). Both believe American exceptionalism justifies and demands such leadership. Romny declares that “We are a unique nation and there is no substitute for our leadership,” while Obama tells his fellow citizens that “We can be this America again...[A]n America that battles immediate evils, promotes an ultimate good and leads the world once more” (Hiatt, 2007)

Thus will be no “Democratic dispensation” for Canada. Thus a strong Canadian commitment to the GWOT will continue to be essential. It may well be the case, as noted above, that the U.S. will have to redefine success in Afghanistan. But as the 2008 American Presidential elections approach the Democratic Party may stress Afghanistan to show that they are serious about the GWOT and defence. To this extent, they will also be looking to allies to do more. Thus Ottawa may find that while it refused to enter the war in Baghdad, it a continued Canadian commitment could be necessary in order to solidify ties with a Democratic Congress and Presidency.

Moreover, the Democrats have been critical of the Bush administrations emphasis on the overseas dimensions of the GWOT on terrorism, accusing he President of neglecting homeland security. Thus Ottawa may also find that it will continue be under pressure from Washington to shore up the northern approaches.

At the same time, the Democrats are likely to adopt a more conciliatory tone when it comes to dealing with allies. They will not abandon the emphasis on security that is so much apart of the American political culture in the post 9/11 world. But in order to secure allied support, the Democrats may well return to a “Clintonian” “unilateralism with a smile” approach as oppose to the Bush, with us or against us “unilateralism with a vengeance” that has caused the Canadian, and other allied governments, so much difficulty when it came to domestic public opinion (Sokolsky, 2003). In this sense, a Democratic Presidency and Congress would make it easier for the Harper government, assuming it is re-elected, to sustain public support in Canada for Ottawa’s contributions to both the home and
away games of the GWOT. Indeed the Conservatives may able to shed some of their recently bellicose rhetoric and return to a more pragmatic and quieter diplomacy akin to the Pearsonian internationalism that Canadians seem to favour. If this is possible then as John-Andrew Pankiw Petty has suggested “the Canadian right might be saved by the US left” (Pankiw-Petty, 2006).

But regardless of which party wins the next federal election in Canada, the tone and character of security relations with the United States will always be in part dependent on the next challenge to U.S. security, wherever that threat may arise. This is not only because, as critics of the left and right in Canada charge, Ottawa cannot afford to be on the outs with Washington for too long. An equally important factor is that Canada simply shares with the United States a broad consensus about threats to the West, the importance of American leadership in countering those threats and the requirement that allies make some contributions in support of U.S. efforts. It is because the United States knows that Canada does share such similar interests, values and perspectives on global affairs that U.S. administrations, of either party, will always press Canada to do more. This means that, especially in a post-9/11 world, there will be no dispensation, even from the Democrats, if Washington believes that Ottawa is standing idly by when the next international crises arises.
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I. Interdependence and Security

As we gain more understanding of international migration, it becomes clear that it is an increasingly important element of state grand strategy, affecting nearly all facets of security-geopolitical, economic, and societal (Rudolph, 2003b; Rudolph, 2006b). Policies have traditionally focused on control mechanisms in order to better shape migration flows to maximize the economic gains while minimizing associated costs, as well as to manage potential threats to societal stability. Since September 11, 2001, the issue of immigration and border control has gained even more salience, as it must now be considered to constitute the front lines of homeland security (Camarota, 2002; Kephart, 2005). In Europe and North America—regions that attract the largest volume of migrants—states face a daunting challenge: to craft policy that will enable states to support the national interest along several security dimensions. Complicating this is the fact that often the policy preferences associated with a given aspect of security contradict one another. By in large, while economic interests generally press states to maintain relatively open borders (Chang, 1998), societal and homeland security interests increasingly press for higher levels of control and more restrictive policies (Rudolph, 2006b). Complicating the situation is the growing evidence that unilateral efforts have generally failed to provide the levels of control necessary to achieve these objectives (Andreas, 1999; Cornelius et al., 2004; Rudolph, 2006a).

In terms of policy design, the European Union has been the most innovative in its attempts to deal with the issue of managing immigration and controlling the border (Papademetriou, 1996; Newland and Papademetriou, 1998; Meyers, 2002. In particular, the European approach of integrated border management sets it apart from most other states around the world whose policies have traditionally been unilateral in orientation. Indeed, in North America, unilateral policies have dominated as policy makers have generally positioned the issue of immigration and border control as central to conceptions of sovereignty (Shanks, 2001; Rudolph, 2005; 2006a). Although the origins of the EU’s integrated approach can be traced back to the ideas codified in its founding documents (Treaty of Rome, 1957), the practical implementation of these ideas has been more recent. Among the more significant was the signing of the Schengen Agreement in 1985. It established the first provisions for a harmonized visa policy among signatory states and established new policies to ensure cooperation necessary to eliminate internal border checks for nationals of Schengen party states (Newland and Papademetriou, 1998). Included in the Schengen Agreement were provisions to establish the Schengen Information System (SIS) that would provide authorities with needed information regarding who should be admitted (or rejected admission) into the Schengen zone. Although not originally signed by all EU member states, the Schengen Agreement and its provisions were later included in the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) that provided much of the political architecture employed in the EU process of regional integration. The EU has also sought to utilize a multilateral approach to dealing with asylum claims. In 1990, the signed the Dublin Convention in order to codify harmonized rules and procedures.
for asylum processing that was aimed to curtail the growing practice of “asylum shopping” (Koslowski, 2000). This paper seeks to address one important question: Can the European approach of integrated immigration controls and border enforcement work in North America? What is the future of North American security cooperation?

II. Theorizing Cooperation on Regime Formation

In a world increasingly marked by both globalization and complex interdependence, states find their options strongly shaped by the interest calculus and decisions by other states (Keohane and Nye, 2001). Indeed, much of the recent discourse concerning both international migration and global terrorism highlight the fact that these forces are shaped by myriad forces in world politics, making them seemingly applicable to issues of regime formation in order to better control outcomes. What factors determine whether or not a regime—such as a North American security perimeter—is created, and what determines the form it will take? I draw on regime theory from the international relations literature to provide a theoretical framework for my analysis. There are three primary schools of thought concerning regime formation: realism, neoliberal institutionalism, and cognitivism (i.e., constructivism).

For realists, “the distribution of capabilities among actors critically affects both the prospects for effective regimes to emerge and persist in an issue area and the nature of the regimes that result...” (Hasenclever, Mayer, and Rittberger, 1997:9). In other words, power is the essential explanatory variable, and regimes are established only when they reflect the self-interest of the most powerful states. In the North American context, this would then place the United States and its perception of national interest as the driving force of regime formation. Within the realist paradigm, any North American security regime would necessarily be based on American interests and how political suasion may subsequently affect the interest calculus of its neighbors to the north and south. Rather than being the product of common interests or a multilaterally negotiated settlement, realists would predict that a North American perimeter would be characterized as an “imposed regime” (Young, 1983). Moreover, in terms of duration of such a regime, realists would expect it to function in its original form only so long as it reflects the interests of the dominant state in the constellation of power at the point of implementation. In other words, the regime will exist only so long as it conforms to American self-interest.

Where power is the primary variable forwarded by realists, neoliberal institutionalists argue that it is in fact the constellation of interests rather than the constellation of power that is essential in understanding regime formation. Arthur Stein suggests that international regimes are created to manage dilemmas of common interests and common aversions in an anarchic world (Stein, 1983). Dilemmas of common interests arise when unconstrained individual decision-making among actors (states) would result in Pareto-deficient outcomes. Attainment of the common good is dependent on interstate collaboration that protects against the likelihood that one state defects from its commitments. To remedy this, regimes are
established that constrain individual decision making in order to achieve the desired Pareto-optimal outcome. In contrast, dilemmas of common arise not from a common desire for a specific outcome, but a common aversion to one possibility. Such dilemmas do not require ceding such a high degree of sovereignty in the creation of a regime, since they are not intended to produce a specific outcome—simply to avoid an undesirable one. Such regimes also generally do not require such a high degree of formalization as those necessary in dealing with dilemmas of common interest. As such, Stein suggests that these would generally not be described as a formal regime.

To utilize such a framework within the context of a North American security perimeter requires that we identify the constellation of interests among participants. Is the issue of migration and security one of common interests or common aversions? The answer to this lies in the perceptions of representative policy makers involved and requires close scrutiny of policy makers’ statements in how they frame the issue of a security perimeter and what they define as the preferred objective. If each sees the identification and apprehension of terrorists as the primary objective, we may have a dilemma of common interest and could anticipate movement toward a formal regime wherein participants would necessarily cede some independent policy making sovereignty. On the other hand, if participants simply seek to avoid another major terrorist event in North America, they may not necessarily have the same desired policy outcome. Instead, they simply want to avoid one possible (undesirable) outcome. If this is the case, we could anticipate that movement toward some kind of regional regime would be less formal and would not be characterized by moves to surrender high levels of independent sovereignty over policy nor would we likely see deep harmonization of policy (i.e., common immigration and refugee policies among NAFTA countries).

Clearly, the distinction between realism and neoliberal institutionalism is a fine one, for it often seems that their similarities outweigh their differences. Emphasis on the role of state power and interests in an anarchic system underlie both. Indeed, Adreas Hasenclever, Peter Mayer, and Volker Rittberger have argued that little stands in the way of a synthesized approach incorporating both realism and neoliberal institutionalism. They write, “Neoliberalism and realism not only share a commitment to rationalism as a metatheoretical stance, but may fruitfully work together when it comes to explaining international regimes, thus offering the prospect of a more unified rationalist theory of international institutions” (Hasenclever, Mayer and Rittberger, 1997:7). They are less optimistic about integration of constructivist approaches.

Constructivists stress the role of social knowledge in the practice of world politics. Where norms, ideas, and principles are seen as largely epiphenomenal to policy outcomes (such as regime formation) in both the realist and neoliberal camps, they are considered much more endogenous from the constructivist perspective. Constructivists not only suggest that structural environments are largely a social construct, but also that social
constructs (such as identities) shape interests (Wendt, 1992; 1994). In the words of Samuel Huntington (1997:28-29): “We have to know who we are before we can know what our interests are.” How might this point of view help us to understand the dynamics of regime formation? There are several possibilities for the role of norms, ideas, and principles. The first involves perceptions regarding the interests and motives of other participants. Robert Jervis (1983) argues that in order for regimes to develop, participants must believe that others share their interests in regime design and targeted results. This perspective clearly suggests overlap with neoliberal perspectives concerning the constellation of interests as primary causal variables. On the one hand, it appears supportive of Stein’s view that shared interests are pivotal in regime formation. However, when mixed with the realist perspective, it raises the question of interests in situations of “imposed regimes.” Can imposed regimes establish conditions of common interest? In other words, if one nation has a preponderance of power, could economic and/or security dependence cause interests to converge? As applied in the North American context, such questions press for a more complete understanding of both individual interests (at the state level), as well as whether American leadership and/or suasion truly create a political environment of common interest if individually they are not congruent.

Another key area where ideas would seem to matter in the North American context is also closely linked to issues of power and interest. Specifically, shared histories shape national identities in the context of relationships between peoples and states. Current challenges facing states in North America must be cast within a historical context—one that involves social sensitivities to power differentials. The United States’ role as the regional hegemon creates expectations that weaker neighboring states should “fall in line” with U.S. interests. This attitude was clearly articulated during Operation Iraqi Freedom, as U.S. policy makers pressured Canadian and Mexican policy makers to pledge support for the war effort. On the other side, Canadian and Mexican policy makers are at times weary of being bullied by their stronger neighbor or are reluctant to appear as a political lackey to U.S. interests. Such power relationships have a strong effect on the national consciousness, engendering sentiments that a truly “sovereign” national identity requires at least periodic dissent against American interests. These issues come to the fore in cases where there is a disparity of interests and may significantly complicate the formation of “imposed regimes.”

Lastly, and perhaps most significantly, traditional ideas about sovereignty may also have an effect on a potential regime in North America, particularly when applied to issues of migration and border control. Although neoclassical economic principles adopted in the contemporary Bretton Woods era have prompted many “trading states” to willingly cede some degree of sovereignty in terms of cross-border flows in order to obtain the economic benefits of such mobility, this has generally not been applied in the realm of international migration. Rather, control over who enters the country and who may be eligible to become part of the national polity
remains a cornerstone of societal dimensions of sovereignty (Rudolph, 2004). As such, efforts to shift policy making beyond the confines of the nation-state have continually met strong resistance or have been unable to overcome initial political inertia whatsoever. This has been the case even in Europe, where we have witnessed the most ambitious efforts to establish such a supranational regime. Complicating the issue in the North American context is the disparity of views regarding migration and sovereignty. Whereas Canadians and Americans generally see the extension of control measures as an assertion of social/state sovereignty, Mexicans continually assert the right of individuals to migrate as a cornerstone of sovereignty—both domestically and internationally—a right explicit in the Mexican constitution.

III. North American Integration and Border Management

In contrast to Europe, integration and regional cooperation in North America was not initiated under extreme circumstances. Instead of a comprehensive “grand design,” such as the one articulated in the Treaty of Rome, North American integration has been more measured and incremental. Recognition of regional—if not global—interdependence concerning international migration has pressed policy makers to shift political discourse from one solely rooted in a domestic perspective to one that moves beyond national borders. This does not necessarily mean that policy makers see management issues from a regional interest, but rather, that regional cooperation is necessary in order to achieve national interests. In an address to the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 4, 2003, John Ashcroft explained that “close working relationships with international allies” would allow the United States to “leverage our anti-terrorism efforts throughout the world” (Ashcroft, 2003). Ashcroft's remarks suggest that, for American policy makers, international cooperation is seen as an extension of U.S. interests and strategy. This strategy to “leverage” U.S. efforts through international cooperation has initially taken two primary forms: the “Smart Border Declaration” with Canada and the “U.S.-Mexico Border Partnership Action Plan.”

Bilateral cooperation between the United States has a long tradition, and has been described as “the most extensive bilateral relationship in the world” (Qtd. in Johnson and Fitzgerald, 2003). In 2003, Tom Ridge, then-U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security, explained the desire for intergovernmental cooperation as an issue of common interests. He stated, “By working together we can better reach our common goals of ensuring the security and prosperity of our citizens” (Canadian Embassy (Washington, DC), 2003). Yet, when we examine the parameters of the existing bilateral measures taken concerning migration and border control, it appears that “common interests” have not generated movement toward a formal regime. Rather, the extension of egoistic self-interest (i.e., “leveraging” domestic efforts) is the driving force being the increased cooperation that we have seen, especially since 9/11.
From the American viewpoint, cooperation with Canada is deemed increasingly important for U.S. security. First, there was concern about terrorist activity and infiltration from the North. Suspicions rose with the apprehension of Ahmed Ressam in December 1999, and these were later bolstered by a 2003 report which suggested that some 50 terrorist groups were present and active in Canada at that time. Moreover, there is a considerably widespread belief that Canadian immigration and border policies are somewhat lax, especially those concerning refugees and asylum (Gallagher, 2003). From the Canadian standpoint, although the 9/11 attacks in the U.S. increased the salience of counter-terrorism as a policy imperative (from the standpoint of self-interest), expressed interests continued to focus on building a more open border. Inability to increase security along the border and allay U.S. concerns would no doubt put this goal in jeopardy. The tremendous back-ups at key points along the border in the days following 9/11 made this perfectly clear.

With mutual interest in increased cooperation, Canadian Deputy Prime Minister John Manley and Governor Tom Ridge signed the Smart Border Declaration on December 12, 2001. The declaration was accompanied by a 30-point action plan based on four pillars: 1) the secure flow of people, 2) the secure flow of goods, 3) secure infrastructure, and 4) information sharing and coordination in the enforcement of these objectives. Table 1 summarizes elements of the 30-point action plan most relevant to pillars 1, 3, and 4 of the Smart Border Declaration. What becomes quickly evident, even with only a cursory examination of the language used within the document, is that the Smart Border Declaration advances integration of border management more so in terms of coordination rather than collaboration. Indeed, according to a 2003 progress report of the Action Plan, there has been considerable progress made in the area of coordination.

In terms of bilateral cooperation and the creation of “smarter” borders, several examples are particularly noteworthy. The US-Canada NEXUS program represents a model example in terms of migration control. NEXUS is intended to concurrently facilitate migration flows while maintaining protocols to increase security. The program enlists the cooperation of several agencies on both sides of the border, including the U.S. Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the Canadian Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA), and Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). NEXUS is intended to facilitate the flow of “low risk” travelers who are pre-screened and must be approved by officials in both Canada and the United States (The White House, 2002). The number of designated lanes for NEXUS participants has been continually expanding, beginning with one site in June 2000 (Port Huron-Sarnia) and expanding to 15 by the fall of 2003.
The expansion of the Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs) also suggests progress in bilateral cooperation in border control between the United States and Canada. Initially established in 1996 along the border in the western region of Washington state to combat drug smuggling and illegal immigration, IBETs have now been expanded across the entire U.S.-Canada border. IBETs establish coordination between numerous agencies, including ICE, the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the FBI, ATF, U.S. Secret Service, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), the CCRA, and numerous local law enforcement agencies on both sides of the border. These are then managed by a Joint Management Team from senior officials drawn from participating agencies that facilitate intelligence sharing and conduct joint operations for border security. Such

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coordination or Collaboration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biometrics</td>
<td>Establish common standards for biometrics</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Alternative Inspection System</td>
<td>Expedited inspection lanes for frequent travelers</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Asylum Processing</td>
<td>Share information regarding refugee/asylum applicants</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Asylum Policy</td>
<td>Establishment of “safe third country” policy</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa Policy Coordination</td>
<td>Increase cooperation in visa processing by sharing intelligence information</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pre-clearance</td>
<td>Expansion of air pre-clearance procedures</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Passenger Information</td>
<td>Provide passenger name records for travelers</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Passenger Analysis Units</td>
<td>Cooperate on identifying potentially high-risk travelers</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Officers Overseas</td>
<td>Allow deployment of immigration officers between countries</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Border Enforcement Teams</td>
<td>Shared training and increased cooperation among border security and law enforcement agencies</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Intelligence</td>
<td>Establish Integrated National Security Enforcement Teams on a case-by-case basis</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingerprint information sharing</td>
<td>Implement electronic system for exchange of fingerprint and criminal records information</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canadian Embassy (Washington, DC)
cooperation, especially in terms of intelligence, increases control capacities for both Canadian and American agencies. Roy Hoffman, head of the ICE office in Blaine, Washington, suggested that, “Sharing information with our Canadian counterparts allowed both sides to better determine where our efforts had to be centered and gave all of us a better chance of success” (Qtd. in Seper, 2004:A7).

Such improvements in bilateral coordination have been touted as evidence that security can be established without sacrificing security by creating smarter borders. In the one-year progress report, John Manley argued that, “The speed with which we have been able to expand programs like NEXUS, FAST and our Integrated Border Enforcement Teams demonstrates our commitment to making the smart border a reality.” As shown in Table 1, however, the level of integration in terms of the smart border remains relatively shallow, with little effort made to formally link or harmonize policy. That said, there is some progress in terms of collaboration in the areas of visa issuance and refugee/asylum policy. Informal convergence is evident in the area of visa issuance. The United States and Canada now share common visa policies with 175 countries, though they still differ with respects to 18 other countries.

Refugee and asylum policy also reflects increased collaboration, although there seems to be a considerable difference in attitudes between Canadian and American policy makers. At issue is whether or not Canada is “soft” on refugee and asylees, and both the ideational and political obstacles to policy change in this area to conform to American desires for increased security. American policy makers need not rely solely on their own suspicions. Skepticism has also been raised by critics north of the border. For example, a Fraser Institute study suggested that, “Canada’s refugee-determination system and migration-control policies are out of step with what appears to be a clear convergence of policies and practices in the developed world” (Gallagher, 2003:5). Joe Bissett, former executive director of the Canadian Immigration Service, seconded this opinion: “We have the most generous refugee system in the world. Much too generous.”

Although harmonization of asylum policy is listed under the 30-point action plan, a closer look at the issue warrants pessimism as to the probability of increased collaboration. In terms of current policy, several dimensions of the Canadian system make it disproportionately open relative to other advanced industrial states. These include high rates of approvals, a generous social welfare system, infrequent prosecutions, and lax deportation procedures. In 2002, the refugee recognition rate (for in-country determinations) in Canada was nearly double the U.S. rate, while the per-capita acceptance rate of refugees from 2000-2002 (in-country Convention refugee recognitions) was four times the American rate (UNHCR, 2003). Moreover, authorities detain few refugees and asylees while their claims are pending adjudication, even though Canadian law permits detention of those applicants who might represent a possible security threat or flight risk. In fact, generally only 5 percent of refugees entering Canada are detained, while the remaining 95 percent are released until their immigration hearing is held. Moreover, in Canada there a few barriers to
claimants working and accessing social entitlement programs while their claims are pending. In contrast, the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) added to existing restrictions on access to social welfare for applicants while their case is being adjudicated by requiring that employment authorization not be authorized for a period of at least six months. Because “first instance” determination of asylum status must be processed within 180 days according to U.S. law, employment opportunities are reserved only for those who warrant an affirmative determination of their case. Moreover, in addition to detaining claimants pending review of their case, the United States also has an “expedited removal” system in place that facilitates detention and removal of individuals apprehended who do not have proper immigration or travel documents. In addition, out-of-status foreigners in the country for more than one year are barred from applying for asylum and are subject to deportation if apprehended.9

In contrast to its American usage, it has been argued that the use of the term “expedited” in the Canadian sense has been to “speed positive claims toward recognition” (Gallagher, 2003:14). Failure to detain applicants pending what is often a lengthy judicial review process is coupled with a de facto policy of failing to deport those who either fail to appear at their hearing or are denied refugee status. One analyst noted, “Not only does Canada permit anyone who arrives to make an asylum claim, but many of those eventually denied refugee status are never removed from the country. Only about 9,000 people are removed from Canada each year, and of these, approximately two-third[s] are failed asylum seekers” (Bissett, 2002:5). According to the Auditor-General’s 2003 report, Canadian authorities have lost track of 36,000 foreigners that were supposed to be deported over the past six years (Berry et al., 2003:147).

Canada’s refugee and asylum policies have resulted in trends that are disconcerting to some security-minded American policy makers. Certainly, Canada’s stance vis-à-vis asylum and refugees make it a first choice for those seeking protection, as well as those seeking admission that failed through other channels (Gallagher, 2003:9). Unfortunately, this also creates conditions conducive for the infiltration of foreign terrorists. The Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) has confirmed the presence of some 50 active terrorist organizations operating in Canada, ranging in scope from the Irish Republican Army to Hezbollah, Hamas, and al Qaeda.10 Moreover, Hani Al-Sayegh, Gazi Ibrahim Abu Mezer, Nabil Al-Murabbb, and Ahmed Ressam (all known terrorists) gained access to Canada by seeking political asylum upon entry.11 Canadian officials were recently outraged when a report issued by the Federal Research Division of the Library of Congress listed Canada among the nations that are “ hospitable to organized crime and terrorism” (Berry et al., 2003). The authors quoted a senior CSIS official who argued that, “in most cases, [terrorists] appear to use Canadian residence as a safe haven, a means to raise funds, to plan or support overseas activities or as a way to obtain Canadian travel documents which make global travel easier.”12 From a U.S. security point of view, this represents a potential threat to American security as terrorists
can exploit Canadian policy and then use their Canadian base as a potential staging ground for terrorist attacks.

In the European Union, policy makers have sought to increase security through integration and policy harmonization, including “fast track” processing to dismiss “patently unfounded” asylum claims and applying “safe third country” and “safe country of origin” principles in asylum processing to reduce the practice of “asylum shopping.” Indeed, in the case of Germany, EU harmonization provided a rationale for a significant tightening of asylum policy, one that had been the most liberal in post-WWII Europe and protected by the German Basic Law (Joppke, 1997; Joppke, 1999). Applying this strategy in North America has proven to be politically challenging, even given the strong bilateral relationship between Canada and the United States.

Canadian concerns for protecting the human rights of bona fide refugees and asylum seekers fleeing persecution made them weary to apply strict limitations on “safe third country” entrants. For example, a Canadian Refugee Bill that included a “safe third country” provision was tabled in Parliament in 1987. After heated debate and considerable political opposition, the bill finally was approved in July 1988. However, when the new law came into effect, government officials were unable to establish a list of “safe countries.” Moreover, the Cabinet did not consider the United States to be a “safe country” for Salvadorans and Guatemalans that fled Central America in the 1980s. Ultimately, the Minister of Immigration announced that, “at the present time I am prepared to proceed with no country on the safe third country list” (Qtd. in Bissett, 2002:4). New legislation passed after 9/11 has yet to change Canada’s concerns about the practice of safe third country principles in asylum processing. The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, passed in November 2001, actually increases restrictions on applying the “safe third country” principle in the practical processing of asylum claims. A report released in December 2003 points out that, “Article 102(2)(a) of the IRPA requires the government to ‘consider’ whether a ‘responsibility-sharing’ agreement exists between Canada and the transit country before a refugee claim can be considered ‘ineligible’ for determination in Canada” (Gallagher, 2003:15). In contrast to American legislation passed after 9/11 that stresses security interests (e.g. USA Patriot Act, the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry/Exit Reform Act), the title of the 2001 legislation touts Canada’s commitment to refugee protection with no reference to security. Moreover, policy makers have made their discomfort at policy harmonization quite clear. In October 2001, Immigration Minister Elinor Caplan suggested that U.S.-Canada discussions concerning a security perimeter focus on information sharing rather than harmonization: “Let there not be any misunderstanding. Canadian laws will be made right here in the Canadian Parliament” (Qtd. in Adelman, 2002).

On the American side, there appears to be less incentive for a bilateral third country agreement with Canada, since the flow of asylum seekers generally flows toward Canada from the United States. Rather, a U.S. State Department official suggested that the “safe third country” agreement is
something that “...Canada wants and that we are willing to agree to as a trade-off for other important counter-terrorism measures.” Reluctance for deeper integration and harmonization in this area is also evidenced in practice. For example, U.S. treatment of the case of Maher Arar suggests wariness with Canada’s commitment to the war on terrorism and may also hint at a reluctance to turn over individuals that appear on U.S. anti-terrorist watch lists. U.S. immigration officials at Kennedy Airport detained Arar, a naturalized Canadian citizen born in Syria, on September 26, 2002, when he was suspected of having ties to Al Qaeda. Rather than deporting him to Canada, American authorities unilaterally decided to send Arar to Syria, without consulting Canadian authorities. A report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies suggests that, “By refusing to send [Arar] to Canada, the U.S. government appears to have believed Canada would let Arar walk free, or at a minimum fail to gain any information from him” (Belelieu, 2003:7).

The political inertia involved may explain the lag in implementing the safe third country agreement. The agreement was signed on December 5, 2002, but was not implemented until December 29, 2004. Under the terms of the agreement, refugees claimants are required to submit their claim in the first country they enter—either the United States or Canada (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2004). In addition to being limited in scope (including only Canada and the U.S.), other limitations were included. An exception exists for refugee claimants attempting to enter Canada from the U.S. if they have family in Canada or if they are an unaccompanied minor. In addition, the agreement applies only to land border crossings. It does not include claims processed at airports or in the country’s interior.

The safe third country agreement is significant development in border management, and definitely suggests that increased collaboration between the United States and Canada is possible. However, there are many obstacles facing the creation of a more expansive North American security perimeter regime. For Canadians, immigration and border policy preferences are based on 1) maximizing the economic gains from migration, 2) upholding Canada’s liberal humanitarian tradition, including protection for refugees and for those fleeing persecution requiring asylum, 3) facilitating the social integration of new immigrants, and 4) border control as a component of homeland security. Liberal, open policies have strong domestic lobbies in Canada that have been instrumental in shaping both immigration and asylum policies. Moreover, the human rights and immigration law lobbies have successfully institutionalized protections for migrants within the judiciary (as well as the Immigration and Refugee Board) that constrain policy makers from enacting restrictionist policies. A Fraser Institute report argues, “...any effort to harmonize policies with other developed countries to address the challenge of illegal immigration...will evoke strong criticism from refugee advocacy and human rights groups as it has in all other developed countries” (Gallagher, 2003:31). Indeed, defense of Canadian liberal identity is also evidenced in their preference for the term “zone of confidence” rather than “security perimeter” when discussing bilateral cooperation (Andreas,
Moreover, protection of Canada’s approach to immigration reflects its distinctiveness and sovereignty. John Manley made this expression of a defense of Canadian sovereignty explicit: “Working closely with the United States does not mean turning over to them the key to Canadian sovereignty” (Qtd. in Wells, 2003:A6; Barry, 2003:11).

The Americans also have an economic-based interest in relatively liberal border policies. On this point, there is commonality between American and Canadian interests. However, the emphasis the Bush administration has placed on security and the war on terrorism warrant that economic interests cannot be forwarded at the expense of security. It is here that interests diverge. The Americans see coordination as a necessary means to increase security. From the U.S. standpoint, maximizing the capacity to screen entrants is not only a homeland security imperative, but a prerequisite for maintaining a relatively open stance regarding migration—both permanent and temporary. Coordination and collaboration would seem to forward this aim. However, like their Canadian counterparts, U.S. policy makers are also keenly defensive of their sovereignty in the issue of migration, making policy integration politically difficult. Echoing the sentiments of Canadian policy makers, President Bush remarked, “You pass your laws, we’ll pass our laws” (Qtd. in Frank and Handelman, 2001:45; also Barry 2003:11).

The Smart Border plan articulates several areas to cultivate increased coordination but few regarding policy harmonization or integration—in other words, few constraints are placed on independent policy decision making. Howard Adelman (2002:24) argues, “Immigration and refugee policy has not been harmonized between Canada and the United States. Nor are there any indications that they will be.” The fact that the driving force behind such a regime is one that is more in line with a common aversion (terrorist alien infiltration) than a common interest (preference for a single common outcome), and is influenced by ideas regarding the goals and structures of such a regime, all would suggest that deeper integration remains politically challenging. Moreover, the process of a deepening of integration similar to that in the EU is likely to be incremental rather than the product of a comprehensive shift in grand strategy. In other words, the process is more likely to resemble policy makers “muddling through” in a piecemeal fashion than reinventing the North American space.

IV. The Future of Cooperation

In March of 2005, the leaders of NAFTA countries adopted a Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America forward a regional strategy to deal with shared challenges, including border management (Independent Task Force, 2005). Can a regional approach to border management work in North America? The European Union’s extensive experience with regional approaches to policy serves as an appealing example of what is possible. However, when one recognizes the important differences that exist on the two sides of the Atlantic, as well as the EU’s more recent challenges with expansion, two things become clear: 1) the challenge is
formidable—strategically, logistically, and politically; and 2) the process of increased regionalization in border management will likely be an incremental one rather than a giant leap forward.

As the evidence presented here shows, creation of a truly “smart borders” regime requires a fundamental reorganization of existing structures and procedures. The fact that this necessitates fundamental changes both in border management and intelligence makes this task all the more daunting. Add to this the institutional inertia particularly acute in the intelligence community, and one begins to see the magnitude of what deeper North American integration entails.

Europe’s success with regional integration was largely a function of the unique context in which the process was begun. Acute geopolitical threat that followed the close of WWII created conditions where major players (especially France and Germany in the earliest stages) shared common interests and ideas and were pressed to act quickly and decisively to forge an integrated response. Indeed, shared interests do exist among North American countries—however, significant differences in how best to proceed are also present. Without an overwhelming threat to push the process of integration, these differences make a sudden shift in grand strategy unlikely. In some respects, the EU is facing similar difficulties now, particularly in the wake of the recent expansion and accession of 10 new countries. Intelligence sources in the EU suggested that national agencies are sharing information on a case-by-base basis, but are often reluctant to share information with new accession countries fearing that it could compromise their sources (Daily Times, November 11, 2004).

Moreover, expanding the Schengen Information System to include the new accession states has proven challenging. Indeed, significant expansion has required a new SISII to be developed, a process that has encountered significant logistical and political obstacles, though it is intended to be implemented by 2007. In addition to adding scope (to accommodate new EU members), the development of the SISII is predicated by the desire to move from a purely reporting system (for law enforcement) to an investigating system for intelligence pooling. Again, agency reluctance to share information or to agree on firm rules to manage the flow of information make establishing a working SISII more difficult for policymakers in the European Union. Another strategy to forward intelligence sharing has also gained proponents in Europe—an EU-wide intelligence service. The EU’s current intelligence agency, Europol, has had limited success in fostering member state cooperation. Magnus Ranstorp and Jeffrey Cozzens of the Center for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at St. Andrews suggest that, “Europol has failed to transcend the traditional obstacles to intelligence sharing; the 34 law enforcement agencies are still reluctant to share ‘high grade,’ real-time intelligence on terrorism that can be acted on immediately” (Ranstorp and Cozzens, 2004). Indeed, as discussions on how to best promote intelligence sharing proceed, it is clear that significant disagreements exist between countries with larger intelligence services (the so-called “big five,” including Italy, Germany, U.K., France, and Spain) and smaller members of the EU (Nomikos, 2005).
As such, discussions and debate in Europe increasingly resemble those in North America, and easy answers to the challenge of effective immigration control and border management remain elusive.

The evidence presented here does not necessarily suggest that further integration is not possible. On the contrary, the simultaneous need for openness and security would seem to make the creation of cooperative regimes a necessity. What this study does suggest, however, is just how complicated the process is as we move toward such a regime. It is only by understanding the myriad facets involved in creating a functioning smart border that we may be confident of success in achieving mutually desired objectives.
1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago, Feb. 28-Mar. 3, 2007. Portions of this paper were published as, “International Migration and Homeland Security: Cooperation and Collaboration in North America.” 2005. Law and Business Journal of the Americas, vol. 11, no. 3-4, Summer/Fall. This research supported by a Canadian Studies grant provided by the Canadian Embassy, Washington, DC. Their support is gratefully acknowledged. Thanks also to Elsa Arismendi who provided invaluable research assistance with this project.


5. See Migration News (October 5, 2005).


7. Peter Rekai points to several causes for this failure to detain potential “high risk” applicants. These include lack of proper intelligence necessary for to identify “high risk” applicants, lack of adequate detention facilities, and humanitarian considerations. See Rekai (2002:13).


11. Al-Sayegh was suspected in the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Saudia Arabia; Abu Mezer was apprehended with plans to detonate a bomb on a New York City subway in 1997; Al-Murabih has been identified as a key operative of Osama bin Laden; and Ressam was arrested trying to enter the United States from Canada with 100 pounds of high explosives intended for detonation at Los Angeles International Airport on New Years Eve, 1999. CBSNews.com. 2003. “North of the Border.” September 7. http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/09/04/60minutes/printable571584.shtml.
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The chapters in this volume clearly demonstrate how the context of inter-American security has dramatically changed over the last two decades. The traditional threat to security was of a military nature and came from other States within the region, where the main target was the State apparatus. In an era of dictatorships, national armed forces were also often seen as a threat to the security of the citizens.

The new threat to security in the Americas is now more multidimensional in nature. The threat develops from within the region and, more often than not, within the nation-state itself. Threats to security now take the form of pandemics, extreme poverty, human rights violations and terrorism. They are also often centered on transnational organized crime, as highlighted by the OAS Secretary General in speeches made throughout 2007. Furthermore, as stated by David Mares in his chapter, these threats are basically a consequence of “the failure of the political leadership in the 1980s and 1990s to use the grand opportunity provided them by history and the poor themselves to set the bases for economic, political and social development.”

In North America, the terrorist attacks of September 2001 profoundly transformed the security context of the sub-region. Mark Salter aptly summarizes this, in stating that “there has been a fundamental reorientation of the vectors of threat, from threats to the integrity of states, expressed as sovereignty, culture, or economic independence, towards threats to the dispersed security of security, represented as homeland security, economic prosperity, and national identity.” According to Dwight Mason, this is a situation that is now such that it might demand a “new grand strategy.”

Given this fundamental change in the contours of the security threat in the Americas, the contributors to the volume try to understand what constitutes the new roles for the armed forces in the region and how the regional institutions have adapted to the new security environment.

In North America, the reaction of national governments was not only immediate but also extensive. National bureaucracies were created or significantly transformed. Regular discussions were held and coordination mechanisms were established between Ottawa, Washington and Mexico City. However, all of this activity did not result in the establishment of regional institutions oriented toward the protection of North America. With regards to the essential aspects of the management of North American security, national governments were unwilling or unable to create trilateral institutions. Up until now, the “security perimeter” has resulted from a combination of bilateral initiatives linking the United States with each of its neighbors rather than from trilateral initiatives. As is the case with trade and economic relations, a true North American security community remains an elusive goal.
According to Rut Diamint, a measure of how things have changed throughout the region over the past two decades at the hemispheric level is that citizens “... no longer find themselves threatened by their own armed forces.” This is an immense change at the local level compared to the situation of the 1970s and, as José Duran notes, is greatly appreciated by the business community.

Things have also improved regarding regional institutions. The OAS has led the way by establishing new structures such as the Committee on Hemispheric Security and the Secretariat for Multidimensional Security. The OAS was also instrumental in organizing a special conference on hemispheric security which generated a comprehensive security agenda for the region. Finally, coordination between regional organizations has somewhat improved with more regular contact between the OAS and the United Nations, and the institutional link created between the OAS and the Inter-American Defense Board.

We must acknowledge the progress made during the last fifteen years with regards to the institutional response to the security threats in the Americas. Yet we must also clearly indicate that more has to be done to improve the situation. At the national level, democratization must be pushed further in terms of civil-military relations. Many experts will agree with Ms. Diamint that governments need to develop a more “effective democratic civic management of their respective defense organizations.”

A larger space must also be provided for civil society actors at the local as well as the regional level. As Mercedes Botto writes, “the security agenda does not include any mechanism for civil society consultation in the national arenas.” At the regional level, more transparency and accountability is needed so that regional commitments can be monitored by civil society actors.

Finally, significant improvements are needed with regards to the security agenda of the Hemisphere and the institutional design responsible for implementing the agenda. In the first case, the problem lies not with the security agenda itself, which has become quite comprehensive, but with the political will to advance the agenda as underlined by Margaret Daly Hayes. Naturally, a necessary prerequisite is that the governments of the region develop a common vision of the security threat in the Americas, as well as of the policies needed to reduce or eliminate the threat.
In the second case, more effective coordination mechanisms must be put in place, as Cristina Eguizabal recommends, particularly between the UN and the OAS in crisis situations. In this regard, the working relationship established between the two organizations during the Haitian crisis and its aftermath could provide useful lessons for the future. With respect to the hemispheric security institutions themselves, Ms. Daly Hayes accurately points out that much more integration needs to occur for the institutional design to work smoothly. Governments must find ways to strengthen the relationship between the OAS security structures, the Inter-American Defense Board and the Ministries of Defense.

During the 1990s, a process began to help better understand the nature of the threat in the Americas and to help deal with it more effectively. This process is by no means complete, and must continue in the years to come. Hopefully, the contributions in this work will help to better understand the contours of the threat and the type of institutional responses needed to provide the Americas with a safer environment and a better place to live.

Catherine Durepos
Gordon Mace
Les divers chapitres de cette publication démontrent clairement l’évolution des enjeux de la sécurité dans les Amériques au cours des deux dernières décennies. Traditionnellement, la menace à la sécurité était de nature militaire et provenait d’autres États de la région, et la cible principale était l’appareil d’État. Alors que sévissaient les dictatures, les forces armées nationales étaient aussi menaçantes pour leurs propres citoyens.


En Amérique du Nord, les attaques terroristes du 11 septembre 2001 ont profondément transformé le contexte sécuritaire de la sous-région. Mark Salter le résume fort bien en mentionnant qu’«il y a eu une réorientation fondamentale des vecteurs de la menace, passant de la menace à l’intégrité des États, telle qu’affirmée par la souveraineté et l’indépendance culturelle et économique, vers la menace à une variété de dimensions de la sécurité telles la sécurité nationale, la prospérité et l’identité nationale.» Selon Dwight Mason, cette nouvelle situation exige une «toute nouvelle stratégie.»

Compte tenu de ces changements fondamentaux à la configurations des menaces à la sécurité dans les Amériques, les experts ont tenté de comprendre le nouveau rôle des forces armées dans la région et comment les institutions régionales se sont adaptées à ce nouvel environnement.

En Amérique du Nord, la réaction des gouvernements nationaux fut non seulement immédiate mais aussi très vaste. Des institutions nationales ont été mises sur pied ou radicalement transformées. Des discussions régulières et des mécanismes de coordination se sont établis entre Ottawa, Washington et Mexico. Toutes ces activités n’ont toutefois pas mené à la création d’institutions régionales orientées vers la protection de l’Amérique du Nord. En ce qui concerne les aspects fondamentaux de la gestion de la sécurité nord-américaine, les gouvernements nationaux n’étaient pas disposés ou étaient dans l’impossibilité de mettre sur pied des institutions trilatérales. Jusqu’à maintenant, le «périmètre de sécurité» a été le résultat d’une combinaison d’initiatives bilatérales liant les États-Unis avec chacun de ses voisins plutôt que d’initiatives trilatérales. Comme c’est le cas pour le commerce et les relations économiques, une véritable communauté nord-américaine pour la sécurité demeure un but difficile à atteindre.

**Conclusion**
(french version)
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En Amérique du Nord, les attaques terroristes du 11 septembre 2001 ont profondément transformé le contexte sécuritaire de la sous-région. Mark Salter le résume fort bien en mentionnant qu’«il y a eu une réorientation fondamentale des vecteurs de la menace, passant de la menace à l’intégrité des États, telle qu’affirmée par la souveraineté et l’indépendance culturelle et économique, vers la menace à une variété de dimensions de la sécurité telles la sécurité nationale, la prospérité et l’identité nationale.» Selon Dwight Mason, cette nouvelle situation exige une «toute nouvelle stratégie.»

Compte tenu de ces changements fondamentaux à la configurations des menaces à la sécurité dans les Amériques, les experts ont tenté de comprendre le nouveau rôle des forces armées dans la région et comment les institutions régionales se sont adaptées à ce nouvel environnement.

En Amérique du Nord, la réaction des gouvernements nationaux fut non seulement immédiate mais aussi très vaste. Des institutions nationales ont été mises sur pied ou radicalement transformées. Des discussions régulières et des mécanismes de coordination se sont établis entre Ottawa, Washington et Mexico. Toutes ces activités n’ont toutefois pas mené à la création d’institutions régionales orientées vers la protection de l’Amérique du Nord. En ce qui concerne les aspects fondamentaux de la gestion de la sécurité nord-américaine, les gouvernements nationaux n’étaient pas disposés ou étaient dans l’impossibilité de mettre sur pied des institutions trilatérales. Jusqu’à maintenant, le «périmètre de sécurité» a été le résultat d’une combinaison d’initiatives bilatérales liant les États-Unis avec chacun de ses voisins plutôt que d’initiatives trilatérales. Comme c’est le cas pour le commerce et les relations économiques, une véritable communauté nord-américaine pour la sécurité demeure un but difficile à atteindre.
Selon Rut Diamint, le fait que les citoyens «... ne se sentent plus menacés par leurs propres forces armées» est un signe qui montre à quel point les choses ont évolué dans la région au cours des deux dernières décennies au plan hémisphérique. Cela représente un changement considérable au niveau local si l’on compare avec les années 1970. Comme le souligne José Duran, cette situation est très appréciée de la communauté d’affaires.

se sont aussi améliorées pour les institutions régionales. L’OEA a montré la voie en mettant sur pied de nouvelles structures comme le Comité sur la sécurité hémisphérique et le Secrétariat sur la sécurité multidimensionnelle. L’OEA a aussi appuyé l’organisation d’une conférence sur la sécurité hémisphérique qui a donné naissance à un agenda détaillé en matière de sécurité pour la région. Enfin, la coordination entre organisations régionales s’est améliorée grâce à des contacts plus réguliers entre l’OEA et les Nations Unies et par le lien institutionnel créé entre l’OEA et le Conseil interaméricain de la défense.

Nous devons reconnaître que des progrès ont été accomplis au cours des quinze dernières années en ce qui a trait à la capacité de réponse des institutions aux menaces à la sécurité dans les Amériques. Nous devons toutefois aussi affirmer qu’il est nécessaire d’aller beaucoup plus loin pour améliorer les choses. Au niveau national, les relations civilo-militaires se doivent d’être davantage démocratiques. Plusieurs experts seront d’accord avec Mme Diamint lorsqu’elle affirme que les gouvernements doivent développer «une gestion démocratique et civique de leurs organisations de défense qui soit plus efficace».

Une espace plus important devrait aussi être disponible pour les acteurs de la société civile au niveau local et sur le plan régional. Comme l’écrit Mercedes Botto, «l’agenda sur la sécurité n’inclut aucun mécanisme de consultation de la société civile dans les espaces nationaux». Sur le plan régional, si l’on veut que les engagements puissent être évalués par les acteurs de la société civile, il faudra plus de transparence et de responsabilité.

Enfin, de grandes améliorations à l’agenda pour la sécurité de l’Hémisphère, et au design institutionnel pour sa mise en œuvre, sont nécessaires. En premier lieu, le problème ne se situe pas tant au niveau de l’agenda de sécurité, lequel est devenu assez détaillé, mais plutôt au niveau de la volonté politique de le mettre en œuvre, tel que souligné par Margaret Daly Hayes. Naturellement, il est essentiel que les gouvernements de la région développent d’abord une vision commune des menaces à la sécurité dans les Amériques ainsi que des politiques nécessaires pour les réduire ou les éliminer.
En second lieu, des mécanismes de coordination plus efficaces doivent être mis en place, comme le recommande Cristina Eguizabal, particulièrement entre l’OEA et l’ONU lorsque survient une crise. À cet effet, la relation de travail qui s’est établie entre les deux organisations durant la crise en Haïti et ses suites peut nous servir de leçon pour l’avenir. En ce qui concerne les institutions pour la sécurité hémisphérique, Mme Daly Hayes signale avec raison qu’il faudra un degré d’intégration beaucoup plus élevé pour que le design institutionnel fonctionne rondement. Les gouvernements doivent trouver des moyens de renforcer la relation entre les structures de sécurité de l’OEA, le Conseil interaméricain de la défense et les ministères de la Défense.

Au cours des années 1990, un processus visant à nous aider à mieux comprendre la nature de la menace dans les Amériques et à y faire face plus efficacement a débuté. Ce processus est loin d’être complété et doit se poursuivre. Nous avons espoir que les idées avancées dans cette publication permettront de mieux comprendre les contours de cette menace et les réponses institutionnelles nécessaires pour que puissent exister, dans les Amériques, des environnements plus sécuritaires et de meilleurs milieux de vie.

Catherine Durepos
Gordon Mace
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