

INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE COLLEGE  
DEPARTMENT OF STUDIES  
CLASS XLIV

## MONOGRAPH

# The United States National Security Strategy: Implications and Repercussions in Latin America



**BY:**

**LTC Raul Rosado  
United States**

**FORT LESLEY J. McNAIR  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
MAY 2005**

# **The United States National Security Strategy: Implications and Repercussions in Latin America**

**BY**

**LTC Raul Rosado  
United States**

MONOGRAPH PRESENTED TO THE INTER  
AMERICAN DEFENSE COLLEGE AS A REQUISITE  
FOR OBTAINING THE DIPLOMA OF  
COMPLETION FOR THE SUPERIOR  
CONTINENTAL DEFENSE COURSE CLASS XLIII

**FT. LESLEY J. MCNAIR, WASHINGTON, D.C.  
Date: 13May 2005**

I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ AND REVIEWED THIS MONOGRAPH AND FOUND ITS CONTENT AND LANGUAGE ACCEPTABLE AND WITHIN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE COLLEGE'S METHODOLOGY.

---

CNEL Freddy Martinez,  
Assessor Ecuador  
Monograph Advisor

---

Date

**NOTE**

The views and opinions expressed in this work are exclusive of the author and do not represent those of the United States Government, the United States Department of Defense and/or their associate elements and the Inter-American Defense College.

## AUTHORIZATION

I, hereby, authorize the Inter-American Defense College to publish this work, as an article for selected reading or as inclusion in the College Review.

---

LTC Raul Rosado  
United States

---

Date

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. SUMMARY .....	7
2. INTRODUCTION .....	8
3. CHAPTER I: THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY .....	10
1.1 Historical Antecedents .....	10
1.2 The National Security Strategy of United States .....	12
1.3 The Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) .....	15
1.4 Other National Security Strategies and Policies .....	17
4. CHAPTER II: IMPLICATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES' NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY .....	21
2.1 United States' general assessment of the Western Hemisphere .....	21
2.2 General contributions and repercussions of the United States' National Security Strategy .....	27
2.2.1 Military and Political contributions, repercussions, and issues .....	28
2.2.2 Economic contributions ; repercussions and issues .....	30
2.2.3 Social contribution; repercussions and issues .....	31
2.3 Political, Military, Economic, and Social effects the United States' National Security Strategy .....	32
2.3.1 Mexico .....	34
2.3.2 Panama .....	38
2.3.3 Colombia .....	40
2.3.4 Argentina .....	42
5. CHAPTER III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	45
3.1 General Conclusions .....	45
3.2 The Future .....	46
3.2.1 What should we expect from the United States .....	47
3.2.2 What should we expect from Western Hemisphere Countries .....	48
3.3 Recommendations .....	49
6. Bibliography .....	51
7. Acronyms .....	54

## SUMMARY

Since its beginning as a nation, United States took very seriously its local and foreign policy process development. For the most part, since U.S. early years as a nation through the 1940' where characterized by its no involvement in international conflicts and wars. U.S. struggled with its own internal wars and the west conquests. It was only after the Japanese attack on Perl Harbor, Hawaii that United States enters the international stage with a decisive intent of defeating its enemies. Since, U.S. has developed a very assertive Foreign Policy to deal with the world and defend the nation's interests at home and abroad. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on American soil served to reinforce United States National Defense Strategy and Foreign Policy. Because of this new era of international terrorism, as it was after Perl Harbor attack, United States National Defense Strategy and Foreign Policy has created resentment throughout the world as well as in the Western Hemisphere. The creation of new departments, new defense plans and national policy has left developing countries in the Western Hemisphere searching for answers to their internal problems and economic stagnation. New transnational threats (terrorism, drug trafficking, organized crime, etc) has forced countries to tighten up borders, create new policies, invest on security, adjust economic policies, and develop a new mentality of cooperation and sharing to maintain an acceptable level of "governability".

Latin America continues to struggle with the problems of extreme poverty, drug trafficking, human rights violations, governmental corruption, and other modern social, political, and economic plagues. Several countries blame the developed countries, in special the United States, for their failures, while other countries have taken advantage of the moment to grow economically and socially. Whether it is the United States' fault or not is very opinionated, however what is clearly established is that it is each countries' responsibility to foster stable governments, solid economic policies, social programs that benefit the needed, and most important respects human dignity and rights.

## INTRODUCTION

Since the formation of the first countries, states found themselves with the need to define how they would conduct business and interact with other states or countries. Whether in formal or informal manner countries establish rules, policies and treaties regarding how it will conduct commerce, trade, defend and coexist with neighboring countries. These policies evolved into what we presently know and define as “Foreign Policy or External Politics.” Such policies have to evolve to allow states achieve their goals and meet their present and future expectation. Our world continues to change as well as the political divisions of land and nations. Thirty new countries<sup>1</sup> have been created since 1990, including the latest state, the Marshall Islands<sup>2</sup>. With this phenomenon, countries created new policies and adjusted exiting ones to meet the new demands for coexistence.

The United States of America is not different from any other country in that it also had to establish its own external policies to deal with the rest of the world and protect its interests. In today’s, globalize world this task becomes very difficult and a complex one. We may be lead to believe that countries establish similar policies to deal with similar situation with all states; however, it does not always happen that way. Countries generally create and establish different policies to deal with similar issues depending on the country and the issue at hand. It would make much sense to think that countries should establish and follow similar policies to deal with similar situations regardless of the country or state however many particular issues, become actors in the process making states adjust policies to meet their goals and objectives.

This study focuses on how the United States’ foreign policy affects Latin America and how countries in the Western Hemisphere react to these. The study is an analysis of the implications and repercussion the United States’ National Security Policy has on the Western Hemisphere. Three main

---

<sup>1</sup> The dissolution of the USSR and Yugoslavia in the early 1990s caused the creation of most of the newly independent states.

<sup>2</sup> The Marshall Islands was part of the Trust Territory of Pacific Islands (administered by the United States) and gained independence as a former colony, establishing it self as an independent state in September 17, 1991.

areas are analyzed in this study. First, the effect the United States' National Security Policy has on the Western Hemisphere countries from the United States point of view. Second, review the effects of the National Security Policy from the Western Hemisphere Countries' perspective and point of view. Third, make recommendations and extrapolations of the region's future. Each perspective or point of view will analyze the Political-Military, economic and social aspects. In addition, we will explore the different dynamics of the Western Hemisphere countries' interstate relationships. Due to the constraints<sup>3</sup>, the study's primary focus is on the impact and point of view that Mexico, Panama, Colombia, and Argentina, have about U.S. National Security Policy. Throughout the study, other countries within the Hemisphere are worth mentioning due to their impact on the entire Hemisphere and the world.

---

<sup>3</sup> To study the implications of the United States' National Security Policy in all the countries of the Western Hemisphere will exceed the time allotted and would become too complex, hence the study will focus on four countries (Panama, Colombia, Argentina, and Mexico).

# CHAPTER I

## The United States National Security Strategy

### 1.1 Historical Antecedents

Within the United States' federal government, many departments and agencies share the great responsibility of establishing U.S. foreign policy. In addition, many other agencies also participate in the process of developing and writing regulations intended to safeguard the country and advance national interest. Certainly, policies and decisions made by these agencies and departments in many occasions transcend U.S. borders, thus affecting people, business, and countries all around the world. Among the many departments and agencies of the United States government that influence the making and implementation of the National Security Policy are the Departments of State, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Immigration, Homeland Security, Justice, Transportation, the CIA<sup>4</sup>, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcements, the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Security Agency to mention a few. In the United States, due to its democratic system, other non-governmental organizations also have great impact on the process. It is public knowledge that religious groups influence the United States elections' outcome, a powerful reason for politicians to pay close attention to these groups. This influence eventually translates into policies and beliefs by which U.S. stands by.

Since the end of World War II, each president's administration has worked very hard in developing the perfect set of executive institutions to manage national security policies and issues. Through history, each elected president has created a policy-making and coordination system to reflect his own personal management style. In this quest, many systems have come and gone with various degrees of success. The National Security Council (NSC) has been at the center of the foreign policy development system since the 1940' mainly as the result of the quest of improving national security.

The NSC has gone through many changes and evolution since its creation. The National Security Act of 1947 established the National Security Council<sup>5</sup> because government realized the

---

<sup>4</sup> The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

<sup>5</sup> The National Security Council was created by Public Law 80(253, approved July 26, 1947, as part of a general reorganization of the U.S. National Security apparatus.

degree of disorder and lack of coordination existing among agencies involved in major post-war policy-making. The NSC then acted under the “chairmanship” of the President, and included the following seven officials as permanent members: the President, the Secretaries of State, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The President would designate "from time to time" the secretaries of other executive departments to attend meetings depending on the topic under discussed. While the new Central Intelligence Agency reported to the NSC, the Director of Central Intelligence was not a permanent member, although he attended meetings regularly as an observer and adviser.

The NSC was the body responsible for coordinating foreign and defense policy. As the proponent of the reform the NSC, realized that there were no institutional means for the coordination of foreign and defense policy. It also determined that the informal management techniques employed by President Roosevelt during World War II and President Truman after the war were not suitable for long range planning. Since its inception under President Truman, the function of the Council has been to advise and assist the President on national security and foreign policies. The Council also served as the President's principal arm for coordinating these policies among the various government agencies.

Since then the NSC has evolved expanding its oversight. Membership has changed however; the President still chairs the council. Its regular attendees (both statutory and non-statutory) include the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff <sup>6</sup> and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the statutory military advisor to the Council, and the Director of Central Intelligence is the intelligence advisor. Among others invited to attend meetings depending on the subject of the session are; the Chief of Staff to the President, the Counsel to the President, the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, the Attorney General, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the heads of other executive departments and agencies, as well as other senior officials. It continues to be the National Security Council's responsibility to advise the President of the United States regarding official foreign policy. In addition, it continues to be very true that many governmental departments and agencies have a great level of influence in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Only the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff attends the meetings and not all the head of the Military Services (Army, Navy, and Air Force) as in the pass.

establishment of foreign policy including the areas of defense, commerce, transportation, immigration, and National Security. The coordinated effort to present one view or perspective on any particular issues remains a great challenge for the current administration, as it normally occurs in a well-established democratic system. For 50 years, 10 Presidents have sought to use the National Security Council system to integrate foreign and defense policies in order to preserve the nation's security and advance interests abroad. Over the years, structural modifications have always reflected presidential management styles.

## **1.2 The National Security Strategy of United States of America<sup>7</sup>**

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America is a document prepared periodically by the executive branch of the government of the United States, which outlines the major security concerns of the United States and how the administration plans to deal with them.

The latest National Security Strategy was issued on September 19, 2002 in the midst of controversy over the Bush administration's doctrine of preemptive war. It also contains military doctrine, and new initiatives to provide substantial foreign aid to countries that are moving towards Western-style democracy. The National Security Strategy of the United States also contains fundamental elements of the Nation's Foreign Policy, which, addresses national security matters, and the protection of the nation's interest at home and abroad.

The Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 requires the President of the United States of America to submit an annual report to the United States Congress on its national security strategy. According to the United States Law,<sup>8</sup> "The President shall transmit to Congress each year a comprehensive report on the national security strategy of the United States referred to as a 'National Security Strategy Report.'" The law also indicates that the report shall include a comprehensive description and discussion of the worldwide interests, goals, and objectives of the United States that are vital to the national security. The report must also explain the nation's foreign policy, worldwide commitments, and national defense capabilities necessary to discourage aggression and to implement the national security strategy. The report must address proposed short and long-term uses of the political,

---

<sup>7</sup> Published in September 2002 by President Bush's Administration in accordance to Law

<sup>8</sup> US Code TITLE 50, CHAPTER 15, SUBCHAPTER I: § 404a Annual National Security Strategy Report, Release date: 2003-08-01.

economic, military, and other elements of the national power of the United States, and an evaluation of the balance among the capabilities of all elements of the national power. The law requires that information must be available as necessary to help Congress understanding all matters related to the National Security Strategy (NSS) of the United States.

President George W. Bush's administration issued its first National Security Strategy report in accordance with the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986<sup>9</sup> and by section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947.<sup>10</sup> The report was released a year after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on United States soil. The strategy report was a well overdue explanation of the principles underlying Presidents George W. Bush's foreign policy approach. The report released to Congress on September 19, 2002 established new policies approaches that would dramatically affect life in United States, the Western Hemisphere, and the World as a whole. The concise document focuses on topics grouped under three themes: promoting "human dignity" through political and economical freedom; providing security against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction; and engaging in conflicts areas and with allies in a preemptive manner.

According to many critics, in the current National Security Strategy report, President Bush presents his vision of a "distinctly America Internationalism," in which United States is negatively viewed as the superpower of the present Era. The focus and attention towards the report centers on the strategy support for preemptive actions towards emerging threats in a military manner; however, it is clear that the report covers a much broader group of issues and policies. Although its military emphasis makes the preemption approach, the doctrine is just a part of a fundamental new strategic approach, this is to tackle, rather than tolerate, the roots of global problems. The strategy proposes that the United States will use its military strength and economic and political influence to create "balance of power that favors human freedom" and to defeat any terrorism and tyrants' threat. In general, the American people, who believe that the United States must play an active leadership role in making the world a safer place, may not all agree with parts of the strategy outlined by the current administration. The strategy's overall goal seems to be in line with the American Spirit; however, the proposed means to achieve them are in many minds questionable and rise important issues. For example, the strategy establishes as a goal to promote global freedom but gives priority to

---

<sup>9</sup> The Act mandates an annual report to Congress detailing the National Security Strategy of the United States.

<sup>10</sup> As amended by 50 U.S.C. 404a Unites States Code (U.S.C.)

counterterrorism policy that greatly depends on other helping countries that necessarily do not agree and support United States foreign policies and share the same set of values. The strategy does not establish clear limitations of its preemptive policy tools and does not specify when to use these tools. Although the use of ad-hoc coalitions to address international and regional threats is emphasized in the report, it does not mention the importance and power broad alliances and institutions have in solving international issues (NATO, United Nations, Organization of American States, etc.).

In more details, the report addresses and focuses on the following goals and objectives:

- (a) To champion aspirations for human dignity,
- (b) Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism,
- (c) Work to prevent attacks against the U.S. and its friends,
- (d) Work with others to defuse regional conflicts,
- (e) Prevent U.S. enemies from threatening the U.S., its allies, and friends with weapons of mass destruction (WMD),
- (f) Ignite a new Era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade,
- (g) Expand the circle of development by opening societies,
- (h) Building the infrastructure of democracy,
- (i) Develop agendas for cooperative action with the other main centers of global power, and
- (j) Transform America's National Security Institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the Twenty-First Century.

President Bush Administration's National Security Strategy Report policies are at an initial glance a reaction to the terrorist's attacks on United States of 9/11. One would wonder what the strategy would focus on if the attacks had not occurred. The NSS report instructs governmental agencies and department to rally behind the administration's strategy to deploy and implement it.

### **1.3 The Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report, September 30, 2001 and “Elements of Defense Transformation,” October 2004**

Much uncertainty exist about potential sources of military threat the future may pose to the United States and its allies and friends, however today we are clear that a new type of threats continue to emerge all over the world. The collapse of the Soviet Union changed the landscape of the world. The old bi-polar world approach is now fragmented in many smaller parts were many states and no-states organizations continue to seek power and define their existence. The United States and the Occidental world has become a target for emerging radical terrorist groups. Whether terrorism is based on religious believes or political aspirations, the truth is that United States and its allies must be prepared to defend themselves. Illicit drugs and weapons trafficking, international terrorism, humans trafficking, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and organized crime are just a few emerging transnational plagues that threat United States and the Western Hemisphere’s security. Globalization and the development of new technology have definitely eliminated geographical boundaries and nation’s sovereignty allowing people and organizations dedicated to terrorize others, and create wealth from illicit activities blossom freely.

In addition to the overarching NSS report, we must also study subordinate agencies and departments’ security plans. Reviewing all these plans will enable us to have a comprehensive understanding of the United States’ National Security Strategy. Major players that currently issue additional detailed policy to supplement the NSS are; the Department of Defense, Homeland Security, Immigration, and the Department of State among others.

Even though the United States has enjoyed a worldwide military superiority for many years, it cannot rest on its lures of fame and must be prepared for present and future challenges. The United States confines the task of creating and developing its military strategy and doctrine to the Department of Defense (DOD).

The Department of Defense in conjunction with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) plays a major role pertaining military strategy and national defense for the United States. The United States’ military has a history of transforming it’s self after every major war or event in order to adapt to new needs and threats. As described in the 2001 QDR report and the Annual report to the President

and the Congress, the U.S. defense strategy, provides the context for the implementation of military transformation strategy. It also describes the importance and contribution the transformation has in supporting the National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Chapter IX of the NSS, “Transform America’s National Security Institutions to Meet the Challenges and Opportunities of the Twenty-First Century,”<sup>11</sup> emphasizes the importance of transforming the military while maintaining near-term readiness and the ability to fight the war on terrorism. The purpose of transforming the military responds to the need to combat terrorism, create efficiencies due to tight budgets, and the introduction of new and advance technology.

The United States defense strategy’s main objective is to defend freedom for the United States, its allies, and friends. It intends to seek a secure international environment of peace, which facilitates the achievement of other social, political, and economic goals. The DOD transformation strategy report lays out the framework to achieve its goals and objectives to make national security possible.

The United States defense strategy encompasses four major defense policy goals to achieve its main objective. The first goal is to assure allies and friends that United States is commitment to creating global stability through the presence of U.S. forces. The military plays a significant role in demonstrating that the United States will honor its obligations and always be a reliable partner regarding security. United States’ willingness to use military force to defend its interest and those of its allies and friends to achieve common goals clearly shows its resolve and credibility. A primary objective of the United States is to assist allies and friends, and to create a balanced military force to deter aggression and coercion. A second goal is to dissuade military competence. United States military strategy and policy creates an unfavorable environment for potential adversarial states to enter in a military power competition. A well-established and resourced research, development, and testing programs gives United States an advantage over other countries, dissuading their will to compete militarily. The third goal is to deter threats and coercion against U.S. interest by providing the President with a great range of military options, discouraging aggression by unfriendly countries. United States military forces provide the President the ability to conduct military operations of any scale and duration with the precision needed to win and prevent future aggression. Improved intelligence capabilities are particularly important, as these assets provide U.S. forces with critical

---

<sup>11</sup> The National Security Strategy of the United States of America September 20, 2002.

information on adversaries' intentions, plans, strengths, and weaknesses. The fourth goal is to be always prepared to engage and decisively defeat any adversary if deterrence fails.

President George W. Bush's reelection team provides the current administration with another term (four years) to finalize its work of transforming the military to meet national security requirements. This phase of the transformation calls for replacing equipment acquired during the Reagan Administration with more advanced and efficient platforms, change in doctrine, a personnel reform, and changes at the higher levels of administration. The current military transformation plan hinges on the following four pillars; strengthening Joint Operations, exploiting US. Intelligence advantages, concept development and experimentation, and developing transformational capabilities.

#### **1.4 Other National Security Strategies and Policies**

As previously mentioned, other federal departments and agencies also develop strategies, policies, and plans to support the NSS. In July of 2002, the newly established Office of Homeland Security<sup>12</sup> within the White House issued its National Strategy for Homeland Security. The National Strategy for Homeland Security is the product of many months of consulting authorities and agencies at all levels, federal, state, and local. The plan was developed base on feedback and recommendations provided by governors, mayors, police and firefighters professionals, state legislators, doctors, scientist, professors, airline pilots, business leaders, civic activists, victims and their families, journalist and soldiers among many other professionals. President Bush's intent was to publish a national strategy and not a federal plan. "Homeland security is a shared responsibility. My intent in publishing the *National Strategy for Homeland Security* is to help Americans achieve a shared cooperation in the area of homeland security for years to come."<sup>13</sup> The National Strategy for Homeland Security is different from the Department of Defense's strategy and others in that it is a revolutionary concept. The strategy establishes goals and objective to defend our Homeland against terrorisms and not strategies to apply abroad as it was before 9/11. It was also the initial steps in putting in motion the largest reorganizations of the federal government in the last fifty years. With the intention to protect the homeland against terrorist attacks, the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress of the United States during its second session enacted the Homeland Security Act of 2002 establishing the Department of

---

<sup>12</sup> On October 8, the President of the United States established the Office of Homeland Security within the White House and as its first responsibility directed it to produce the first National Strategy for Homeland Defense.

<sup>13</sup> President George W. Bush's cover letter to the national Strategy for Homeland Defense published plan, July 2002.

Homeland Defense. The newly created department has the monumental tasks of protecting the entire society against terrorism. This results in an extremely difficult and complex mission and requires the mobilization and coordination of many resources. The department's first priority is to prevent new terrorist attacks on United States soil. To accomplish its mission, the Department of Homeland Security consolidated 22 agencies and 180,000 employees, merging federal functions into a single agency dedicated to protecting America from terrorism. The new department would take over and continue the work the goals established by Office of Homeland Security created earlier by the President.

The objectives of the Department of Homeland Security in order of priority stated in the plan are to; prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the danger and recover from attacks if they occur. The implementation of the strategy counts on the help and support of federal, state, and local government. It also requires the direct involvement of non-governmental organizations, the private sector, and citizens in general to make the plan an effective one.

Six are the critical mission areas the National Strategy for Homeland Security focuses on and aligns its goals. The functional areas included in the plan are intelligence and warning, border and transportation security, domestic counterterrorism, protecting critical infrastructures, defending against catastrophic terrorism, and emergency preparedness and awareness. As we can see, the strategy has a great impact not only on neighboring countries but also on the entire world. The once very accessible United States is not so any more.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 the Bush Administration in conjunction with other agencies and non-governmental organizations, has developed many strategies at the national level. Without going into the details of each plan, it is important to mention a few plans that affect the United States relationship with the rest of the world. The following published strategies and documents have definitely influenced the way United States defends and secures its homeland as well as, interest abroad. The Managing Mexican Migration to the United States (April 2004), the National Money Laundering Strategy (2003), The National Strategy for Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets (February 2003), are a few new policies and plans developed to support the NSS. The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace (February 2003), National Strategy for

Combating Terrorism (February 2003), National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (December 2002), U.S.-Mexico Border Security and the Evolving Security Relationship (April 2004) are other plans developed so far to support the NSS. On the same token, these strategies also affect the way other nations view the United States and how relationships are redefined.

Yet another piece of legislation that the Bush Administration passed to fight terrorism is the controversial USA Patriot Act in response to the September 11, 2001 attacks. The Bush Administration introduced legislative proposals immediately after the September 11 attacks. Attorney General John Ashcroft pressured Congress to pass the bill without changes within a week. Vermont Democrat Patrick Leahy, chairperson of the Senate Judiciary Committee, convinced the Justice Department to agree to some changes, as members of the House of Representatives began to make significant improvements. However, the Attorney General's warnings of further imminent terrorist acts, and that Congress was to blame if it failed to pass the bill immediately moved Congress to pass the Act. Extensive and hurried negotiation in the Senate resulted in a bipartisan bill. Minor changes made by the House occurred before the bill was passed with a vote of 357 to 66. The Senate and House versions were quickly reconciled, and the President signed the Act into law on October 26, 2001.

The USA Patriot Act brought major changes to the U.S. including amendments to many acts and laws. The Wiretap Statute (Title III), Electronic Communications Privacy Act, Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, Pen Register and Trap and Trace Statute, Money Laundering Act, Immigration and Nationality Act, Money Laundering Control Act, Bank Secrecy Act, Right to Financial Privacy Act, and the Fair Credit Reporting Act were all affected with the intention of providing authorities with new tools to fight terrorism.

The Act gives federal officials greater authority to track and intercept communications, for both, law enforcement and foreign intelligence gathering purposes. This new Law continues to be one of great controversial in negotiating with other countries in the Hemisphere. It empowers the Secretary of the Treasury with regulatory authority to combat corruption within U.S. financial institutions and prevent foreign money laundering activities. The Act seeks to close our borders to foreign terrorists and to detain and remove those within our borders. It creates new crimes, new

penalties, and new procedural efficiencies for use against domestic and international terrorists. Although it is not without safeguards, critics say some of its provisions go too far. Although it grants many of the enhancements pursued by the Department of Justice, some are concerned that it does not go far enough. Others believe it violates human rights, invades privacy, and is goes far beyond the required tools to fight terrorism. Many Latin American countries see The Patriot Act as an impediment to advance relationships and establish trust with U.S.

## Chapter II

### Implications of United States' National Security Strategy

#### 2.1 United States' general assessment of the Western Hemisphere from a political, economic, social, and military point of view

Before proceeding with the analysis of the effects and repercussions of the United States National Security Strategy and Policy has on countries of the Western Hemisphere, it is important to present United States' point of view of the Hemisphere general situation. A characteristic of the United States' democracy is freedom of speech and the right to free expression. In exercising these rights, many editors, professors, government officials, and citizens in the United States and abroad have analyzed the situation in Latin America. Among those writers, Mr. Ryan Mauro<sup>14</sup> in his article "The Latin American Bloc: The Ignored Danger to Freedom" really stands out. Mr. Mauro indicates that several countries in Latin America continue to foster leftist-socialist forms of governments as well as anti-American sentiments, becoming a threat to United States and neighboring countries. The situation is one that deserves immediate attention before it degrades the great advancements in democracy Latin America has achieved during the last decades.

A major concern surrounds Venezuela and President Hugo Chavez's actions and his display of defiance against the United States. Chavez's open opposition to U.S. policies and President Bush's Administration clearly demonstrate his sentiments. Many analysts accuse him of being Fidel Castro's number one fan, which does not set well with U.S. Others perceive Chavez's actions as a result of his quest for power by drastically reducing Venezuela's freedom. This resulted in massive protests combated by strong oppression of the media and opposing figures supported by Fidel Castro's regimen.

President Chavez's administration recently hired hundreds of Cuban teachers to manage the Venezuelan education system. This action clearly shows Chavez's intentions to create anti-American sentiments in the education system while fostering pro-socialist ideas. I an assessments of his "Plan Bolivar" where the new military-police force took over the authority of the largest social programs,

---

<sup>14</sup> Mr. Mauro is a member of the Northeast Intelligence Network, which specializes in tracking and assessing terrorist threats.

points out that it only serves to decrease privatization, hence transforming free markets and capitalism into socialism and dictatorship. Chavez also ordered his vice president to take charge of the “Bolivian Circles,”<sup>15</sup> heavy populated by Cuban intelligence officials. The Bolivian Circles are similar to those forces Castro formed and used to enforce communism in Cuba. These forces deployed against protestors during the last demonstrations against Chavez. U.S. argues that Chavez’s visit to Libya, Iraq, and Iran to sign agreements of cooperation with these countries, are considered a potential bloc and a threat to American interest. As part of Venezuela’s foreign policy, Chavez openly continues to praise Castro and Saddam Hussein, a clear indication of their common anti-Americanism feelings. They are also strong believers of totalitarianism as a form of governing.

In a much bolder analysis, some single out Chavez as a supporter and protector of terrorist groups, possible thousands of Columbian and Arab terrorist. Many analysts believe that Margarita Island is a safe place for terrorist training camps and money laundering activities. Similarly, there are growing concerns that Cuban intelligence officers are in control of Venezuela’s counter-terrorism and intelligence agencies sections. In addition, many argue that they direct the Presidential Guard and bodyguard forces for Chavez. Columbia continues to hint on allegations that they have evidence indicating that Venezuela is cooperating with the “Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia” known by its Spanish acronym as FARC<sup>16</sup>, and the “National Liberation Army” known by its Spanish acronym as ELN<sup>17</sup> both terrorist rebel groups. Venezuela allows them to use the border area to escape Colombian forces.

Many political, social, and economic specialist and analyst throughout the Hemisphere have expressed their concerns of Venezuela’s strong tendency of a leftist government. Ms. Condoleezza Rice mentioned during her head of the State Department of the United States confirmation hearings, that it is unfortunate that the government of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez has not been

---

<sup>15</sup> New paramilitary local militias created by Chavez.

<sup>16</sup> “Fuerzas Armadas de la Revolución Colombia” FARC for its name in Spanish. In the 1960s, after Colombia’s two main political parties ended more than a decade of political violence and agreed to share power. In 1963, students, Catholic radicals, and left-wing intellectuals hoping to emulate Fidel Castro’s communist revolution in Cuba founded ELN. FARC formed in 1966, bringing together communist militants and peasant self-defense groups.

<sup>17</sup> “Ejercito Nacional de Liberación” name in Spanish. Although ELN is more ideological than FARC, the two groups have similar programs: both say they represent the rural poor against Colombia’s wealthy classes and oppose American influence in Colombia (particularly Plan Colombia), the privatization of natural resources, multinational corporations, and rightist violence. The two groups are rival forces, and FARC now represents a direct threat to ELN.

constructive, but rather a source of difficulties for its neighbors<sup>18</sup>. She also indicated that it was very important for the current administration to monitor the situation in Venezuela. Venezuela's particularly close association with the Communist-controlled Cuba, as well as, its many breaches of democratic institutions within the country deserves close attention by United States and the Hemisphere. "We are very concerned about a democratically elected leader who governs in an illiberal way, and some of the steps that have been taken against the media, against (political) opposition, I think are really very deeply troubling," she said.<sup>19</sup> In summary, Venezuela's President actions are a focal point of concern and interest to United States.

Brazil currently exhibits elements of a leftist form of government, also a concern of United States. Critics believe that the close association with Venezuela and with Castro's help, Luiz Ignacio Lula Da Silva reached power establishing another leftist form of government in Latin America. Da Silva similar to Chavez has expressed his admiration for Fidel Castro and his communist regime. President Da Silva, a unionist by trade, roused to power through the Workers Party to unite the divided groups of the radical left in Brazil. Although President Lula Da Silva served as an ambassador to the Soviet Union<sup>20</sup> under a socialist regime, he has not openly exhibited any anti-Americanism. Even though some analyst and columnist see Brazil as a traditional country with strong commercial and political ties to United States, other express their concerns of a country quickly turning into a threat as the government moves further towards leftist practices. Leftist ideologies trends demonstrated by Brazilians during June of 2003, when they rated the United States, as a nation more dangerous than Iran, continue to worry many in U.S. Even more remarkable were comments by Da Silva during his first day in office about the United States in 2003. Da Silva embraced Venezuela, Brazil, and Cuba as the "Axis of Good," implying the danger United States represented to them.

Brazil expressed its desire of forming an alliance with Cuba, dropping Cuba's embargo led by the West, to make Brazil independent from Western policy. Brazil also expressed interests in promoting a multi polar world were the United States' power is checked by another alliance as it was during the Cold War. Brazil has refused to take action against the Colombian terrorist group FARC

---

<sup>18</sup> These comments come not only by Venezuela's support to the FARC, but also by, the recent resurgence of territorial disputes with Guyana.

<sup>19</sup> Ms. Condoleezza Rice's comments during Congressional confirmation hearings for Secretary of State, 19 January 2005.

<sup>20</sup> President Lula Da Silva served as ambassador to the Soviet Union during the time of Salvador Allende in the 1970s.

because its possible links to Cuba. Brazil strongly opposes the United States' role in the war on drugs in Colombia. After ending scientific cooperation treaties with United States, Brazil established a strategic partnership with China, and improved ties with Russia and France. In addition, Da Silva refuses to support in any way the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FETAA) proposed by President Bush. Another sign of Brazil's anti-Americanism was demonstrated when Da Silva persuaded Chile to oppose to the war in Iraq. Using the excuse of the war in Iraq as a justification, the Brazilian government suddenly increased its research and development of its nuclear program. Even though, it did not specify if the program focused on the development of weapons, while Brazil began a rocket program with China. This represents a threat to the region since we know that Brazil, a former nuclear power, retains its ability to enrich uranium and definitely has the technology and capability to build nuclear weapons.

Because of the deep economic crisis in Argentina, Nester Kirchner, a member of the far left, assumed power in May 2003. The elections results in Argentina gave an immediate boost to similar movements in Uruguay, Bolivia, and Peru, a situation that might merit observing. In a meeting celebrated at City Hall in Argentina, President Lula Da Silva and Fidel Castro said they would initially work toward establishing an alliance bloc between Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina. The alliance building would grow by incorporating Bolivia and Chile, eventually uniting the entire South America to create a multi-polar world to counter American (United States) power. The so call meeting was overcrowded and very popular among Argentines. Argentines dislike of United States is evident and well documented by results of a survey administered by the Pew Research Center. According to the survey, 73% of the country opposes United States' policy.

Although Panama is a strong ally of United States, the turning over of to the Canal Panamanian, authorities allowed Chinese companies gain the dominance of commerce activities in the area. As part of the strategy, the front company, Hutchinson Whampoa, leased the port on both sides of the canal. As mentioned in Chinese military general's texts books, China's strategy in the area is to own ports in the event of a war with United States. It is no coincidence that Cuba, Brazil, and Venezuela have teamed up with China. When United States retired its troop from the Canal as required by the Panamanian government, the FARC found it self free to establish bases to operate in the country. Panama's law enforcement incompetence allows the FARC terrorist group to continue to threaten its southern population. In addition, the FARC exploited the opportunity to spread its drug

trafficking operation into Panama with very little resistance. The lack of an efficient law enforcement system also allowed close to 150,000 illegal immigrants from China to establish themselves in Panama. This large number of illegal immigrants added to the 40,000 Chinese already legally living in the country becomes a threat to Panamanians locals' authority. If one considers that the total population of Panama is barely over 3 million persons, the number of Chinese in the country has the ability to influence the destiny of the country. The Chinese Triad<sup>21</sup> established a base to operate from within several of the Chinese companies placing Panamanians on the verge of becoming either Chinese or Cuban puppets.

In summary, Panama continues to fight against the illegal narcotics and arms trafficking. The country's proximity to a major cocaine-producing nations and its role as a commercial and financial crossroads makes it a country of special importance. Although money-laundering remains a problem, Panama passed, significant reforms in 2000 intended to strengthen its cooperation against international financial crimes. The conclusion of the Speed Joyeros case<sup>22</sup> in April 2002 marked the dismantling of a major money-laundering network with scores of arrests in several countries.

Mexico another strong ally of United States has a growing Marxist movement in the south part of the country that if not brought back to democratic practices may affect the nation. Mexico did not support United States decision of going to war against Hussein. In addition, it really has not worked with United States in solving current borders disputes. For many years, Mexico has suffered the consequences of deep-rooted corruption in its society and institutions. It currently spends lots of energy and time trying to defuse the situation. With the intention of gain a seat in the "Group of 8" and a reform in the United Nations, President Fox announced the creation of an alliance with Brazil to pursue Latin America "common interests." A radical leftist leader may decide the near future of Mexico, although not official, reports indicate that the most likely candidate to replace Fox seems to be Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador, currently the mayor of Mexico City. Despite leading a leftist revolt in 1989, he has an 80% rating approval from his constituents.

---

<sup>21</sup> The Chinese Triad is an organized crime group with links to Chinese intelligence.

<sup>22</sup> On September 17, 2000, Yarden Hebroni, a major money-laundering suspect, was arrested at the Newark Airport upon her arrival from Panama. Hebroni and her business in Panama, "Speed Joyeros," had been targets of a money laundering investigation, which began in April 1999 and culminated in 2000. Hebroni used her business to launder proceeds for several Colombian drug traffickers through false gold purchases/sales; by exchanging cash for second and third-party checks; false invoicing; and a multitude of bank transfers

Another place in South America of great concern is the “triple frontier,” where Paraguay, Brazil, and Argentina borders meet. The area is suspicious of providing a sanctuary for corrupted organizations involved in the laundering of over \$500 million dollars to support terrorist organizations. Paraguay’s relaxed laws against terrorist funding in conjunction with Brazil’s muslim population of over 1.5 million people, provides fertile grounds for the recruitment of terrorist. Argentines intelligence reports indicate that Hamas, the Party of Islamic Unification and the Egyptian branch of Muslim Brotherhood are currently operating in this area. Reports also indicate that spies from six different countries are possibly assisting operations in the area and that the Muslim community is now expanding into Chile, Ecuador, and Venezuela.

As for Cuba, Condoleezza Rice said that we needed to pay close attention to the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission to Assist a Free Cuba. She added that the regime of Cuban dictator Fidel Castro needs to be isolated from the Hemisphere, and that U.S. was making progress in limiting the Cuban government's ability to siphon monies intended for humanitarian assistance, and from remittances sent by U.S. residents to family members on the island. Cuba remains as the only communist regime in the Hemisphere. Castro’s strategy and support to terrorist groups continues to be a threat to the region. Cuba’s association with Venezuela and Brazil governments raises great concerns of a growing leftist movement in the region. Two Spanish reporters that managed to penetrate a Cuban drug trafficking cartel reported that Castro’s government is currently supporting drug trafficking activities. Cuba continues to be a main player in the drug trafficking activities from Colombia into United States and Europe<sup>23</sup>.

The U.S. State Department indicated in its Annual report on Human Right Practices<sup>24</sup> that Cuba continues to violate the fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens. People in Cuba have no chance to change their government in a pacific and peaceful manner. Prisoners die in jails due to the lack of medical care and food. Members of the security forces and prison officials continue to abuse prisoners with beatings and inhuman treatment. The country denies its citizens the freedom

---

<sup>23</sup> Mr. Mauro is a member of the Northeast Intelligence Network, which specializes in tracking and assessing terrorist threats.

<sup>24</sup> Submitted to the Committee on International Relations U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on foreign relations U.S. Senate By the Department of State in accordance with sections 116(d) and 502b(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2003; Joint Committee Print, House Committee on International Relations and Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; April 2004:

of speech, press, and association. Havana has long provided safe haven to terrorist groups, earning it a place on the State Department's list of terrorist-sponsoring states. The country is known to be harboring terrorists from Colombia, Spain, and fugitives from the United States. We know that Cuba is collaborating with other state sponsors of terror<sup>25</sup>.

Castro's visits to Iran, Syria, and Libya, all on the State Department's terrorist list demonstrates his interest in collaborating with anti-American groups and countries. Castro repeatedly denounces that the United States' war on terrorism and continues to view terrorism as a legitimate instrument to achieve revolutionary objectives. At Tehran University, these were his words: "Iran and Cuba, in cooperation with each other, can bring America to its knees. The U.S. regime is very weak, and we are witnessing this weakness from close up." Cuba continues to be the sore thumb for the Western Hemisphere.

In summary, several regions or countries within the Hemisphere require close attention by democratic states to ensure political stability and economic growth of the Hemisphere.

## **2.2 General contributions and repercussions of the United States' National Security Strategy in Western Hemisphere Countries (Latin America)**

As mentioned earlier, United States bases its National Security Strategy on its values and national interest. The NSS aims to help make the world a better and safer place. United States' NSS goals are to seek economic freedom, peaceful relationships with other states and countries, and respect to human dignity throughout democratic states. It also states that it is not only the United States' responsibility to work for a safer world, but every state as well. The United States in this pursue of a safer world is committed to achieve its goals by assisting needed states with financial and humanitarian aid, support democratic governments, espouse human dignity, and work with other states and countries to defuse conflict and defeat terrorism. The Latin America and Caribbean communities are not exempt from this policy and although more can be done, the U.S. continues to substantially help these countries.

---

<sup>25</sup> Mr. Mauro is a member of the Northeast Intelligence Network, which specializes in tracking and assessing terrorist threats.

United States continues to provide financial aid and humanitarian relief to support many countries in the Western Hemisphere. In doing so United States must also enforce its foreign policy, which in some occasions becomes the center of criticism of many. Although known by many as a helping country, the United States also struggles with its own internal problems and issues. It would only be fair that other countries recognize this fact and be patient and grateful of the United States' financial assistance, and help by not criticizing because they did not receive what they expected. We must recognize that the U.S. in many occasions precludes its own citizen from social programs and benefit while continues to help other nations. In more than its 200 years of existence, U.S. has always solved its problems without the assistance of the international community. From natural disasters to terrorist attacks, the U.S. has financially solved its problems, learning to not depend on foreign aid. The sections below describe a few of the assistance programs United States currently provides countries in the Western Hemisphere, as well as some of the repercussions.

### **2.2.1 Military and Political contributions; repercussions and issues**

United States' military relationships with Latin America have evolved throughout the years even more since the terrorist attacks on United States' soil in 2001. In addition to the declared War on Terrorism, the United States also declared a war on drugs trafficking. Although United States focus is on the war in Iraq, Washington continues to promote assistance programs designed to eradicate drug lords and drugs terrorist in Latin America. To that effect, the United States' armed forces have trained over 22,800<sup>26</sup> Latin American military and police personnel on drugs interdiction tactics and law enforcement. U.S. military trained personnel were mainly from Colombia to support the "Colombia Plan." Other top recipient countries of military trained personnel were Bolivia, Panama, Peru, and Ecuador. For many critics and political figures, this constitutes a violation of those countries' sovereignty and an intrusion of the Imperialist northern country in Latin America.

Many agree that the presence of police and U.S. military forces is a sign of invasion, disrespect, and lack of consideration from United States. Some agree that U.S. policy and personnel training programs in Latin America crosses the lines and violate the basic principles of democracy. Critics indicate that U.S. policy encouraging military practices, and doctrine only serves to confuse

---

<sup>26</sup> This number of military trained personnel represents an increase in relationship to 2002 and 2003. Source: Report to Congress, "US Government Annual Foreign Military Trained Report, US Department of Defense" for 2003 and 2004, June 2004.

traditional civilian and military roles. Democratic societies require a clear division and separation of civilian and military roles to maintain a stable environment. These roles should not promote dangerous expectations. The use of military forces to carry out social crime fighting missions could result in politicization of the armed forces and increase the possibility of creating a situation where excessive force is used. From the decade of the 60s to the 80s, we saw that when the armed forces focused on internal problems it resulted in coups and the restriction of citizen's freedom. This policy not only affects the implementation of U.S. foreign policies, it also changed the focus within the United States. Resources and responsibilities traditionally carried out by the U.S. State Department have shifted to the Department of Defense, The Pentagon. As a result, the roles and responsibilities of the U.S. Southern Command (U.S. Southcom) have largely increased in Latin America. These actions are contrary to "The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961"<sup>27</sup> of the United States.

U.S. Southcom currently has a disproportionate role in U.S.-Latin America relationships compared to the U.S. State Department. During 2002 and 2004, U.S. Southcom's Commander visited Latin America countries far more times than U.S. State Department officials and other U.S. government officials combined. The command has more people working in Latin America than most key civilian federal agencies combined including the Departments of Agriculture, the Department of State, Commerce, Transportation, and the office of the Secretary of Defense. These facts worry some U.S. critics and governmental officials since U.S. Southcom's role in Latin America has very important political implications in the region. Other critics and analysts believe that U.S. assistance to governments in Latin America to train personnel on drug interdiction skills is a fair contribution in the fight against the drug plague, one that has deteriorated the life style and economic potential of the Western Hemisphere and in particular life in United States.

### **2.2.2 Economic contributions; repercussions and issues**

For Fiscal Year 2005,<sup>28</sup> (FY 05) the United States government intends to spend at least \$859.7 million dollars in military aid for Latin America including the Caribbean countries. This amount nears the \$921.1 million dollars projected in economic aid for Latin America and the Caribbean for

---

<sup>27</sup> The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 stipulates that the State Department, and not the Pentagon, set policy and make decisions regarding military assistance programs. The program must be subject to human rights and democracy conditions.

<sup>28</sup> For the United States, Federal Government FY 2005 runs from 1 October 2004 through 30 September 2005.

FY 05. In total, close to \$1.78 billions dollars will be poured into Latin America and Caribbean countries, compliments of United States taxpayers; a great injection to many local and small economies in the region. These totals does not include the contributions made by private organizations (donations), non-governmental organizations, workers compensations, and money sent to families and relatives form alien workers in the United States. Although the major economic and humanitarian programs aid like the Development Assistance and Child Survival and Health were reduced for FY 05 by 12%, the overall assistance grew. The upward trend of military aid started during FY 00 with President William (Bill) Clinton’s Administration introduction of “Plan Colombia.” Since, the aid has increased every year.

The U.S. Federal agency that manages the bulk of non-military aid for United States is the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)<sup>29</sup>. The USAID is an independent agency responsible for planning and managing U.S. foreign economic and humanitarian assistance around the world. In 2004, USAID invested over \$900 million dollars in Latin America and the Caribbean. Aid programs include economic assistance for the following programs:

- Education, improving literacy and competitiveness,
- Poverty reduction and increased trade,
- Improved health care quality and access,
- Conservation of the Hemisphere’s resources,
- Natural disaster mitigation and reconstruction,
- Counter-narcotics and alternative development, and
- HIV/AIDS prevention and education.

The USAID has a growing presence in Latin America and the Caribbean, contributing and managing 16 field missions and programs throughout the region. USAID currently operates in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican, Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, and in Peru. The USAID also supports Cuba and Venezuela projects in a non-presence mode.

---

<sup>29</sup> “USAID has been the principal U.S. development agency since its creation by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. Today, the Agency provides leadership, resources, and technical expertise in economic growth, agriculture, trade, democracy and conflict mitigation, humanitarian assistance, disaster preparedness and recovery, and global health. The Agency has also implemented a new business model of public-private partnerships called the Global Development Alliance,” extracted from the USAID information brochure.

The Bush's administration also introduced two new non-military aid programs, the "Millennium Challenge Account"<sup>30</sup> (MCA) program, and the HIV/AIDS initiative. These two programs do not promise great economic injections to Latin America and Caribbean countries since only Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Honduras might qualify for the aid. Honduras and Nicaragua both applied for the assistance however only one may qualify for the final approval. By design, the President's Millennium Challenge Account is more than an increase in current development assistance. Three specific criteria are required to qualify for the assistance; good governance, investment in health and education, and sound economic policies. The most important criteria for the MCA program are sound economic policies. A World Bank analysis<sup>31</sup> of foreign aid found that assistance has a favorable impact in countries' growth with sound economic policies; the contrary resulted for countries without solid economic policies. Regarding the HIV/AIDS assistance program it promises even less to the region since only a hand full of countries around the world qualify. In the Western Hemisphere, only Haiti and Guyana participate or benefit from this program.

The increase of military assistance aid programs and funding by United States instead of in humanitarian and development programs portrays the image of a nation much more concerned with its own security rather than in the well-being of the regions population. Not necessary wrong or right, it is simply perceptions and opinions. Many would argue that United States' national security is directly related to democracy and prosperity in the Western Hemisphere. Critics add that the focus should be on humanitarian, economic aid, and social programs rather than military assistance.

### **2.2.3 Social contributions; repercussions and issues**

During General James Hill<sup>32</sup> Posture Statement testimony to Congress in early 2004, he listed among the urgent new emerging threats in the region "radical populism" and "street gangs." Congress immediately challenged the General's list indicating that these threats are social problems that concern civilian authorities and not the military. U.S. Southcom and the Department of Defense publicly defined these new threats as urgent risks, making them turn their attention to these and

---

<sup>30</sup> The United Nations Development Program defines Official Development Assistance as flows to developing countries that are administered with the primary objective of promoting economic development and welfare of developing countries and carry a grant element of at least 25 percent.

<sup>31</sup> 1997 World Bank report on Foreign aid assistance

<sup>32</sup> U.S. South Command, General Commander 2002-2004

applied military forces to social problems. Social and political analysts strongly challenge the use of force, and believe doing so may induce Latin America countries to apply military forces to civil situations. Policymakers must remember the difference between a police force and the military. The Police force's role is to protect the population and their property by applying law and order techniques through the minimal use of force while the military's mission is to defeat and destroy the enemy using overwhelming force. Not to imply that U.S. Southcom's policy incentives this practice, but Brazil has already used its military to deal with street gangs, and Guatemala and Honduras have established joint military-police patrols, a risking position described by many critics.

“Radical Populism” is a term that should concern political leaders and social movements that foster economic and social policies and not the military, so listing this as a threat is out of bounds for the military. Street gangs are also a police enforcement issue and should not be listed as a military threat to a state. Using the wrong tool could bring disastrous results to society, destabilizing the political order in a state not to mentioned possible human and civil rights violations.

### **2.3 Political, Military, Economic, and Social effects the United States' National Security Strategy has on Mexico, Panama, Colombia, and Argentina from their respective perspectives**

Except for a few countries in the Western Hemisphere, it is hard to find much support and enthusiasm for President Bush Administration's policies. Zogby International conducted a poll in October of 2003, to rank different presidents' popularity within the region. Results indicate that President George W. Bush was the hemisphere's most unpopular president with an 87% negative rating.

Many Latin American governments argue that Washington for a long time has neglected the Western Hemisphere in general except for Canada and in some instances Mexico. Many say that the White House's agenda for the region falls short of President Bush's campaign promises of placing Latin America's issue on the high priority list. However, the events of September 11, 2001, may well explain Latin America's disappointment towards U.S. policy. Al Qaeda's attacks on the U.S. immediately created a new and urgent set of priorities for Washington. This resulted in a major distraction from Latin American issues leaving U.S. and Latin American priorities more divergent than at any time since the end of the cold war in 1989.

Two points of views have developed about the terrorist attacks effects on U.S.-Latin America relationships. One group is of the opinion that the relationship has fundamentally changed. They argue that since 1989, Washington has struggled to develop a post-cold-war foreign policy framework. September 11 provided that framework for U.S., replacing the East-West conflict. The war against terrorism became the base for U.S. international and foreign policy, making all other issues and promises less important. Except for Mexico, with a 2,000-mile border with the U.S., the rest Latin American countries have little to contribute to the war. Their limited military capabilities, no significant financial resources to spare, and not much will to become involved make them less attractive to U.S. interests. Finally, this largely Christian region is not much of a target for international terrorism. Others are of the opinion that U.S.-Latin America relationships have improved and grown closer after the September 11 attacks. However, very few see it this way.

Essentially, almost all countries in the Western Hemisphere had to make changes to their foreign policy based on changes to the United States' foreign policy in light of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks similar to the aftermath of the Pearl Harbor attack. Immigration, drug trafficking, money laundering, security, commerce, trade, and anti-terrorism among other policies declared by the United States have all greatly affected Western Hemisphere countries. Some countries have adapted well, while others struggle with the changes. While some countries seek to take advantage of the new policies and grow better relationships with U.S. (Chile), others turn away looking for excuses, creating blocs against U.S. (Venezuela and Cuba), and other countries are just idle and have not tried to better their country (Mexico, Argentina).

United States' popularity in Latin America continues to decline, especially now with the Bush Administration. According to a poll realized by "Latin American barometro" in 2004<sup>33</sup>, U.S. image continues to fall dramatically in three key countries of the Western Hemisphere, Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina. The Economist<sup>34</sup> sums it up by saying, "A bare majority of Latin Americans are convinced of democracy, but they are deeply frustrated by the way their democratic institutions work in practice." Support for democracy has significantly dropped, since 1996; in 10 of the 17 Latin American countries polled. Notably, 52% of the sample agreed with the following statement: "I

---

<sup>33</sup> Latin American barometro, a Chile based company, realized a poll in eighteen countries of the Western Hemisphere, September 28, 2004.

<sup>34</sup> The Economist is a weekly magazine published in United States, also [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com)

wouldn't mind if a non-democratic government came to power if it could solve economic problems." The level of confidence and trust in the region's political leaders and parties continue to decrease in proportion with the degree of poverty growth and economies do not help the common citizen.

On the other hand, the poll also shows that there are countries in Latin American where the U.S. image raised significantly, including Colombia, five nations in Central American, and the Dominican Republic. When it comes to Latin America's three biggest countries, there is a growing apathy towards the United States, especially among the most educated people. The Economist Magazine first released the overall poll results and trends in October of 2003. Further details followed during the Eight Annual Miami Herald Americas Conference<sup>35</sup>.

Relations between the United States and Latin America have often suffered from unrealistic expectations. Unless vital national security interests are at stake, as it was in Central America during the 1980s, Latin America has not been a top priority for Washington. It does not appear that this will change in the near future. The projection of U.S. power in the world, combined with the assumption that Latin America will automatically go along with any policy by Washington, creates an unnecessary fracture and strain in the Western Hemisphere relationships. The following sections present how several countries in the Western Hemisphere perceive and react to United States foreign policy.

### **2.3.1 Mexico**

After the September 11 attacks, no country has experienced more friction with the United States at the highest political levels than Mexico. It seems that expectations were set to high. After the attacks, President Bush looked towards Mexico for solidarity and support based on his foreign policy experience and personal ties with Mexico's President Fox. In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks against United States, Washington felt that Mexico did not support or offer sufficient solidarity. The start of the Iraq war just served to add to the crumbling relationship, when Mexico opposed to United States' intervention in Iraq. Mexico's opposition did not sit well with the United

---

<sup>35</sup> Miami, Sept 14/PRNewswire/ -- The 2004 Miami Herald Americas Conference, the premier business and political forum on Latin America and the Caribbean, addressed emerging issues in the region, with the emphasis on the future of Latin America in light of the U.S. November election. The events took place on Thursday and Friday September 30 and October 1, at the Baltimore Hotel in Coral Gables, Miami.

States' Congress and especially with President Bush. Towards the end of 2003, some signs of positive intentions to repair relationship commence to surface. The Summits held in Mexico during October 2003 and January 2004; the U.S. presidential elections, and the focus on the Mexican-American voters prompted United States to get interested in Mexico once again. However, comments from Mexico's ambassador to the United States, Adolfo Aguilar Zinser demonstrated the bitterness feelings towards United States, especially since the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) signing. Ambassador Aguilar Zinser commented that, "the United States treats Mexico as its backyard."

Two major areas of United States foreign policy seem to aggravate the Mexico-United States relationship. These are NAFTA with its economic implications, and U.S.-Mexico Immigration policies. Let us examine each area.

Mexico is without a doubt a very important neighbor of United States. Mexico is in particular important in terms of border security, trade and oil supplier, illegal immigration, drugs trafficking, and environmental issues. Mexico is for United States after Canada, the most important country in the region. It is very disturbing for many critics, policy-makers, and businesspersons in the United States to learn that Mexican's positive opinion of the United States declined from a 73% in 2000 to 41% in 2004. This represents a drastic change in strategy and makes prospect investor think twice before investing in Mexico. On the other hand, 62% of Mexicans have a positive opinion of the European Union and 58% have a good opinion of China. It is very interesting to note the Mexican's likelihood for China, particularly after doubling their exports to the United States following the signing of the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)<sup>36</sup>, about 10 years ago. Mexico became the second largest trading partner of the United States, and is among the top ten export markets for 43 states of U.S. Mexico was ranked as the 9<sup>th</sup> largest economy in the world. President Bush said and reiterated it in 2002, that United States recognizes that the relationship with Mexico is very important for both countries. One would wonder how the Mexican's economy could have turned out if the treaty was never signed. Maybe it is better to cancel the treaty and ask Mexico to stop trade with the United States and make trading arrangements with the European Union and China.

---

<sup>36</sup> NAFTA was signed in 1994.

Further details of the poll indicate that only 4% of Mexicans agree with United States' intervention in Iraq, one of the lowest responses in the region. The war in Iraq played an important roll in the poll. Mexico, whom lost to the United States haft of their territory, is very sensible of invasions no matter where they occur. The sentiment grows even stronger after learning that the reasons to invade Iraq were based on poor intelligence and weapons of mass destruction that were not found.

Another reason that might have an impact on Mexican's opinion of the United States, as with other countries in the Western Hemisphere, is the element of human idealization. It is normal for people and for that effect for a country, to idealize whatever is far and express dislike for what is close or on hand. The same phenomenon occurs in Poland and in the Czech Republic. They openly express their dislike towards Russia and admiration towards the United States, especially towards former President Ronald Reagan. Although they may have, other reasons that are stronger than those of Mexicans may have towards the United States the concept still applies to Mexicans. Poland and the Czech Republic suffered many years of communist policies and violations of their civil and human rights. "When Mexicans profess a better opinion of China, a dictatorship, than of the United States, they may be expressing a similar beware-of-thy-neighbor sentiment. The grass is always greener on the other side of the world."<sup>37</sup>

Internal Mexican politics may have also played an important rile in Mexican's opinion of United States. Many believe that President Vicente Fox oversold the idea and the benefits of a United States-Mexico trade relationship. The expectations of immediate economic growth, drastic reductions in unemployment, and an overnight prosperity for all went unfulfilled. Not all Mexicans are benefiting from the trade growth with United States, international visibility, and of a close relationship with United States. In 2002, the Mexican government estimated a gross domestic product (GDP) per capital of \$6,400 however, about 53% of all Mexicans (over 50 million people) had an annual income of less that \$1,400, and 23% (over 22 million people) had an annual income of less that \$720. From this perspective, it is obvious that only a very small percent of the population is directly benefiting from Mexico's economic growth.

---

<sup>37</sup> Article by Andres Oppenheimer, The Miami Herald, U.S. Image is suffering in Mexico, September 28, 2004.

The history of Mexican's migration to United States goes back to the mid 1800s. Official records start in to 1850, when many Mexicans migrated to United States to become field hands to work in agriculture<sup>38</sup> and the railroad industry. The institution of Mexican workers in United States was already established by then. The Institution's goals were to watch for the workers' rights in commercial agriculture, mining industry, light industry, and the railroad<sup>39</sup>. As it still occurs today, Mexicans immigrates' working conditions were not the ideal and salaries were always very low.

U.S. Immigration policies, laws, and issues continue to affect the Mexico-United States relationships. Although President Bush did not openly mention any immigration issues during his second inauguration address in January 2005, many assure that Congress will work on proposed legislation in the near future. Weeks after his second inauguration, the President renewed the call for an amnesty plan and a guest worker program. Bush previously indicated during an interview with the Wall Street Journal that an immigration reform was a very important issue to resolve because of the great number of immigrants in the country. He also indicated that immigration reform is a key corner stone for national's security. Critics predict that Bush's administration immigration proposals will face very strong resistance, even from his own congressional representatives. Congress' intentions are to push for even stricter immigration policies, and not the legalization of illegal immigrants. "I'm opposed to his amnesty program and I know that some of my colleagues are too," said U.S. Representative Randy "Duke" Cunningham<sup>40</sup>, speaking from his office in Washington, D.C., shortly after he heard Bush's second inaugural ceremony.

This is not President Bush's first attempt to pass legislation to resolve or improve immigration policies between United States and Mexico in particular. He proposed a guest worker program for illegal immigrants in 2001, right after the September 11 attacks on New York and the Pentagon. The proposal or idea met great opposition, not only by local community and Congress, but also by those benefiting from the proposed plan (Mexicans). Last year President Bush outlined his proposal, saying that it would allow workers to stay in United States for three years, but would not guarantee legal

---

<sup>38</sup> Immigrates during the 1850 – 1880 migrated to the region in United States that once belonged to Mexico (what we know today as southern and west Texas, New Mexico and parts of Arizona)

<sup>39</sup> The presence of Mexican workers in the American labor scene started with the construction of the railroad between Mexico and the U.S. That presence grew between 1880 and 1890. As much as 60 percent of the railway-working crews were Mexican.

<sup>40</sup> Honorable Randy "Duke" Cunningham is a U.S. Representative of California's 50<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, serving his 7<sup>th</sup> term. He currently serves on the very powerful House Appropriations and the Intelligence Committees among other committees.

permanent residency or citizens. Two sides remain in constant struggle with the proposal. One party, immigrant advocates, criticized the plan indicating it did not provide the instruments or road map to permanent residency. Opponents to the plan indicated that the proposal would only reward people who broke the law by entering the United States illegally. It seems that whatever legislation passes if any, it will not please all parties. Many immigration advocates are concerned with the proliferation of new anti-immigration legislation proposals by state and local governments. Several states and local counties governments are proposing initiatives to eliminate most of the benefits illegal immigrants currently receive. Benefits like free medical treatment, schooling, college tuition, and driver's licenses are among those benefits jeopardized.

### **2.3.3 Panama**

The Panama Canal was the center of the Panama-United States relationship for many years. It has now shifted to commerce and trade. Cultural ties between the two countries are strong, and many Panamanians come to the United States for higher education and advanced training. About 19,000 American citizens reside in Panama; many of them are retirees from the Panama Canal Commission and individuals who hold dual nationality. There is also a rapidly growing enclave of American retirees in Chiriqui Province in western Panama. Panama is currently a very strong ally of the United States. Strong ties exist since 1903, when Panama declared its independence from Columbia, largely assisted by United States. In November 1903, United States signed the "Hay/Bunau-Varilla" Treaty with Panama and shortly thereafter renewed the construction of the Panama Canal. The Canal opened for service in August 1915. The United States provided security for the Canal and operated it from its inauguration until December 31, 1999. According to the Panama Canal Treaties<sup>41</sup>, United States would turn over the canal to Panama's government for its security and operation. The Canal is currently the main source of income for the Panama economy, since the Canal opened in 1915. The canal also is a symbol of Panama's sovereignty and prestige before the world. Panamanians are very

---

<sup>41</sup> One of the more difficult treaty debates in recent years was the Panama Canal treaties in 1978. In 1904, the Senate approved a treaty, which gave the U.S. authority to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama and control a 10-mile-wide canal zone. Following riots by Panamanians protesting U.S. control of the canal in 1964, the United States and Panama renegotiated the treaty, and in September 1977, President Jimmy Carter and Panamanian leader Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera signed two treaties. The first, the Permanent Neutrality Treaty, declared the canal neutral and open to vessels of all nations. The second, the Panama Canal Treaty, provided for joint U.S.-Panama control of the canal until December 31, 1999, when Panama would take full control.

proud of what the canal is and represents. Riots and protest demanding the sovereignty of the Canal were common during the years before the signing of the September 1977 treaty. Today Panama operates the canal with Chinese contractors and provides its own security with the nation's police force.

Many Panamanians still express disagreement and resentments towards United States. This time the center of the debate is mainly due to United States commercial and trade policies and intention to approve the Free Trade Agreement (FTA). On April 26, 2004, the United States began negotiating a bilateral free trade agreement (FTA) with Panama. Building on the U.S.-Dominican Republic-Central America Free Trade Agreement's (DR-CAFTA) text, the negotiations moved quickly and so far many chapters near completion. After Presidents Martin-Torrijos inauguration on September 2004, a fifth round of negotiations took place. The treaty is currently waiting for the United States Congress to pass the implementation into law and President Bush's signature.

As with other agreements policies and treaties, many are in favor and others are not, creating a genuine debate. Opposed to the FTA state that the agreement only supports U.S. foreign policy and economic interest and does not take in consideration Panama's interest. Protests have erupted at the University of Panama over the FTA. Several groups with apparent ties to numerous policy issues manifested their anti-American sentiments on Panama's streets. Labor and environmental groups in the United States have also raised concerns over numerous bilateral FTA agreements and the extent to which they fail to support the enforcement of higher standards abroad. Import competing businesses in both countries have raised issues related to their vulnerability, particularly in the agricultural sector. Panamanian farmers openly oppose a FTA. They claim that the treaty puts them in competition with subsidized American products, which would invade their markets, creating more unemployment, and annihilating farm economies that do not have government support. The University of Panama asked to be excluded from the FTA negotiations, which could harm the future of public education. In addition, several civic, religious, labor and citizens' groups organized the National Alliance for Life (ANAVI) to oppose the FTA. Many citizens express their worries about the secrecy of the negotiations.

On the other hand, supporters argue that the treaty supports U.S. foreign policy strategy in the region that include promoting democracy and the rule of law, fighting corruption, and narco-

trafficking trade, and money laundering. It also encourages regional economic integration. Supporters also allege that it will bring stability to Panama's open economy. In addition, the treaty will benefit the commercial interests of both countries by promoting transparent movement of trade and investment.

In general, although some groups mainly oppose the conditions of the FTA, the vast majority in Panama support United States' foreign policy especially those areas related to combating terrorism, and drugs, arms, and people trafficking. The relationship has been a positive one throughout the years, in spite of Noriega's era, and it promises to continue strong.

### **2.3.3 Colombia**

Colombia and United States relationships have had peaks and valleys throughout the years. Colombia and United States enjoyed of a cordial and friendly relationships during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, during the first two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, relationships deteriorated mainly due to President Theodore Roosevelt's Administration intervention in the Panama revolt. Despite the diplomatic strains, economic ties with the United States were of great importance to Colombia even in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The United States was the major market for Colombia's leading export and source of revenue. Colombia's relations with the United States were somewhat strained during the late 1940s and throughout most of the 1950s. The pro-Catholic Conservative government's persecution of the nation's few Protestants during the early years of "*la violencia*" and the dangers posed by the internal disorders to United States nationals living in Colombia caused relationships to sour. Nevertheless, Colombia's partnership with the United States prompted Colombia to contribute troops to the UN Peacekeeping Force in the Korean War (1950-53). Colombia also provided the only Latin American troops to the UN Emergency Force during the Suez conflict (1956-58). These few facts demonstrate that overall United States and Colombia have a long tradition of partnership and friendship.

Colombia is a beautiful country, which has suffered from a long period of internal problems, many of which are associated with the illegal production and distribution of illegal drugs, mainly cocaine. Although United States government will not openly blame the country for Colombia's problems, we all know that United States is the primary market for illicit drugs. The drug problem has fueled a civil war in the sparsely populated cocaine-producing areas and created significant law

enforcement problems in the populated portions of the country. Once again, United States steps up to its challenges and works with Colombia's president to develop and implement an aggressive plan to combat drugs. "Plan Colombia," an ambitious and controversial initiative, main goal is to resolve the present forty-year civil war in Colombia. The plan, designed by United States President William Clinton's Administration and agreed by the administration of Colombian President Andres Pastrana was signed in 1999. The plan establishes three main goals. The plans' first goal is to revitalize social and economic activities in Colombia. The second goal is to overcome the armed conflict, and the third goal is to establish an anti-narcotic strategy to eliminate narcotics activities in the region. The original plan called for a budget of \$7.5 billion dollars. President Pastrana initially pledged \$4.9 billion of Colombian resources (65% of the total costs) and called on the international community to provide the remaining balance. The Clinton's Administration committed the United States to provide \$1.3 billion in foreign aid for the next five years and 500 military personnel to train local forces. The final U.S.-approved \$1.3 billion assistance package is mostly of a military and counter narcotics nature but also includes a small amount of social development aid. In 2005, the Bush Administration approved \$463 million dollars to support the plan. Though the Colombian Government sought additional support from the European Union and other countries, with the intention of financing the social component of the plan, it received very little cooperation.

Many critics from Colombia and United States are very pleased with the plan's outcomes. Others are against the plan because they claim that elements within the Colombian security forces, which receive aid and training from it, may be involved in supporting or tolerating abuses by rightwing paramilitary forces against the population and legal leftwing organizations. These critics argue that, in order to remain eligible for such aid, the Colombian state and military should sever any persisting relationship with these illegal forces and heavily prosecute past offenses by paramilitary forces or its own personnel. In addition, many argue that the implemented Plan Colombia program does not include components, which address social aid, and institutional reform as originally intended to. The Plan Colombia label has become associated with being fundamentally a program of counter narcotics and military aid for the Colombian government.

During Presidents Bush's visit to Colombia in November 2004, (prior to the elections), some protestors marched the streets of Colombia but were greatly outnumbered by Colombians thankful for

Washington's aid. Unlike his visit in Chile, President Bush was not greeted by massive street protests during his four-hour stop to visit President Alvaro Uribe, his firmest ally in South America. In summary, United States aid to Colombia to combat drugs as part of its foreign policy has definitely helped Colombia not only reduce the production of illegal drugs but also better its economy.

Similar to citizens of other developing countries, Colombians could result affected by new U.S. immigration policies. United States now requires all visitors from developing countries to be fingerprinted and photographed at US airports. Western Europeans are exempt, and will continue to be treated with respect despite the fact that many terrorists hold European passports and travel to the U.S. from Europe. Angry Brazil immediately passed a law making U.S. citizens be treated like criminals at their airports, too. This new action by United States may put another wrinkle in Colombia-U.S. relationships.

#### **2.3.4 Argentina**

Argentina is a valued ally of United States; however, its economic struggles are of great concerns for United States. Except for the period of the Falkland Islands<sup>42</sup> War with England, when United States sided with England, Argentina has been closely associated with United States. Counter-terrorism is an area Argentina and United States continue to work closely together. Argentina's devastating terrorist attacks in 1992 and 1994<sup>43</sup>, and the 911 attacks on United States soils have created a special bond among the countries. The United States is also currently working with Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay through a regional cooperation mechanism to fight terrorism, money laundering, and drugs and arms trafficking in the tri-border area. The U.S. National Security Strategy, as with other countries in the region, has not directly affected Argentina. Except for immigration policies and some commerce imports restrictions, Argentina has not felt the impact directly.

---

<sup>42</sup> The Falkland Island War of 1982 was an undeclared war, between England and Argentina. Argentina suffered heavy military losses and the military junta was discredited.

<sup>43</sup> In 1992 and 1994, two bombs devastated the Argentinean Jewish community, and marked the arrival, for the first time, of Middle Eastern terrorism to South America. Little progress has been made in apprehending those responsible for the attacks. Argentina's Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires was the sight of the first explosion, a car bomb, on March 17, 1992. The bomb killed 29, and injured over 250. On July 18, 1994, the AMIA Jewish community center in Buenos Aires was bombed; 87 people were killed, and over 100 injured. Judge Jose Galeano was assigned to investigate, but, like Judge Levene, he made little progress.

In 2001<sup>44</sup>, Argentina reached the peak of its economic crisis. This made many Argentines change their opinion towards United States economic policies. Some critics blame the Bush Administration's policies for Argentina's collapse. As always it is easier to fix blame on others rather than to accept responsibility for one's own failures. A closer look at the situation in Argentina will demonstrate that the Bush Administration was correct in not supporting extending Argentina another International Monetary Fund (IMF) loan. That approach would have prolonged Argentina's economic problems, not solved them.

U.S. policy establishes that it should provide opportunities and incentives for countries to adopt economic reforms and institute the rule of law, not to help them become more dependent on international lending. The Bush Administration demonstrated its understanding of this principle by stopping the policy of bailing out countries in crisis and by reinvigorated U.S. leadership on trade to pursue free trade agreements. After all, many still blame U.S. foreign policies for Argentina's economic collapse; specifically they blame Bush Administration's failure to support another international bailout of Argentina. These critics ignored the fact that Argentina's crisis is the direct result of its poor economic policy choices. Although, Argentina adopted a few free-market policies, and it failed to make the necessary institutional reforms to support them. More important, it resorted to increasing debt and raising taxes, policies that make it more difficult for markets to develop and expand.

From opinion polls conducted throughout Latin America, we learned that a growing anti-Americanism continues to surface. In Argentina, the main reasons are due to the economic reforms of the 1990s made by its government based on United States suggestions and guidance. Many agree that these reforms did little to improve life for the common people. In addition, in Argentina the polls suggest that citizens also reject closer foreign policy ties to the United States. In a Gallup poll published February 3, 2002, nine out of ten Argentines opposed having their country participate in the Iraq war. About fourteen years ago, under President Menem administration, Argentina sent a token force to join the U.S.-led coalition that drove Saddam Hussein's troops back out of Kuwait.

---

<sup>44</sup> This year marked the turned down of Argentina's economy. The economy raced to a stagflation, with record declining GDP (16%), investments plummeted 46%, and personal consumption expenditures dropped 21%. Unemployment grew as well as inflation rates, and the peso fell exponentially.

In summary, Argentina's resentment towards the United States is fundamentally due to its economic collapse of 2001 and not so much because of United States National Security Strategy policies.

## Chapter III

### Conclusions and Recommendations

#### **3.1 General conclusions of the effects of the United States' National Security Strategy has on Western Hemisphere Countries and related issues and concerns**

There is no doubt that the terrorist attacks perpetrated on United States on September 11, 2001 brought an array of policy changes, foreign and domestic, for the United States. As the most powerful nation in the Western Hemisphere, and most likely in the entire world, its actions by nature affect not only neighbors but also the whole world. Latin America is not the exception. One also needs to recognize that not all countries in the region are similarly impacted. While some countries are affected by U.S. immigration policies, counter-narcotics trafficking, and money laundering mainly affect others. One thing for sure is that the common denominator problem or issue throughout the Hemisphere for developing countries is poverty, lack of employment, weak democracies, and organized crime. While the United States focus is in eradicating terrorist and terrorist groups, Latin America is more concern in solving domestic problems. This disparity in focus is the foundation for the differences in approaches, priorities, concerns and most important an impediment for clear understanding among the region. The large economic struggles many countries in the Hemisphere are currently living create great resentment toward United States. Whether right or wrong, the tendency to blame others, in this case United States, for one owns a failure is a common practice among Latin America countries. This human behavior combined with the misunderstanding of local problems and the push to secure national interest of the United States, makes its difficult to reach consensus among the region's states. Except for a few countries in the region, a growing anti-Americanism by many citizens continues to fuel the problem.

From the United States perspective, terrorist groups, narcotic trafficking, immigration, building strong democratic countries and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction continues to be the agenda. United States foreign policy and its National Security Strategy continue to focus in these areas. Several countries within the Western Hemisphere continue to be of great concern for United States' security. Venezuela's President Hugo Chavez's recent comments and accusations<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Venezuela's President, Hugo Chavez continues (News on Univision Spanish Channel, 20 and 21 February 2005) to accuse President Bush for planning his assassination while he threatens to stop all oil supplies to United States.

against the President of United States continue to stem serious concerns among policy makers and security agencies in United States. Venezuela's purchase of Russian military weapons and equipment just adds to the tense relationships with United States. On the other hand, Cuba's President Fidel Castro has also accused President Bush of wanting to assassinate him. Brazil's resentment to sign the FTA places relationships between United States and Brazil in a difficult posture. Other countries of concern are Columbia with its internal war against the FARC, Mexico due mainly to immigration issues, and Argentina because of its economic problems. Many Latin American countries remain unable to confront terrorism and transnational crime, constrained by scarce resources and, in some cases, lack of political will.

In summary, United States foreign policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean remains with little change and focus since the first President Bush Administration. While tensions and problems continue to rise in the Middle East, Israel, Iran, Lebanon, and in Korea the American priorities will continue to be in those regions placing Latin America and the Caribbean in a lower priority level.

### **3.2 The Future**

Unfortunate, U.S.-Latin American relationship will continue the same course it has for the last ten years. Free trade agreements among some countries of Latin America and United States will continue to improve as other states may join in. The creation of sub regional trade agreements (MERSOSUR, CARICON, etc.) may hamper the possibilities to achieve entrance into the United States market. Those states may be left behind and not benefit of trading with the largest market in the Western hemisphere and possibly in the whole world. The tendency of some states in Latin America to pursue closer relationships with China, Russia, and the European Union are forcing the United States also look to other markets paying little attention to markets within the region. The War on Drugs will continue for years to come with no eminent end in sight. Drug trafficking illegal activities are well organized, financed, and some argue, and overtly supported by some states. The problem is very complex and motivated by many social and economic problems. Illegal immigration, in particular from Mexico into the United States will continue to be a big problem for United States and Mexico. Negotiations between U.S. and Mexico to reach an agreement on immigration issues and policies may still take years while many continue to die trying to cross the borders.

Many critics forecast a strong economic recovery in Argentina in the next years, after its failure of 2000. This offers some good promises for Argentina and the region. Argentina is instrumental in economic growth for the “Cono Sur” in South America. Its recovery will also benefit trade relationships with other countries and the United States.

Extreme poverty in the region will continue to stem problems for developing countries. Many argue that poverty is the main cause and fuels bigger problems such as, drug trafficking, terrorism, and illegal immigration. Poor health and sanitation, corruption, and weakening democracies will also play a dynamic role in the near future. The number of people infected with HIV and AIDS, as well as with other diseases continues to grow while poor countries do not have the resources to deal with the problem effectively. Quality of life in Latin America’s sub developed countries continues to deteriorate, as the income disparity among citizens continues to grow disproportionate. While some countries within the Hemisphere continue to pursue unity and integration (Central America countries), others continue to isolated them self from the rest of the world (Cuba).

### **3.2.1 What should we expect from United States**

Although United States current Administration and policy makers have expressed their interest in renewing and growing its relationships with Latin America, its focus remains on counter-terrorism and problems in the Middle East. The current situation has diverted United States’ attention away from Latin America issues. Certainly, United States priorities do not mach those of Latin America countries. While Latin America struggles with fighting local gang crimes, poverty, corruption at the local level and state levels, health issues, and many other localized issues, United States obviously is focused on fighting drug trafficking, terrorism and developing a globalize world. Economic growth and spreading democracy are the currents priorities of U.S. foreign policy. United States economic and military support to Colombia’s government to combat drugs trafficking and the FARC will continue to increase. It is the interest of United States to reduce the amount of drugs entering the country from Colombia drug cartels and terrorists groups.

United States will continue to pass strong laws to control immigration especially from Central America and Mexico. Local governments<sup>46</sup> have already legislated new laws to control the number of immigrants moving into their respective jurisdictions as well as the benefits these may receive from local agencies.

Counter-terrorism is and will continue to be United States first priority. The United States cannot afford another attack on its soil, and will do everything and anything to prevent this even if that interferes and contradicts the beliefs of other countries. The bottom line is that, United States will do what ever is necessary to prevent another attack, even if this means a preemptive attack on another nation that proves to be a threat to United States, including countries in the Western Hemisphere. A predisposition of self-defense and a proactive posture is clearly explained in the Administrations current National Defense Strategy. United States will continue to provide economic aid to many countries in Latin America to fight poverty, support health programs, improve infrastructure, support education programs and support many other programs.

### **3.2.2 What should we expect form Western Hemisphere Countries**

In general, many countries in Latin America will continue to work hard to improve their economic posture, grow relationships with other nations to create favorable commerce and trade postures, fight poverty, and provide its citizens the opportunity for progress. The gap between the desire to improve the general situation of their country and the resources available to make it happened is simply too large. Poor developing countries within the Hemisphere will continue to struggle economically because of poorly designed fiscal and economic policies. The dependency of exterior aid in particular from United States only makes the situation worst forcing developing countries to react to every changing situation in the United States with no success. Corruption will continue to sabotage any progress made by developing countries in the region. Drugs and crime seems to have no end, spilling into international arenas affecting everybody in the Hemisphere and the World.

In the political field, many argue that the surge of several countries exhibiting leftist forms of government (Brazil, Venezuela, Chile, Argentina, and others) may destabilize the region. The

---

<sup>46</sup> Arizona, California, and Texas local governments have pass legislation to limit the number of benefits illegal immigrates have in their jurisdictions. (I.e. medical services, driver licenses, schools, grants, etc.)

alliance of some countries in the Hemisphere with China, the European Union, and Russia will continue to grow as the need for commerce trade and governmental relationships dictates. It seems that several countries will continue to grow further apart from any form of trade and relationship with United States (Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil), while others' relationships will grow closer (Mexico, Colombia, Panama).

### **3.3 Recommendations to improve relationships and build a safer Western Hemisphere**

Although United States is very busy with its war on terrorism and with surfacing problems in the Middle East and now in Lebanon and Israel, it must focus on issues in the Western Hemisphere to improve relationships and help in creating a safer region for all. President Bush's National Security Strategy acknowledges that United States cannot win the war on terrorism by it self. United States needs the cooperation and assistance of other nations to fight terrorism in the world. Latin America is not the exception; however, America's neighbors cannot meet that challenge and still confront a host of other local and transnational threats. Dr. James J. Carafano and Mr. Stephen Johnson<sup>47</sup> make some very bold recommendations to improve the U.S.-Latin America relationships. They recommend that the Bush Administration and Congress should review current departmental and agencies' missions to allocate responsibilities based on resources and capabilities. This will facilitate the development of new and improve partnerships and better cooperation from Latin America countries. Essential elements of this reform include revitalizing the U.S. Southern Command to make it a more effective partner in promoting security in Latin America. Recommendations also, include the development of sub regional partnerships to promote military-to-military, and civilian agency to civilian agency cooperation to incorporate standard operating procedures. The amendment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to allow flexibility in supporting civilian law enforcement in democratically governed countries will improve effectiveness in combating narco-traffickers and crime. Finally, they recommend that U.S. promote the revision of the 1947 Inter-American (Rio) Treaty of reciprocal Assistance to enable it to address modern security needs. Latin American countries need to step up and take full responsibility for their acts and learn not to depend so much from foreign aid and

---

<sup>47</sup> James J. Carafano, Ph.D. is a Senior Research Fellow for national Security and Homeland Security Department, and Mr. Stephen Johnson is a Senior Policy Analyst for Latin America in the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies at The Heritage Foundation.

assistance to improve their respective countries. Corruption must stop and be heavily prosecuted to enable countries to prosper.

## References and Bibliography

1. “The National Security Strategy of the United States of America” September 2002, The White House, Washington, D.C., at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/>
2. “Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense of the United States, dated September 30, 2001, at <http://www.dod.gov>
3. Declaración sobre la Seguridad en las Américas, Organización de los Estados Americanos, Conferencia Especial sobre Seguridad, Ciudad México, México 27-28 Octubre, 2003.
4. “El Plan Colombia” Hoja informativa Dirección de Asuntos del Hemisferio Occidental Washington, DC 14 de marzo de 2001, at <http://www.spanish.state.gov/spa/p/wha/rls/fs/2001/1042.html>
5. Entrevista hecha por Luz María Noli del Canal 2 de la TVN de Panamá, Secretario Colin L. Powell, Ciudad de Panamá, Panamá, 1 de septiembre de 2004, at <http://www.spanish.state.gov/spa/secretary/rm/35907.html>.
6. Public Law 107-56-Oct 26, 2001, Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) Act of 2001, The White House, Washington, D.C.
7. “Three Years of Progress in the War on Terror” Fact Sheet report, Office of the Press Secretary, The White House, Washington, D.C. U.S., September 11, 2004. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/09/20040911.html>
8. Testimony of Roger F. Noriega, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs (WHA), Department of State Before the Committee on Foreign Relationships, United States Senate, March 2, 2004.
12. Colombia: “The Politics of Escalation” article by Mark Cook, <http://www.emperoro-clothes.com> .
13. Results of the OAS Special Conference on Security, Fact Sheet Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Washington, DC, October 29, 2003, at <http://www.state.gov/g/inl/rls/nrcrpt/2003/vol1/html/>
14. International Narcotics Control Strategy Report - 2003, Released by the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, United States Department of State, Washington, D.C., March 2004. <http://www.state.gov/g/inl/rls/nrcrpt/2003/vol1/html/>
15. “Security and Civil-Military Relations in the New World Disorder: The Use of Armed Forces in the Americas” “The Three Temptation of Latin America” by Peter Hakim, Resdal –Red de Seguridad y Defensa de America Latina, at <http://www.resdal.org/Archivo/hakim> .
16. “Security and Civil-Military Relations in the New World Disorder: The Use of Armed Forces in the Americas - The United States and Latin America: A Strategic Perspective, “The United States and

Latin America: A Strategic Perspective” by Donald E. Schulz, at <http://www.resdal.org/Archivo/hakim> .

17. Traditional Threats, New Concerns, and Other Challenges to Hemispheric Security, Ambassador Roger F. Noriega, Assistant Secretary for Western Hemisphere Affairs, Remarks at the Inter-American Defense College, Washington, DC., October 22, 2003
18. “U.S. Policy Toward Latin America: Lessons from Argentina”, by Ana I. Eiras and Gerald P.O. O’Driscoll, Jr. PH.D., The Heritage Foundation, Executive Memorandum, 214 Massachusetts Ave, N.E., Washington, DC 20002, No. 798 January 15, 2002, at <http://www.heritage.org> .
19. Securing Our Homeland, U.S. Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan, 2004. Published by the Department of Homeland Security, Washington, D.C., 20528, at <http://www.dha.gov> .
20. “Bounty hunters called in to track down FARC terrorist leadership”, by Jeremy McDermott, In Bogotá, The Scotsman, January 15, 2004, at <http://thescotsman.scotsman.com/international.cfm?id=48012005> .
21. Information about the Effects of Immigration on Georgia, Southern Party of Georgia 725 Ridgeview Road Morganton Georgia 30560, at <http://www.spofga.org> .
22. Issues in International Political Economy, July 2004, Number 55, “Security Dominates Concerns in Latin America”, by Sidney Weintraub, William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies 1800 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, Tel: (202) 775-3292, Fax: (202) 775-3199, at <http://www.csis.org> .
23. “New migrant law irks Mexico: Leaders bash Arizona as other states consider measures”, by Chris Hawley, Republic Mexico City Bureau, January 23, 2005.
24. “The US and Latin America through the Lens of Empire” by Michael Shifter, at <http://www.rcci.net/globalizacion/2004/fg406.htm>
25. “Public diplomacy and U.S. foreign policy,” by Jerrold Keilson, Great Decisions 2004, at <http://www.greatdecisions.org>
26. “U.S. Official Outlines Full Agenda for Western Hemisphere, says U.S. will work to strengthen regional democracies, economies” by Scott Miller, Washington File Staff Writer Created: 16 Nov 2004 Updated: 16 Nov 2004,at <http://www.usinfo.state.gov> .
27. National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, February 2003, White House, Washington, D.C.
28. The National Strategy for The Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets, February 2003, White House, Washington, D.C.

29. "U.S.-Mexico Border Security and the Evolving Security Relationship Recommendations for Policymakers," a Report of the U.S.-Mexico Bi-national Council, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Instituted Technologic Autonomy de México (ITAM) April 2004.
30. National Strategy for Homeland Security, July 2002, Office of Homeland Security, Washington D.C.
31. National Drug Control Strategy, Update: The White House March 2004, Office of National Drug Control Policy Washington, D.C. 20503.
32. "Bolivarian Revolution" Continues, Despite U.S. Resistance Published by Venezuelanalysis, 1/1/05, at [http:// www.venezuelanalysis.com](http://www.venezuelanalysis.com) .
33. "Strengthening America's Southern Flank Requires a Better Effort," James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., and Stephen Johnson, at [http://www.revistainterforum.com/english/pdf\\_en/Strengthening-America.pdf](http://www.revistainterforum.com/english/pdf_en/Strengthening-America.pdf) .
34. International Narcotics Control Strategy Report - 2003 Released by the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs March 2004. Introduction Legislative Basis for the INCSR, at <http://www.state.gov/g/inl/rls/nrcrpt/2003/vol1/html/>
35. Mexican Report, Global Views 2004, at <http://www.ccf.org/globalreviews2004>
36. The Miami Herald Mon, Apr. 28, 2003, "U.S.-Argentina relations may be key election issue," by Kevin G. Hall, Knight Ridder Newspapers.
37. The Miami Herald, Jan. 05, 2003, "Bush policy toward Latin America stuck in limbo", by Andres Oppenheimer.
38. Media Release-- World Public Opinion Says World Not Going in Right Direction, Linked to Widespread Negative Views of US Influence, Rich Countries Seen as Not Playing Fair With Poor Countries, Globalization Mostly Seen as Positive, UN Well Trusted. For Release: 9 am June 4, 2003. Global scan.
39. Historical Text Archive © 2003, "Panama's Policy Toward the U.S.: Living With Big Brother", by Donald J. Mabry, at <http://www.historicaltextarchive.com/sections.php?op=viewarticle&artid=234>
40. "Why the U.S. Must Re-Engage in Latin America," by *Stephen Johnson* No. 1694 October 3, 2003, published by: The Heritage Foundation, 214 Massachusetts Ave., NE, Washington, D.C. 20002-4999, at <http://www.heritage.org>
41. Politics: "U.S. Militarizing Latin America," by Jim Lobe, "OneWorld" U.S. Washington, D.C., Wed., Oct. 6, 2004.

## Acronyms

1. U.S. – Unites States of America
2. CIA - Central Intelligence Agency
3. NSC – National Security Council
4. NSS – National Security Strategy
5. NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization
6. WMD – Weapons of Mass Destruction
7. 9/11 – September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on U.S.
8. QDR –Quadrennial Defense Review
9. DOD – Department of Defense
10. FARC – Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia
11. ELN – National Liberation Army
12. FETAA – Free Trade Agreement of the Americas
13. U.S. Southcom – U.S. Southern Command
14. FY – Fiscal Year
15. USAID – United States Agency for International Development
16. MCA – Millennium Challenge Account
17. NAFTA – North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement
18. FTA – Free Trade Agreement
19. DR-CAFTA – Republic-Central America Free Trade Agreement
20. ANAVI – National Alliance for Life
21. UN – United Nations
22. IMF – International Monetary Fund
23. MERCOSUR - South American Common Market
24. CARICON - Caribbean Community