

## Brazil-U.S. Relations

**O**n June 4, 2003, Brazil @ The Wilson Center, in conjunction with the Brazilian Embassy in Washington and the Brazil Information Center, hosted an all day seminar on “Brazil and the United States in a Changing World: Political, Economic, and



**Fernando Furlan, Minister of Development**

Diplomatic Relations in Regional and International Contexts.”

An opening panel discussed U.S.–Brazil relations in historical perspective, focusing on major developmental influences within the context of long-term socio-historical change. Noting past encounters with state nationalism, former U.S. ambassador to Brazil and Brookings Institution scholar *Lincoln Gordon* warned of the hazards of what he called “unhealthy and negative nationalism” in Brazil. Despite publicized fears of anti-U.S. sentiment in Brazil, however, he argued that current bilateral relations are quite healthy. Moreover, he indicated that bilateral trade disputes, which have characterized relations in recent months, are indicative of a healthy bilateral relationship insomuch as they are outgrowths of democratic state discourse in a globalized age. Presenting an alternative view, *Paulo Roberto de Almeida* of the Brazilian Embassy detailed the development of today’s

**INSIDE**

Brazil-U.S. Relations	1-3	Argentina @ the Wilson Center	17-20
Democratic Security in Colombia	3-4	Political Crisis and the Threat to Democratic Governance	20-21
Argentina-United States Bilateral Relations: An Historical Perspective and Future Challenges	4-6	Brazilian Environmental Policy under Lula	21-22
Mexico’s Changing Politics	6-7	Presidential Candidate Lucio Gutiérrez	22-23
Religion and Society in Cuba	7-9	Chiapas: The Dilemmas of the Current Conflict and Negotiation	23-24
Brazil’s 2002 Presidential Election	9-10	Promises and Disillusionment: Affirmative Action and Race Relations in the United States and Brazil	24-25
NAFTA at Ten	10-12	Creating Community	25
Legislatures and Trade Agreements	12	The Geopolitics of Oil: Iraq and Venezuela	25-26
Honduran President Discusses Regional Integration	12-13	Interns and Researchers	27
Urban Crime and Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean	13-15	Recent Publications	28-29
Bilateral Relations between Mexico and the United States	15-17	Fellows and Public Policy Scholars	30

hesitant and distrustful bilateral relationship. While private investment has increased in Brazil since 1995, Almeida argued that Brazil needs the opportunity to develop further if it is to achieve an equitable and balanced relationship with the United States. *Thomas Skidmore* of Brown University observed that Brazil spent significant resources promoting itself to Washington during the 1990s, perhaps at the cost of further and deepened state socio-economic development. He proposed increased export promotion for Brazil as a means to reduce its dependence on capital inflow and to redress the balance of payments. Skidmore also directed attention to future Brazilian-U.S. trade policy and conflicts that may arise. *Eduardo Viola* of the University of Brasilia highlighted the influential role played by the Brazilian media in shaping the view of national society, both towards the United States and development policy in general.

A second panel on “Parallel Paths of Development and Economic Interdependence” focused on historical and contemporary socio-economic development within a comparative framework. *John DeWitt*, a long-time Foreign Service Officer and adjunct professor at the University of Florida, discussed the similarity of socio-economic development in Brazil and the American South during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Georgetown University visiting scholar *Eliana Cardoso* assessed economic policy and growth in Brazil during the last century in com-

parison with South Korea. Both DeWitt and Cardoso emphasized the role of institutions—from farms to international financial organizations—in influencing the course of development. They argued that due to globalization and its varied effects on society, current institutions may now be much more highly contested than ever before.

During a luncheon speech, U.S. Permanent Representative to the OAS Ambassador *Roger Noriega* laid out the Bush administration’s policy towards Brazil and Latin America. While emphasizing the strong need for pragmatism in U.S.-Brazilian relations, Noriega noted that both countries are strongly supportive of a multi-lateral trade agenda and that it would be possible to work together in forming a strong trade-based U.S.-Brazil partnership. He rejected the notion that the United States has diverted its attention away from Brazil and Latin America since September 11<sup>th</sup> and underscored the importance of the FTAA for the region.

During a third panel on regional trade issues and related hemispheric/multilateral negotiations, *Jeffrey Schott* of the Institute for International Economics discussed the challenges to U.S.-Brazilian trade liberalization. Noting that both countries have much to gain from such liberalization, he stated the need for continuing dialogue on the issues of steel, citrus, sugar, telecom, government procurement, and tariffs. Brazilian Ambassador *Rubens Barbosa* also argued for a continued and balanced dialogue on trade issues, while also highlighting the difficulties of negotiating FTAA within the rules and guidelines set forth by the WTO. *Marcelo de Paiva Abreu* of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, contrasted the political obstacles in Brazil and the United States which have hindered economic integration. He noted that strong protectionist lobbies and resistance to close U.S. relations are obstacles in Brazil, while the U.S. tends to be ignorant of “how things work”

## Brazil Advisory Council

Over the past 30 months Brazil @ the Wilson Center has become a valued source of quality information and analysis for U.S. policy makers and scholars. In addition to generating interest and debate on issues related to Brazil-U.S. relations, the project has created new channels of communication among leading scholars and policymakers in both countries, addressing key issues on the bilateral agenda and promoting the exchange of ideas.

In order to facilitate the continued growth and evolution of the project, the Wilson Center has invited distinguished Brazilian and American leaders from public service, academia, and the private sector to serve as members of an Advisory Council. We are pleased to announce that former U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Anthony Harrington has accepted the invitation to serve as the U.S. chair of the Council.



**Roger Noriega**

in Brazil as it emphasizes “special goods” exemptions in negotiations. *Paolo Giordano* of the Inter-American Development Bank, meanwhile, argued for a closer examination of the FTAA-WTO relationship and the role played by civil society in the FTAA process.

The last panel, entitled “Prospects for Bilateral Relations in 2003 and the Future,” discussed the new administration of President Luis Inácio Lula Da Silva and its relations with President Bush and other major world partners. *Peter Hakim* of the Inter-American Dialogue argued that neither the United States nor Brazil ever found the relationship satisfactory. At present, however, Hakim stated that much of Brazil’s possible international success stems from its internal accomplishments in the areas of fiscal policy, investor confidence, and sustained growth. *Thomaz Guedes da Costa* of the National Defense University noted that, while Bush and Lula share many personal affinities, Brazil needs to be much more proactive if it is to successfully reinvigorate U.S.-Brazil relations—Brazil will earn the respect of the United States only when it is able to convince the Bush administration that it is an influential “shaper” of the state system. *William Perry* of William Perry & Associates indicated that both Bush and Lula are practical leaders, and that idealizations of the bilateral relationship as continual and harmonious are not only unrealistic but also harmful to policy formulation. *Maria Regina Soares de Lima* of the Inter-University Research Institute of Rio de Janeiro emphasized the many cultural linkages between the two states as an example of a growing Brazil-U.S. convergence in the post-Cold War era. While predicting future diplo-

matic and political friction on such issues as trade, she noted that Lula’s election was an important event in and of itself, indicating a consolidation of Brazilian democracy. She argued that a new state-based pragmatism toward the United States is emerging in Latin America, with Brazil leading the way. *Luis Bitencourt*, director of Brazil @ the Wilson Center, pointed to questions of practical policy formulation, highlighting the extent to which a workable view of future relations can be constructed within Brazil and the United States.

*Luiç Fernando Furlan*, Brazil’s Minister of Development, Industry & Foreign Trade, emphasized his commitment to improving and expanding Brazil’s exports and implementing social security and other reforms by the end of the year. Both Ambassador Barbosa and Furlan predicted that Lula’s June 2003 visit to the United States would be highly beneficial for the deepening of U.S.-Brazilian dialogue, and would assist in clarifying issues of contention regarding the EU and FTAA. ■

## Democratic Security in Colombia

Colombian President *Álvaro Uribe* spoke at a September 24, 2002, breakfast co-sponsored by the Latin American Program, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Inter-American Dialogue, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Association of American Chambers



**Rep. Jim Kolbe and President Álvaro Uribe, photo courtesy of sardari.com**

of Commerce of Latin America, and the Heritage Foundation. Uribe outlined a program of “democratic security” to protect Colombian civilians from armed groups of the left and right, and pledged to enlarge the armed forces and national police. He also pledged to expand drug eradication efforts and to protect human rights.

*Rep. Jim Kolbe (R-AZ)*, Chair of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, introduced President Uribe, stating that it was “in the interests of the United States to promote stability in Colombia by helping it address its long-standing problems.” Kolbe noted a bipartisan compromise in the Congress over erasing the “imaginary line between counter-narcotics and counter-terrorism,” indicating that Uribe had an unparalleled electoral mandate to combat terrorism and implement fiscal austerity.

Uribe began by noting a significant deterioration in the security situation, low economic growth, and unacceptably high unemployment. He pledged to restore the confidence of the average Colombian in the government’s capacity, by “strengthening the military to enhance security, to restore law and order,” [and] by reforming state institutions. Uribe outlined several initiatives to reduce government expenditures and raise revenues, including through pension reform, the freezing of government salaries, the streamlining of government bureaucracy, as well as the implementation of emergency measures and the introduction of ordinary legislation to increase income taxes. He promised to honor Colombia’s financial obligations to the international community as well as to meet its domestic social obligations.

Asked about reports of collaboration between Colombia’s armed forces and paramilitary groups, Uribe emphasized a strategy of democratic security for all Colombians. For security policy to be sustainable, he said, it needed public support, and that depended on the observance of human rights. Uribe stated emphatically that to end terror in Colombia, the country needed to destroy narcotics. He pointed to increased spraying of coca crops during his administration, as well as the need to provide incentives to farmers for alternative crops. Uribe invited illegal armed groups in

Colombia—the FARC, ELN, and AUC—to enter into dialogue with the government following a cessation of hostilities. Uribe also noted that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had agreed to lend its good offices in the search for a negotiated settlement. ■

## Argentina-United States Bilateral Relations: An Historical Perspective and Future Challenges

On March 5, 2003, the Latin American Program and the Wilson Center’s Cold War International History Project sponsored a conference on U.S.–Argentine relations, focusing on the conflicted relationship between the two countries both during the current crisis in Argentina and the period of the military dictatorship. The conference was occasioned by the declassification of thousands of U.S. documents from the Ford and Carter administrations that cast a new, and at times harsh, light on bilateral relations during the Dirty War of the 1970s. In addition, the conference focused attention on the fact that the principal focus of U.S. foreign policy on the war against terrorism made it less attentive to crises in the hemisphere, in Argentina and elsewhere.

In discussing current relations, *Juan Gabriel Tokatlián* of the San Andrés University in Buenos Aires argued that former president Carlos Menem’s policy of “pragmatic acquiescence,” in which the country subordinated its foreign policy to an external actor, had been “costly and useless.” The unrestricted alliance with the United States, manifest in Argentina’s support for the first Gulf War and in other ini-



Kathryn Sikkink, John Dinges

tatives did not benefit Argentina; today the country is weaker, less relevant in international affairs, and more impoverished than it was a decade and a half ago. Tokatlián argued that the best foreign policy for Argentina would be a good domestic policy, which empowered institutions, developed national identity, and enhanced competence and maturity on the part of political leaders.

*Mark Falcoff* of the American Enterprise Institute said that a principal challenge in the bilateral relationship was “to restore a measure of political and moral credibility.” For Argentina, distrust towards the United States has to do with the way in which “the relationship was oversold” during the Menem years. In the U.S. financial press, Falcoff argued, there was a tendency to overstate radically the extent of the economic reforms enacted during the 1990s. Since the onset of the current economic crisis, Argentines have become deeply disillusioned with U.S. indifference to their plight, and Falcoff faulted the U.S. belief that “if Argentines simply tighten their belt everything will be all right.” He also argued that Argentina’s political credibility in the United States was linked to Argentines themselves finding a political leadership in which they could believe.

Argentine economist *Beatriz Nofal*, former under-secretary of industry and trade, described multiple causes of the worst economic crisis in Argentina’s history: external shocks, domestic vulnerabilities, governance problems, and mistakes in economic policy, especially adjustment policy. Nofal emphasized the “tremendous social regression” that has left more than half of Argentines below the poverty line, but also cited signs of a precarious economic rebound. Argentine skepticism about closer integration into the world economy and cooperation with the United States had been fueled by Washington’s lack of reciprocity, she argued, at the same time that closer collaboration with the international community did not necessarily mean subordination. She argued for a balanced FTAA that eliminated agricultural and agro-industrial subsidies and non-tariff barriers to trade and did not widen per capita income gaps.

Latin American Program director *Joseph S. Tulchin* called for a realistic foreign policy posture on the part of Argentina that was rooted in a sense of the country’s strategic objectives. He argued that Argentina cannot define itself in relation to the United States and insisted that, given conditions of asymmetry, it was unrealistic to expect a balanced relationship between the two countries. He described as a “signal success” the fact that management of the current political and economic crisis was achieved without military intervention.

The second panel addressed new information in the close to 5,000 documents released by the U.S. Department of State in August 2002, in response to a request by prominent Argentine human rights groups.

*Carlos Osorio* of the National Security Archive described U.S. support for the military junta in the 1970s and the double message on human rights under the Ford Administration; the clash between the Carter administration and Argentine government over human rights in 1977; the parallel rapprochement and negotiations with “moderates” in the junta; and divisions within the U.S. embassy in Buenos Aires over the scale of violations and over how forcefully and in what manner to promote human rights. Osorio concluded that the work of U.S. embassy staffers boosted the morale of human rights workers in Argentina, preserving their work if not their lives. He noted that information contained in the documents is helping lawyers, family members, and judges in clarifying the fate of the disappeared.

*Carlos Sersale di Cerisano*, former director general for human rights in the Argentine Foreign Ministry, said “bringing to memory the Argentine ‘holocaust,’” especially for a new generation of Argentines, had contributed to the consolidation of Argentine democracy, by reminding citizens of the suffering of living under a military government. So far, he said, no criminal proceedings had been initiated on the basis of information contained in the documents, and it was too early to tell if the release would have an impact on changing domestic laws (*Punto Final* and *Obedencia Debida*) that had protected members of the military from prosecution.

Sersale said that, other than in the press and among human rights organizations, the response to the release of the documents had been limited.

University of Minnesota professor *Kathryn Sikkink* focused on “critical junctures” of repression, arguing that repression is a choice governments make in the context of ideology and a perception of costs and benefits. The attitude of the U.S. government is crucial in influencing both areas. She cited new material contained in the documents that shed light on the period between June 1976 and January 1977, the peak of repression in Argentina as well as the period of what she called the “green light” from U.S. policymakers. Sikkink referred to cables reflecting efforts by U.S. Ambassador to Argentina Robert Hill to impress on Argentine military leaders that certain norms could never be set aside in the fight against terrorism. These demarches were undermined by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who in meetings with the Argentine foreign minister, a naval admiral, encouraged the government to continue and even accelerate the war against subversion.

Columbia University School of Journalism professor *John Dinges* portrayed the U.S. embassy in Buenos Aires as essentially ignorant of the approximately 4,000 disappearances that took place in 1976, as well as of the thousand or so killed by the military before the coup. Dinges said that his own research placed the number of those killed between 1975 and mid-1978 at some 22,000, a figure based on a document of an Argentine intelligence battalion chiefly responsible for the repression. Dinges called U.S. human rights policy in both the Ford and Carter periods ineffective with respect to Argentina, noting that human rights violations, including two to three thousand disappearances, continued in the first two years of the Carter administration.

*E. A. “Tex” Harris*, a political officer in the U.S. embassy in Buenos Aires at the height of the dirty war, described policy struggles within the U.S. government over how forcefully to incorporate human rights issues into diplomacy. He detailed his own efforts to collect information from relatives of victims of repression, opening the U.S. embassy to their visits and

establishing an internal database unique to that period. He described U.S. decisionmaking concerning an Export-Import Bank loan to a U.S. company, to set up a turbine factory for a wholly owned subsidiary of the Argentine Navy. His efforts to report on the beneficiary of the Ex-Im Bank loan were opposed by his superiors, and only through his extraordinary efforts did the information reach Washington in time to impact on the loan decision. Harris argued that Argentina provided cautionary lessons that must be learned in the battle between protecting homeland security and preserving individual human rights. ■

---

*A bulletin in Spanish summarizing the conference findings was published in May 2003. A fuller report in English will be available in the Fall of 2003.*

## Mexico’s Changing Politics

The Wilson Center sponsored three events focused on political changes in Mexico, featuring presentations by *José Woldenberg*, president of the Federal Electoral Institute (IFE), *Tomás Yarrington*, governor of the border state of Tamaulipas, and *Jorge Castañeda*, former secretary of foreign affairs.

Woldenberg argued that Mexico’s democratic transition was built on gradual change that began at the grassroots and slowly extended from local to national government. Change was the natural result of a modern society that could no longer sustain a single-party political system.



**Jorge Castañeda**



**José Woldenberg**

He argued that elections were central to the transition, and that as opposition parties won more and more elections, citizens gained greater confidence in the ability of the political system to undergo real change. Clean elections led to other positive developments in Mexico, including expanded political liberties; a free and more critical press; a more assertive congress; the emergence of opposition political figures; and a growing sense of citizenship. According to Woldenberg, Mexico now needs to use the open political system it has achieved to debate substantive issues like reducing poverty.

Tomás Yarrington emphasized the role of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) in creating the conditions for Mexico's democratic transition and stressed that the party needs to learn to be a constructive opposition party in Mexico. At the same time, the National Action Party (PAN) needs to learn to govern effectively. He emphasized the role of governors in states along the U.S.-Mexican border in conducting "foreign policy" on a daily basis, and noted that governors on both sides of the border have been developing common solutions to address concerns regarding infrastructure, natural resources, and economic growth.

Jorge Castañeda noted that the democratic transition in Mexico had achieved its first objective, of breaking with the 71-year history of one party rule, but it had not been able to generate a real change in living conditions for average Mexicans. He lauded President Fox for ensuring a peaceful and orderly transition, but noted that

the administration had become bogged down by trying to do too much. Noting that he was considering a possible presidential bid in 2006, he argued that the Mexican government should focus its energies on two major goals that are achievable: reforming education and promoting the rule of law. To do this, it would also be necessary to reform the political system and increase government revenues by closing tax loopholes and using oil resources more wisely. ■

## Religion and Society in Cuba

On January 21, 2003, a group of scholars and practitioners from the United States, Latin America and Europe met at the Wilson Center to examine the profound impact of religion on Cuban society, culture, national identity and transnational adaptation. To set the context for a discussion of modern Cuban religions and their impact, *Margaret Crahan* of Hunter College, City University of New York, traced Cuban diasporas from the sixteenth century to the present. She examined their impact on the formation of diverse religions in Cuba and the link between these religions and Cuban national identity. Crahan argued that the combination of religious groups resulting from centuries of migration has led to the formation of unique religious beliefs, practices and cultural identity. *Alfonso Quiroz* of Baruch College and the Graduate Center at the City University of New York reviewed the evolution of laws governing civil society in Cuba and argued that relaxing the current legal framework would better enable civil groups to promote non-violent political transition while avoiding further erosion of the rule of law. Nevertheless, *Karen Leimdorfer* of Southampton University suggested that religions' historic international links and associations with foreign agendas had



**Silvia Pedraza**

the administration had become bogged down by trying to do too much. Noting that he was considering a possible presidential bid in 2006, he argued that the Mexican government should focus its energies on two major goals that are achievable: reforming education and promoting the rule of law. To do this, it would also be necessary to reform the political system and increase government revenues by closing tax loopholes and using oil resources more wisely. ■

resulted in religions frequently being regarded by the Cuban leadership as antithetical to Cuban national interests.

*Daniel Levine*, University of Michigan, and *Ariel Armony*, Colby College, presented theoretical and methodological frameworks for the analysis of the interplay of religion, culture and society. Using an expanded definition of society to include informal networks and groups, Armony discussed societal changes following the economic crisis of the early 1990s and argued that democratic transformation would have to be tied to the creation of a pluralistic civil society.

The panelists paid considerable attention to the role of the Catholic Church in Cuba. *Cristina Hip-Flores* of Harvard University and *David Roncolato*, Allegheny College, agreed that the Catholic Church has played a significant role in addressing the problems of Cuban society by providing an array of social services, while it has

spirit practitioners in Cuba have historic ties to communities in Brazil and New York. *John Burdick*, Syracuse University, described popular devotion to the Brazilian slave Anastasia and analyzed the black movement's rejection of her as being part of black identity, in order to suggest the various manners in which popular religiosity and race intersect.

*Sarah Mahler* of Florida International University, *Silvia Pedraza* of the University of Michigan, and *Yolanda Prieto* of Ramapo College discussed transnational religious ties and their impact on identity, as well as religion and the construction of Cuban-American identity. Pedraza examined the role of the Catholic Church in the Cuban exodus since 1959 and the impact of the exodus on the work of the Church on the island. Prieto described the impact of four waves of out-migration on the Catholic Church in Cuba and the inter-group dynamics among four groups in the United States, specifically in Union City, New Jersey. Mahler noted that despite the official posture of the Catholic Church, Catholic religious leaders abroad sometimes use religion to express their political opinions, ranging from antipathy towards the Castro or U.S. governments to support for rapprochement and reconciliation between Cubans and Cuban-Americans. *Mauricio Font* of the Bildner Center for Western Hemisphere Studies at the City University of New York agreed that religion has had a large impact on the formation of national identity and he recognized its importance for building civil society. However, he expressed skepticism that religion has had a great impact on politics in Cuba.

Commentators *Philip Brenner* and *William Leogrande* of American University, *Hugo Frühling* of the Universidad de Chile, and *Cristopher Welna* of the Kellogg Institute, University of Notre Dame, underscored the seminar's overarching themes: religion's impact on the formation of Cuban identity and the development of transnational identities in the context of globalization, and the relationship between civil society and political transition. Some saw religion and the expansion of civil society in Cuba as an opportunity for political

---

**The Catholic Church has played a significant role in addressing the problems of Cuban society by providing an array of social services, while it has chosen to remain apolitical to avoid confrontation with the Cuban state.**

chosen to remain apolitical to avoid confrontation with the Cuban state. *Brian Goonan* of Catholic Relief Services and *Thomas Quigley* of the United States Catholic Conference discussed the specific work of the Church in Cuba, including the services provided by Caritas Cuba, and the international links that have sustained the Church's activities.

Other analysts highlighted the importance of religion and race in the formation of cultural identity and the link between Spiritist practices on the island and abroad. *Marta Moreno Vega*, Caribbean Cultural Center, examined the transformation of Afro-Cuban spiritism in Cuba and the globalization of these traditions. Despite the fact that Afro-religious beliefs and rituals were historically kept underground and were used as resistance mechanisms, they have had a major impact on Cuban culture and identity, and spiri-



change. Others, however, felt that there were no incentives for the Cuban state to allow the growth of civil society and that a political transition would depend on other factors, including the dynamics within the regime. ■

## Brazil's 2002 Presidential Election

For the first time in Brazilian history, the effects of a presidential election were felt in the international financial sector. During the campaign, Brazil's credit rating was downgraded; as Luis Inácio da Silva (Lula), presidential candidate for the leftist Workers Party (PT), surged in the polls, uncertainty over his future policies led many analysts to predict economic turbulence.

The campaign provided the backdrop for a June 17, 2002, Working Group of Brazil @ the Wilson Center. *Lourdes Sola* of the University of São Paulo discussed the identification and weighting of factors for making reliable predictions of electoral behavior, the relative importance of the electoral strategies of the incumbent party's candidate, José Serra, and the challenges that a Lula government would face.

*Riordan Roett* of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies underlined the significance of this election in influencing Brazil's foreign policy on sensitive hemispheric issues such as bilateral relations with the United States, the FTAA, Mercosul, the Doha Round of the WTO, and the Argentine crisis. Although Roett acknowledged the pre-electoral economic turbulence, he expressed doubts that it would last and instead emphasized the importance of managing expectations prior to the October elections.

Brazil's economic prospects following the October 2002 Lula victory were the subject of a March 19, 2003 meeting with political scientist and risk analysis expert *Alexandre Barros*. Discussing Lula's first 75 days in office, Barros noted that Brazil faced grim prospects for a quick global economic recovery. He underscored that the government is also forced to cope with overwhelming social demands on

the domestic front. Barros said that the central challenge for Lula's administration will be to transmit confidence to foreign financial markets by demonstrating respect for existing contracts, while simultaneously addressing social needs, trimming public expenditures, fighting corruption, reducing the debt burden, and promoting economic growth. To maximize the possibilities for balancing and achieving these goals, during the first days of his administration Lula adopted a very orthodox set of economic policies similar to those of the previous administration. According to Barros, "there is nothing more similar to a conservative than a liberal in power."

In Barros' view, Lula has been pursuing a responsible economic policy based on maintaining fiscal restraint while pushing for reforms of the tax (revenue sharing) and social security systems as well as securing the autonomy of the Central Bank.

Some critics have questioned the efficiency of the Lula administration, pointing to details overlooked in the formulation of major policies. Some of these criticisms could be expected as a new and inexperienced administration takes over; however, Barros felt that these issues, as well as what he referred to as "ego disputes" within the administration and the possible radicalization of some factions of the PT could raise

---

### **Brazil needs to increase its exports, a reality that underscores the enormous importance of bilateral trade with the United States.**

red flags. He also noted concern about apparent double standards for the administration's appointments: economic positions were filled on the basis of technical merit, while appointees in other sectors appeared to have been designated for political reasons.

Barros emphasized the importance of addressing Brazil's debt burden (57 percent of GDP in 2002) and for the Central Bank to achieve its targets, reducing its vulnerability in dollars. In order to achieve these goals, Brazil needs to increase its exports, a reality that underscores the enormous importance of bilateral trade with the United

States (which accounts for 23 percent of Brazil's imports and 24 percent of its exports).

On some issues, Barros deemed it too early to make reliable predictions. These are the "big ifs" of the Lula government: privatization, deregulation, social expenditures, growth and debt, and friction in Brazil-U.S. trade relations. Barros felt that the overall outlook for Lula's administration would hinge on its effectiveness in managing these "ifs". Despite the deterioration of global political and economic conditions and the emergence of serious domestic challenges in Brazil, Barros expressed optimism regarding Brazil's future. ■

## NAFTA at Ten

Ten years ago, in December 1992, U.S. President George Bush Sr., Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, and Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in San Antonio, Texas.

Since the signing of NAFTA, trade and investment among the three North American nations has grown by more than 100 percent, with \$1.7 billion in trilateral trade each day.

To mark the 10th anniversary of this historic agreement, the Wilson Center convened a two-day conference to assess the impact of NAFTA, the lessons the agreement may hold for deepening North American ties and future trade agreements, and the international effort to "get globalization right." The 10th anniversary of NAFTA comes in the midst of the most wide-ranging set of trade negotiations the world has ever seen. In addition to the Doha Development Agenda launched last year, a number of regional and bilateral negotiations are underway. In particular, Canada, Mexico, and the United States will be engaged in the effort to forge a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA) by 2005. This ambitious trade agenda is being dealt with in the context of a widespread debate over the benefits and costs of globalization, particularly the effects of trade on poverty, inequality, labor rights, and the environment. During the conference, pan-

elists examined the experiences of the past decade to look ahead to the still unfolding development of a North American community both challenged and strengthened by growing economic and social integration.

**THE THREE SIGNATORIES** "The NAFTA signing created the largest, richest, most productive market in the world," said former *President George Bush, Sr.* at the opening session of the two-day program, held in the Atrium Ballroom of the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center. More than 800 people attended this session featuring the three national leaders who negotiated and signed the agreement. All three leaders lauded what they saw as NAFTA's success at creating millions of new jobs. Since 1993, Bush said that in the United States some 350,000 manufacturing jobs were lost due to NAFTA, but that 2 million higher-paying jobs were created.

"Our countries are stronger, our economies more robust, our peoples more prosperous, our social structures more resilient, our capital markets more stable, and our roles in the world more vigorous as a result of NAFTA," said former Canadian Prime Minister *Brian Mulroney*.

"NAFTA guaranteed that Mexican products would gain access to the world's largest market," said former Mexican President *Carlos Salinas*. "For the first time, labor and environmental issues—the latter an issue on which Canada taught us much—had a place in a trade agreement." He also recounted the process leading up to NAFTA, recalling the importance of reducing Mexico's debt, unifying the government, and rallying the public before signing on.

Mulroney endorsed similar future agreements such as the pending FTAA, which potentially would encompass 800 million people in 34 countries when ratified. "The power of a good idea should never be underestimated," he said. "It should happen again."

**MAKING AN IMPACT** Dozens of key business leaders, academics, and current and former government officials convened for two days of panel discussions. During the first panel, after the three heads of government spoke, speakers called NAFTA a paradigm shift for the three nations led by three visionary leaders.



**Lee H. Hamilton, George Bush Sr., Brian Mulroney, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Joseph Gildenhorn**

Yet speakers also addressed the challenges facing NAFTA, including the need for more work to strengthen dispute-resolution mechanisms, to increase the openness of borders among states while strengthening exterior borders, and to have agricultural trade open and free of subsidies. Another challenge will be to ensure that certain regions, particularly the southern sections of Mexico, are not left behind.

**LINKING NORTH AMERICA** While the “big idea” behind the European Community was the prevention of another European war, many found it difficult to see the “big idea” behind NAFTA, beyond the obvious strengthening of trade relations. NAFTA institutions do exist, and the three states do submit to them, but these institutions are neither democratic nor transparent. The question was raised as to whether the concept of continental security could be the new idea around which NAFTA could move forward, especially if the tradeoffs between continental democracy and sovereignty are addressed in the process.

Numerous speakers throughout the conference noted that, in practice, NAFTA represents two separate bilateral agreements (between the U.S. and Mexico and the U.S. and Canada), more so than one trilateral agreement as was intended. For example, there is little military

collaboration between the United States and Mexico compared with the stronger military cooperation between the United States and Canada. Panelists reported the call for a reduction in the perceived unilateralism of the United States regarding border issues with Canada and particularly Mexico. Some suggested that potential benefits would result from stronger convergence on many elements of tax policy.

**GETTING GLOBALIZATION RIGHT** A panel on globalization highlighted growing income inequality both within Mexico and between Mexico and the United States. Income disparities

in Mexico are among the highest in the world, with many social groups and geographic regions failing to participate successfully in the market economy, a situation which, in turn, drives migrants to the United States in search of jobs.

Panelists also said that income inequalities have been a major source of Mexican migration. For example, the rural population comprises one fifth of Mexico’s total population, yet it contributed only about one twentieth of GDP. Meanwhile, the U.S. job creation of 1.2 million jobs per year exceeded growth in the U.S. labor force—a gap that Mexicans living in the United States helped fill. Six million Mexicans, working in the United States, send about \$9 billion to Mexico each year.

In particular, speakers urged a focus on building stronger institutions in NAFTA to address governance problems and corporate disputes. Panelists observed that, regardless of whether the NAFTA countries develop a common currency, interest rates and monetary policy in Mexico, the United States, and Canada are beginning to converge

**INTO THE FUTURE** While NAFTA addresses business relations, some of the related and more difficult issues have yet to be tackled, such as migration, labor, security, transportation, and monetary policy. Regarding NAFTA as a model

for future agreements, speakers emphasized that negotiators should take a long-term approach to the agreement, seek to avoid special status treatment for politically powerful industries, and focus on building institutions for the resolution of disputes. Speakers also stressed the importance of involving civil society, NGOs, and businesses, big and small, to build a more powerful constituency for a better agreement. Panelists suggested that NAFTA be seen as a model, along with the creation of the European Community, for the creation of substantial regional free trade agreements in other parts of the world. ■

## Legislatures and Trade Agreements

Although issues of trade liberalization and free trade agreements have taken on ever greater importance in U.S.-Latin American affairs, consultation within countries of the region between legislatures and the executive branch has been inadequate at best. To address this concern, the Latin American Program sponsored two meetings aimed at helping elected representatives from both the United States and Latin American grapple with the issues they face in the debates over regional integration and free trade. The initiative, carried out with the generous support of the Inter-American Development Bank, brought parliamentarians and trade ministers from Central America and the Caribbean to Washington in December 2002 and March 2003 to meet with members of the U.S. Congress.

During the meetings on “Legislatures and the Approval of Trade Agreements in the Americas,” visiting policymakers spent a day on Capitol Hill discussing the challenges of free trade agreements with members of Congress and senior staff of key congressional committees. A second day was devoted to meetings at the Wilson Center with trade specialists from other U.S. governmental institutions involved in trade issues, such as USAID, the USTR, GAO, CRS, and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Throughout the discussions, it became clear that political pressures have significant leverage in determining the outcomes of trade agree-

ments, and that understanding these pressures would lead to the adoption of more focused and successful strategies aimed at the ratification of trade agreements in the legislature. The face-to-face discussions also helped define the position of each country and build confidence, thus narrowing the gap between expectations and the realm of the politically possible.

In terms of negotiating power and resources, coordination between countries within the region was found to be crucial to increase bargaining power, unify interests and demands, and promote a better and more efficient use of existing capacities. In this context, U.S. and multilateral agencies can play a significant role in capacity building in the developing countries.

On a more technical note, participants from Central America and the Caribbean expressed concern about preserving special and differential treatment for small economies, and especially about the need for longer periods in which to phase out tariffs. They also realized that, because of U.S. concern, special attention needs to be focused on environmental and labor laws. Most agreed that the recent U.S.-Chile trade agreement could serve as the framework for future accords. ■

## Honduran President Discusses Regional Integration

During his visit to the Wilson Center on April 29, 2003, Honduran President *Ricardo Maduro Joest* addressed the state of Central American economic integration and Honduran democratization—both of which have deepened despite the widespread devastation brought about by Hurricane Mitch in 1998. Maduro, of the Honduran National Party, was elected to the presidency in November 2001 on a strong anti-corruption platform. Prior to his election, he served as president of the National Bank and the Central Bank, as well as coordinator of the Economic Cabinet. His administration has been an active supporter, with the United States, of the proposed U.S.-Central America Free Trade Agreement (U.S.-CAFTA)—which will also include Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Accompanying



President Ricardo Maduro Joest

President Maduro was Honduran ambassador to the United States *Mario Canahuati* and Foreign Minister *Guillermo Pérez-Cadalso Arias*.

Maduro detailed the significant democratic development in Honduras since the transition from military rule in the early 1980s. Specifically, he noted the growth of civilian participation, which has assisted his administration's efforts to support electoral reform aimed at widening participation. Despite internal challenges posed to his initial campaign efforts, Maduro argued that state reforms targeting "participation between elections" as well as anti-corruption measures have been instrumental in bringing about progress. He also highlighted his administration's emphasis on macroeconomic stability and on participatory, sustainable socioeconomic growth. Maduro also emphasized the need for greater and deeper regional integration, and expressed strong support for a trade agreement between the United States and Central American countries.

To foster equitable socio-economic development, Maduro underscored the need for "bridges between the moment we sign treaties and the moment when they produce results." He noted that one such "bridge" was that of immigration policy, since remittances from workers living in the United States provide 6 percent of the GDP of the Central American region and

10 percent of Honduran GDP. He stressed that regional and state policies to foment local economic development will be most beneficial if they are able to directly affect and assist those most in need. According to Maduro, such policies should include increased assurances of investment security, equitable access to markets (i.e., for Honduran coffee), and more open avenues for citizen participation in the socio-political arena. ■

## Urban Crime and Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean

On April 30, 2003, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Woodrow Wilson Center sponsored a conference on public safety and the prevention of violence in Latin America and the Caribbean. The conference drew experts from various countries, including current and former governmental officials, researchers, and NGO activists; its aim was to share experiences and studies carried out in various contexts in order to identify international trends related to the prevention of violence and the promotion of public safety.

Scholars and practitioners alike agreed on the need to promote crime prevention and improve the perception of security at the community level through an integrated approach that included participation of the community, not one limited to police reforms. In addition, there

---

**Municipal programs must focus on the particular concerns of specific populations. For this to occur, local level institutional capacity building must take place, especially prior to crime prevention tasks carried out in a given jurisdiction.**

was consensus that municipal programs must focus on the particular concerns of specific populations. For this to occur, local level institutional capacity building must take place, especially prior to crime prevention tasks carried out

in a given jurisdiction. Finally, while the speakers emphasized the need to find solutions at the local level, they also underscored the need to find mechanisms to coordinate the different levels of government.

World Bank Vice President for Latin America and the Caribbean *David de Ferranti* opened the seminar. *Antanas Mockus*, Mayor of Bogotá, delivered a keynote address. Mockus described a plan implemented in Bogotá to promote a “culture of citizenship” in order to counteract cultural norms that promote violence.

The first panel, moderated by *Shelton Davis* of the World Bank, dealt with “Preparing Municipal Crime and Violence Prevention

---

**It is hard to implement community policing strategies when there is not sufficient trust between the communities and the forces of law and order.**

Strategies: The Role of Diagnosis, Partnerships, and Stakeholder Consultations.” *Claudio Beato*, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil, described the “Program to Control Homicides Committed by Youth,” which was implemented in the *favelas* or shantytowns of Belo Horizonte. The program aims to mobilize the community through communication campaigns and a joint task force composed of municipal officials, judges, and district attorneys. *Tinus Kruger* of CSIR in South Africa discussed the preparation of a manual to help the national and local governments collaborate in the development of crime prevention strategies. *Allison Rowland*, Center for Economic Research and Teaching, Mexico, outlined the difficulties of coordinating national, state, and municipal initiatives on citizen security in Mexico, as well as the limited role that citizens play in fighting crime. *Alberto Föhrig* of the University of San Andrés, Argentina, noted the importance of focusing on specific problems and at-risk populations, analyzing the local context before anti-crime initiatives are to be implemented, and applying an interagency approach.

The second panel addressed “Youth Crime and Violence Prevention Issues.” *Father Jorge*

*Cela*, Bono Center, Dominican Republic, presented a study carried out in five marginal settlements in Santo Domingo, which analyzed three areas: at-risk youth involved in crime related to drug use, gang activity, and the police’s repressive practices. *Alberto Concha Eastman* of the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO) discussed PAHO’s study of youth gangs in El Salvador. *Lynn Curtis* of the U.S.-based Eisenhower Foundation presented several examples of the youth-oriented programs the foundation sponsors. The “Youth Safe Haven-Ministation” program, for example, is a combination of the American concept of after-school programs and the Japanese idea of neighborhood-based police mini-stations. Other panel participants included *Guadalupe López* of the Association of Honduran Municipalities. *Mayra Buvinic* of the Inter-American Development Bank moderated the session.

During a third session focusing on “The Role of Police and Judicial Systems in Municipal and Local Crime and Violence Prevention Strategies,” *Hugo Frühling* of the Center for Development Studies in Chile explained the importance of community policing and the challenges facing community policing that arise from the lack of coordination among different governmental levels, the lack of sufficient numbers of police, and centralized and militarized police forces. *Catalina Smulovitz*, Torcuato Di Tella University, Argentina, argued that it is hard to implement community policing strategies when there is not sufficient trust between the communities and the forces of law and order. Police forces, for example, often consider these initiatives threatening. In addition, community policing programs require a high level of sustained community involvement and collaboration among state agencies, which may be difficult to attain. *Carlos Basombrío* of the Legal Defense Institute in Peru described the three major objectives of the police reform that took place in Peru under the Toledo administration: to legitimize the police forces, to institutionalize citizen security at the local level, and to limit impunity and recourse to authoritarian measures. *Joseph S. Tulchin* of the Wilson Center, who moderated the session, commented on the

transition that must occur in Latin American countries from militarized, authoritarian regimes characterized by impunity to democratic regimes with professional police forces that uphold the rule of law.

The following panel addressed “The Role of Urban Environmental Design and Physical Planning in Crime and Violence Prevention Strategies.” *Severin Sorensen*, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), described a HUD program that focuses on an environmental analysis of crime and the efficient allocation of limited resources. *Susan Liebermann*, CSIR, South Africa, stated that crime prevention strategies must involve environmental planning and designing in order to be effective. *Macarena Rau*, Citizen Peace Foundation, Chile, explained how the South African model of using environmental design to reduce crime was applied to the design of public spaces in Chile. *Andrew Altman* of the District of Columbia Office of Planning discussed a crime-fighting strategy in Washington, D.C. that was based on citizen feedback regarding areas most affected by crime. *Roberto Chávez* of the World Bank emphasized the need for comprehensive responses that generate community participation.

In the closing session, “Monitoring and Evaluation of Crime and Violence Prevention Programs,” Wilson Center consultant *Julia Pomares* outlined indicators by which police performance in Argentina could be judged. *Christopher Stone* of the New York-based Vera Institute indicated that crime-prevention programs should be evaluated in terms of the priorities of the audience. *Rodrigo Guerrero*, former mayor of Cali, Colombia, underscored the need for practical approaches to citizen security problems. *Andrew Morrison* of the IDB and *María Emilia Freire* of the World Bank also participated in the panel.

In August 2003, the Wilson Center, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank jointly published a policy bulletin summarizing the meeting’s major conclusions.

Following the World Bank meeting, Basombrío, Beato, Föhrig, Pomares, and Smulovitz, along with *Tamara Taraciuk*, a Junior

Scholar at the Wilson Center, and Lilián Bobea of FLACSO-Dominican Republic, met to plan the next stage in the Wilson Center’s project on citizen security. In the next year and a half, the Wilson Center will sponsor field work in five countries in the region to test ways of building capacity at the neighborhood level as a strategy of reducing insecurity and levels of violence. ■

## Bilateral Relations between Mexico and the United States

The Mexico Institute of the Latin American Program hosted four seminars on relations between Mexico and the United States, to explore both short- and long-term trends in bilateral affairs. These seminars explored the issues on the bilateral agenda, the nature of civil society linkages between the two countries, and the politics of trade in both countries.

On May 9, 2003, the Mexico Institute, together with the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) and the Mexican Council on Foreign Affairs, sponsored a roundtable discussion on the “New Parameters of Partnership between Mexico and the United States.” Approximately sixty people, representing the two governments, the private sector, academia, and non-govern-

---

### The Diálogos process created new linkages among civil society organizations and helped create a “space below” in the predominantly “top-down” integration process in North America.

mental organizations participated in the off-the-record meeting. Speakers and commentators included Ambassador *Jeffrey Davidow* of the Institute of the Americas; *Rafael Fernández de Castro* of ITAM; *Riordan Roett* of the Johns Hopkins University-SAIS; *Demetri Papademetriou* of MPI; *Gustavo Mohar* of Structura; *Doris Meissner* of MPI; and *Andrew Selee* and *Larry Harrington* of the Woodrow Wilson Center.

There was general agreement among participants that the relationship between the United

States and Mexico remains intense, with a high level of coordination between the governments that is unprecedented in history. At the same time, there has been loss of momentum for new initiatives in the relationship because of recent policy disagreements and the longer-term consequences of the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks in the United States. Participants generally noted that the perceived crisis in the bilateral relationship is related to elevated expectations about the relationship. Nonetheless, the bilateral relationship continues to evolve, mature, and develop, and there will be new opportunities for creative discussions around such issues of mutual concern as migration, security, trade, law enforcement, and economic prosperity.

On May 23, 2003, the Mexico Institute hosted a seminar on the “Politics of Trade in Mexico and the United States,” in collaboration with the University of California, Berkeley, APEC Study Center and the Mexican Center for Economic Teaching and Research (CIDE). This meeting explored the changing dynamics of trade policy in the two countries and analyzed the actors and purposes that trade policy serves. *Antonio Ortíz Mena* of CIDE argued that Mexican trade policy has passed through three phases: from a largely protectionist period dominated by the foreign affairs ministry in the 1970s and early 1980s; to a phase dominated by the commerce ministry and heavily oriented toward trade as an engine of development; to the current status where the congress and the executive jointly weigh in on trade policy and it is the subject of considerable debate. *Isabel Studer* of FLACSO-Mexico argued that the Environmental Side Agreements of NAFTA, though weak in and of themselves, have spurred the growth of the environmental movement in Mexico and provided a forum for environmental NGOs to meet and coordinate strategies across the three countries.

*Jeff Faux* of the Economic Policy Institute pointed to the disjuncture between the deep economic integration of NAFTA and its weak political development. Today there is no doubt that integration will continue. But what needs to be discussed is the terms of that integration and how it can be used to spur equitable development in

the three countries. Promoting equity requires the development of a continental polity with political institutions that allow citizen input into the process. *Gary Hufbauer* of the Institute for International Economics noted that the lack of progress on other trade agreements might open up room for creative progress with NAFTA. This could involve incremental change (resolving current disputes) or a “big idea,” such as advances on migration, security, energy, or trade policy itself.

On June 17, 2003, the Mexico Institute hosted a seminar on “Cross-Border Dialogues between the United States and Mexico.” This seminar was of particular importance given the growing impact that hometown associations, unions, environmental organizations, and other civil society organizations that operate “across borders” have on the bilateral relationship. The seminar marked the publication of the book *Cross-Border Dialogues*, edited by David Brooks and Jonathan Fox (La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, 2003), and was co-sponsored by the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego, and the Latin American and Latino Studies Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

The first panel provided an analysis of the *Diálogos* process, which brought together social organizations from Mexico and the United States between 1988 and 1997. *David Brooks* of *La Jornada* described the genesis of the initiative, which began as a means for civil society organizations from both countries to share their concerns and opinions on binational and trilateral economic integration and its impact on domestic issues. According to Brooks, the *Diálogos* process created new linkages among civil society organizations and helped create a “space below” in the predominantly “top-down” integration process in North America. *Jonathan Fox* of the University of California, Santa Cruz, argued that this process was a critical part of achieving “globalization from below.” A range of networks has formed as a result of this process, as well as a few coalitions, but very few transnational movements (other than among Mexican migrants). The *Diálogos* process brought organizations together strongly around NAFTA, but this energy has not always been sustained. In fact, there is



no sustained trend toward greater cohesion among the civil society organizations in the United States and Mexico, except among border organizations, Fox argued.

A second panel discussed the processes of “Building Linkages” between Mexican and U.S. social organizations in three arenas: the environment, political rights of immigrants, and cooperation among labor unions. *Mary E. Kelly* of Environmental Defense observed that before NAFTA, there were hardly any joint efforts carried out by Mexican and U.S. groups dealing with environmental affairs. Nonetheless, debates on NAFTA and its actual implementation caught the attention of such groups and generated networks among them so that “the discussion arrived to stay.” Concerning the political rights of immigrants, *Jesús Martínez Saldaña* of California State University, Fresno, and an advisor to the Michoacán state government, emphasized the fact that Mexican immigrants in the United States lack their most basic political right, voting, even though approximately 90 percent meet the requirements established by Mexican laws to vote. However, he noted that Mexican migrants already play a vital role in Mexican politics, especially at the state and local level. This is leading many state governments to consider legislation to allow Mexicans abroad to vote in state elections, and a movement is building to grant Mexicans in the United States the right to vote in national elections. *Mark Anderson* of the Food and Allied Service Trades (FAST), an affiliate of the AFL-CIO, described the history of increased union cooperation between Mexico and the United States, which developed as a result of the NAFTA negotiations.

Finally, on June 10, 2003, the Mexico Institute hosted a private breakfast meeting with Ambassador *Andrés Rozental* of the Mexican Council on Foreign Affairs, which focused on “Rethinking the U.S.-

Mexico Agenda.” Rozental emphasized the central importance of migration in U.S.-Mexico relations, but suggested that it could be dealt with in stages. He also noted that ongoing cooperation in security and trade should be recognized and built upon. Key participants from the State Department, National Security Council, and U.S. Senate and House staffs discussed these issues with Ambassador Rozental and representatives of the Mexican Embassy. ■

## Argentina @ the Wilson Center

In the midst of the worst economic and political crisis in recent Argentine history, the Latin American Program launched “Argentina @ The Wilson Center,” a project designed to provide the Washington-based policy community with a deeper understanding of the causes and implications of the country’s turmoil. The project also seeks to contribute to dialogue among different groups in Argentina, bringing together networks of public policy experts to discuss and debate issues of critical importance to the country.

Since Argentina’s default in January 2002, attention abroad has focused on the debt crisis and the seemingly endless negotiations between the Argentine government and the International Monetary Fund. Far less attention has been paid to the country’s social tragedy and the role of



Guillermo Calvo, Eugenio Díaz Bonilla, Alberto Rodríguez Saa, Fernando Riavec, Pablo Rojo, Daniel Montamat, and Julio Pierkas



Joseph S. Tulchin, Richard McCormack, María del Carmen Feijóo, Ernesto Aldo Isuani, Fabián Repetto, and Carola Álvarez. On the screen, the audience at the Catholic University in Buenos Aires.

the state and civil society in addressing unprecedented levels of poverty and unemployment. Accordingly, on October 30, 2002, the Project organized a conference on “Argentina’s Social Default,” combining the perspectives of policymakers and representatives of non-governmental organizations. During a first session moderated by *Ambassador*

ethical contract is stronger than ever before.” *María del Carmen Feijóo*, executive secretary of Argentina’s Consejo Nacional de Coordinación de Políticas Sociales, outlined the programs implemented since January 2002, when President Eduardo Duhalde took office. Feijoo referred to the “Jefas y Jefes de Hogar” (Heads of Households) program that, she argued, had “restored social order.” *Ambassador Joseph B. Gildenhorn*, chairman of the Wilson Center’s Board of Trustees, called on the policy community in the United States to pay attention to problems of poverty and marginalization throughout the hemisphere. Other participants included: *Fabián Repetto*, Instituto Interamericano para el Desarrollo Social (INDES); *Carola Álvarez*, IDB; *Ernesto Aldo Isuani*, FLACSO-Argentina; *William Recant*, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee; *Javier García Labougle*, CARITAS; and *Raul Francisco Zavallia Lagos*, Fundación ProVivienda Social. The representatives of non-governmental organizations described how organized civil society has tried, with only partial success, to complement the efforts of the state, which in turn has relied on loans from multilateral agencies as well as tax revenues to address the dramatic increase in poverty since the recession began in 1998.

Social policies figured prominently in a second event, held on December 3, 2002, on

---

**Since Argentina’s default in January 2002, attention abroad has focused on the debt crisis and the seemingly endless negotiations between the Argentine government and the International Monetary Fund. Far less attention has been paid to the country’s social tragedy and the role of the state and civil society in addressing unprecedented levels of poverty and unemployment.**

*Richard McCormack*, former U.S. under secretary of state for economic affairs, *Bernardo Kliksberg* of the Inter-American Development Bank referred to the increasing importance of civil society organizations in addressing the crisis. He explained how, as society became more polarized, the number of NGO’s and the number of people involved in volunteer work had increased. Despite the fact that the social contract has been broken, he argued, “the

“The Road to Elections: Argentina’s Economic Future.” Senior economic advisors for several of the principal presidential candidates were invited to discuss the economic crisis and the policies they would adopt on monetary, fiscal, trade, unemployment and development matters. The advisors agreed on the need to simplify and reform the tax structure, and to adopt more prudent and restrictive policies on government borrowing. They disagreed sharply, however, on the key targets and central themes of their programs. *Julio Pierkas*, advisor for presidential candidate Ricardo López Murphy, stated that public policies should promote the use of market-based strategies and efficiency within the public sector. *Pablo Rojo*, senior economic advisor for Carlos Menem, emphasized two main objectives: to restore the international community’s confidence in Argentina, by stabilizing monetary policy, exercising fiscal balance, and respecting private property; and to restore the purchasing power of wage-earners. Other participants included *Alberto Rodríguez Saa*, senior economic advisor for Adolfo Rodríguez Saa; *Fernando Riavec*, senior economic advisor for Patricia Bullrich; *Eugenio Díaz-Bonilla*, senior advisor of José Octavio Bordón; and *Daniel Montamat*, senior economic advisor for Rodolfo Terragno. Ambassador *Manuel Rocha*, former U.S. ambassador in Argentina, served as moderator.

To reflect on the debate, Woodrow Wilson Center fellows *Ariel Armony* and *Héctor Schamis* collaborated with the Latin American Program in organizing a day-long workshop on April 3, 2003, called “Rethinking Argentina.” Those participating represented a wide variety of academic disciplines and perspectives, and included Argentine author and writer *Tomás Eloy Martínez*; Inter-American Development Bank chief economist *Guillermo Calvo*; *Martín Abregú*, Ford Foundation; *Gastón Chillier*, International Human Rights Law Group; *Margaret Crahan*, Hunter College and The Graduate Center of the City University of New York; *Judith Filc*, Department of Spanish and Portuguese at New York University; *Edward Gibson*, Northwestern University; *Louis*

*Goodman*, American University; *María Matilde Ollier*, FUNDAR; *Jorge Quiroga*, Woodrow Wilson Center; *William C. Smith*, Miami Department of International Studies; and *Joseph S. Tulchin*, Latin American Program, Woodrow Wilson Center.

The discussion ranged widely over the Argentine economy, Argentina’s role in the world, democracy and political parties, culture and the role of intellectuals in society within the political arena, civil society, the rule of law, and violence and citizen security. A summary of the dialogue together with an introduction by Armony and Schamis will be published as a conference report in the Fall of 2003.

---

**The representatives of non-governmental organizations described how organized civil society has tried, with only partial success, to complement the efforts of the state, which in turn has relied on loans from multilateral agencies as well as tax revenues to address the dramatic increase in poverty since the recession began in 1998.**

Immediately following the inauguration of newly elected President Néstor Kirchner, Argentina @ the Wilson Center held a conference analyzing Argentina’s April 2003 presidential elections. Two front-runners (both Peronists) emerged in the April 27<sup>th</sup> vote: Néstor Kirchner, governor of Patagonia’s Santa Cruz province, and former two-term president Carlos Menem. They were to meet in a run-off election, but Menem withdrew when polls indicated he would face a crushing defeat. As a result, Kirchner assumed the presidency with the 22 per cent of the vote he had garnered in the first round. The May 28, 2003 seminar was aimed at exploring the implications of Kirchner’s slim electoral mandate for future political and economic developments, as well as the impact of the 2003 elections on internal developments in the Peronist party.

Political analyst *Rosendo Fraga* suggested that Kirchner could turn the conditions to his advantage if he grasped the opportunity to

change political culture in Argentina, making consensus and alliance the basis for democratic governance. *Mark Falcoff* of the American Enterprise Institute indicated that Kirchner's limited mandate could mark the beginning of more performance-based presidencies; if that were to occur, it would demonstrate growing maturity and change in the political system. Argentine pollster *Graciela Romer* also argued that following four years of economic recession, the demands of the Argentine public are more realistic, and that to sustain governance, politicians must begin responding to those demands, such as creating employment, alleviating poverty, protecting against crime, and fighting corruption. Historian *Carlos Floria* said that Kirchner's greatest challenge will be to

---

**Following four years of economic recession, the demands of the Argentine public are more realistic...to sustain governance, politicians must begin responding to those demands, such as creating employment, alleviating poverty, protecting against crime, and fighting corruption.**

construct authority. *Santiago Cantón*, executive secretary of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States, emphasized the need for foreign policy coherence, which should be based on Argentine national interests and not on automatic alignment with any political or economic bloc. *Andrés Oppenheimer* of the *Miami Herald* moderated the panel, adding that it was vitally important for Argentina to take a realistic view of world affairs and a realistic view of its own capacities.

Each of the conferences described above was broadcast live to Argentina, in partnership with either the Universidad Católica or the Economics Faculty of the Universidad de Buenos Aires. Newsletters summarizing each of the events are available from the Latin American Program.

Argentina @ the Wilson Center held two additional meetings in Buenos Aires. On

September 26–27, 2002, the project collaborated with the Universidad de San Andrés in a meeting on defense and security policies in the hemisphere. On May 14, 2003, the project joined with the Universidad de Bologna in discussing post-Iraq scenarios. Conference reports on both meetings are available from the Latin American Program. ■

## Political Crisis and the Threat to Democratic Governance

On May 20, 2003, the Latin American Program conducted a workshop to discuss political crises in Latin America and the threat to democratic governance, as part of the ongoing project on "Creating Community." The participants sought ways to identify points of crisis and suggested precise research that would enable the philanthropic and policy communities to respond in appropriate and effective ways.

Ongoing political and economic turmoil in Venezuela demonstrates the fragility of democratic governments in Latin America and reveals the lack of information in the United States about the roots of such crises. *Joseph S. Tulchin*, director of the Latin American Program, challenged the group to identify the factors that contribute to the vulnerability of democratic governance in the region and come up with pragmatic steps to address these issues. Members of the group reached a consensus as to which might be considered key issues for study; however, several members cautioned that it was easier to identify existing crises than it was to predict impending ones. And, as *Raúl Benítez* (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) pointed out, the causes of some crises are indeterminate.

Nevertheless, *Frances Hagopian* of the Kellogg Institute, University of Notre Dame, felt that there were general characteristics or causes of crises ("destabilizing factors") that might emerge upon further examination, including citizen's concerns about public security, corruption, the impunity of elected representatives, and the absence of economic and social security. If there were destabilizing factors, *Robert*

*Kaufman* of Rutgers University suggested it would be useful to examine the aspects that strengthen democratic governance and prevent crises from occurring, by looking at the countries that seem to better manage their vulnerabilities, such as Brazil and Mexico.

Participants engaged in considerable debate over the distinction between root causes of instability that might require changes in political culture requiring generations of experience, and more immediate problems that might be more easily subject to correction. *Jonathan Hartlyn*, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, focused on this latter arena, arguing that it would be useful to highlight the areas that could be most effectively addressed by a range of policy options. As for specific issues that could be examined and addressed by policy change, *Genaro Arriagada* of Chile's *Siete Más Siete* argued that weak political systems and electoral processes plague the region, and stressed that state reforms would prevent crises from occurring. *Kurt Weyland* of the University of Texas at Austin added that the politics of identity, including gender, race, and ethnicity, could create problems for democratic governance when groups do not feel represented and do not believe in democratic means.

The group discussed several other issues that have serious short-term consequences and are of major concern to the public: decentralization and the effectiveness of local governments, mechanisms of representation, the quality of institutions, and informal power and the influence of the wealthy. Root problems such as poverty, inequality, and income concentration, have broader implications for the region; but rather than trigger crises of governance, the consensus was that these problems constitute a base on which other issues grow to become precipitants of a crisis. The group proposed a deeper, geographically-specific examination of the issue areas that could lead to the outbreak of crises in the region, as well as broader, long-term research into the linkages between core problems and specific destabilizing factors. The workshop helped to define several lines of research the Latin American Program will pursue in the year ahead. ■

## Brazilian Environmental Policy under Lula

The appointment of *Marina Silva* as Brazil's minister of the environment is testimony to the evolution of environmental politics in Brazil. Silva's background—from her beginnings with the rubber tappers' movement and founding of the Central Workers union in the Amazon state of Acre, to her rise through the ranks of local and federal government—reflects the Lula administration's reach beyond traditional elites for cabinet-level appointments. Silva spoke at the Wilson Center on May 1, 2003, outlining the administration's plans to promote economic development while simultaneously respecting and preserving the environment in Brazil. Silva outlined three broad agendas—known as “brown, blue, and green”—that form the basis of governmental environmental policy.

The brown agenda is mainly concerned with the processing and disposal of solid waste through sound environmental practices. The Lula administration is devising a national solid waste policy aimed at promoting social inclusion and creating jobs.

The blue agenda is focused on air pollution and the recovery of rivers and riparian buffers. The agenda includes a joint program with the ministry of cities, which addresses urban pollu-



Marina Silva

tion problems and will attempt to improve environmental conditions for disadvantaged populations in urban centers. Additionally, a national policy for water resources will include a new program that provides water through a cistern network in regions where potable water may

### **Silva concluded by simultaneously highlighting sustainable development and the importance of social inclusion of the millions of Brazilians living in poverty.**

not be readily available. Thirty thousand such cisterns have been built with the help of FEBRABAN (the privately-owned Brazilian Federation of Banks) in the arid Brazilian Northeast. An additional 200,000 are planned for next year, with the ultimate goal of 1 million by the end of Lula's tenure.

The green agenda emphasizes agricultural development while respecting forest conservation. Silva underscored the success of policies adopted during the former administration and noted that henceforth, the approval of agricultural projects will depend on assessments of their environmental impact.

Basic principles for pursuing these agendas include: 1) coordination of policy at the state and federal levels; 2) the inclusion of environmental criteria in the formulation of all government policy, with the goal of minimizing negative environmental impacts; 3) stimulating the participation of civil society in formulating environmental policy; and 4) the designing of realistic policies that do not preclude the economic development of a country rich in natural resources, which is striving to provide a better standard of living for the 50 million Brazilians who live below the poverty line. Silva concluded by simultaneously highlighting sustainable development and the importance of social inclusion of the millions of Brazilians living in poverty. ■

### **Presidential Candidate Lucio Gutiérrez**

*Lucio Gutiérrez*, at the time a candidate for president of Ecuador, spoke at a luncheon co-sponsored by the Latin American Program and the Inter-American Dialogue on November 1, 2002. Gutiérrez won the first round of presidential elections in October 2002 with 20.4 percent of the vote. The runner-up and his opponent for the second round elections, Álvaro Noboa, finished with 17.4 percent of the vote.

In his speech and throughout his visit to the United States, Gutiérrez reiterated his desire to listen to suggestions and to create a bilateral dialogue. He asked for international cooperation in resolving Ecuador's problems, which he identified as corruption, poverty, and a lack of competitiveness.

Gutiérrez proposed to begin combating corruption by depoliticizing the judiciary and creating a fourth branch of the state for control and accountability. To combat poverty, he

### **The Woodrow Wilson Center launches Mexico Institute**

On March 2, 2003, the Woodrow Wilson Center inaugurated the Latin American Program's Mexico Institute to focus attention on Mexico and U.S.-Mexico relations. The Mexico Institute hosts conferences, seminars, and workshops; carries out major studies of U.S.-Mexico relations and Mexican politics; publishes timely analyses of the bilateral relationship; and sponsors public policy scholars.

Center Director Lee H. Hamilton named a distinguished advisory board for the Mexico Institute with thirty leaders drawn from academia, the private sector, and public life. The advisory board, chaired by *Roger Wallace*, chairman and CEO, Investamex and *José Antonio Fernández*, chairman and CEO, FEMSA, met on March 2 and 3 for the first time to inaugurate the Institute. They provide direction to the Institute's work and to its fundraising efforts.

The Institute co-sponsors a public policy scholars program with the Mexican Council on Foreign Affairs, and will be hosting four Mexican scholars during the 2003-2004 academic year.

also proposed investing more in education and health and creating jobs in new, non-oil sectors such as tourism and mining. According to Gutiérrez, many steps were needed to improve Ecuador's competitiveness, including investing in hydroelectric power to lower the country's energy costs, reducing the amount of bureaucratic red tape, and lowering interest rates. He said that foreign investors should view Ecuador as a serious alternative for investment. Gutiérrez pledged that his administration would work to insure citizen security, judicial security, social security, environmental security, and food security for all Ecuadorans. ■

### Chiapas: The Dilemmas of the Current Conflict and Negotiation

The Latin American Program and the North American Studies Center (CISAN) of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) hosted a full-day seminar in Mexico City on October 30, 2002, to focus on the conflict in Chiapas and questions of indigenous rights in global perspective. The seminar included leading political actors and scholars from Mexico, Guatemala, Canada, and the United States, and took place at a time when the peace negotiations to resolve the conflict between the Mexican government and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) showed little sign of being renewed.

Three keynote speakers—*Luis H. Álvarez* (the federal government's peace commissioner for Chiapas), *Samuel Ruíz* (emeritus bishop of San Cristóbal), and *Emilio Zebadúa* (secretary of government of Chiapas)—agreed that historical factors such as the lack of rule of law, near-feudal structures of political and economic power, unresolved land claims, racism, and intra-communal conflict had led to a situation of great tension which impeded progress in the peace process.

However, *Bishop Samuel Ruíz* stressed that the national government had not lived up to its agreements under the 1996 San Andrés Accords on indigenous rights, and that the neo-liberal



Andrew Selee, Cynthia Arnson, Will Kymlicka, Raúl Benítez

policies that the administration of President Vicente Fox was pursuing only worsened the conditions that gave rise to the conflict in the first place.

*Luis H. Álvarez*, on the other hand, expressed the Fox administration's willingness to restart the dialogue and stressed the importance of rebuilding channels of communication. He pointed out that the EZLN had broken off the dialogue and had maintained complete silence despite the government's willingness to open the doors to the Zapatistas' peace caravan in 2001. He argued that the government was seeking to address the underlying causes of the conflict by implementing social programs in the indigenous communities of Chiapas.

At the same time, *Emilio Zebadúa*, in representation of Chiapas Governor Pablo Salazar, noted that the conflict has several different dimensions that go beyond the state level and that there are national political obstacles that impede finding solutions. Nonetheless, he emphasized that there have been positive advances in ending the impunity with which paramilitary organizations operated since the first democratically elected government took office in 2000. However, he also recognized that the state government was limited in its capacity to reform the justice system and ensure public security.

*Álvaro Pop*, a Guatemalan indigenous leader, emphasized that his country has made significant advances in the social and political recognition of indigenous rights since the peace accords of 1996, but he noted that the indigenous movement pursues multiple strategies rather than speaking with a single voice on many issues. *Will Kymlicka* of Queens

University mentioned that many liberal democracies have successfully implemented regimes of minority rights despite inherent tensions between group rights and individual rights. This has been particularly important in light of growing demands for recognition from ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups around the world. *Donna Lee Van Cott* of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville compared the experience of indigenous movements elsewhere in Latin America, noting that indigenous rights have been recognized only when expansive state reform processes have taken place. *Miguel Concha* of the Fray Francisco Vitoria Human Rights Center described the evolution of the notion of human rights from one that addresses only individual rights to one that embraces the idea of collective rights as well.

*Luis Hernández Navarro* of *La Jornada* criticized the Fox administration for failing to use the “democratic bonus” he had when first elected to make real changes. Hernández said the government had no strategy for peace, and had failed to address the needs of the indigenous communities and prevent the reemergence of paramilitary groups. Similarly, *Guillermo May* of the National Indigenous Congress and *Gonzalo Ituarte* of the parish of Ocosingo suggested that the conditions that gave origin to the Zapatista uprising have not changed substantially.

*Senator Felipe de Jesús Vicencio* (PAN) was pessimistic about the possibilities for restarting the peace process. He noted that there is no agreement about which key actors should be in the peace process, what the causes of conflict were, or what possible strategies for negotiation might look like. *Congressman Jaime Martínez Veloz* (PRD) was more optimistic, suggesting that conditions existed for Congress to reevaluate the controversial indigenous law that had been passed in 2001 and approve additional reforms closer to those agreed on between the government and the EZLN.

*Miguel Álvarez* of Serapaz saw few opportunities in the current political climate for reestablishing the dialogue between the government and the EZLN, however. He emphasized that the nature of the conflict had changed profoundly since 1994 and that the forms of medi-

ation and dialogue needed to be revised radically to adjust to the current conditions. ■

---

*A report on the Chiapas conference, edited by Cynthia Arnson, Raúl Benítez Manaut, and Andrew Selee, was published by the UNAM in August 2003.*

## Promises and Disillusionment: Affirmative Action and Race Relations in the United States and Brazil

As the culmination of the 2002 Brazilian Public Policy Scholars Program, jointly sponsored by the Brazil Project and Brazil’s Ministry of Culture, three Brazilian Public Scholars discussed “Racial Comparisons between Brazil and the United States” on August 21, 2002.

*Paulo Menezes*, a lawyer from São Paulo and author of *Ação Afirmativo no Direito Americano*, discussed the evolution of affirmative action in the Brazilian legal system, contrasting it with similar provisions in other countries. Well known activist *Diva Moreira* contrasted Brazil’s experience with that of the United States, arguing that the lack of solidarity among social movements and a smaller federal government obstruct the future development of affirmative action in Brazil. *Rosana Heringer*, Director of the Center for Afro-Brazilian Studies at Candido Mendes University in Rio de Janeiro, noted that the U.S. commitment to diversity, conflict resolution, long-term outreach programs, and education of the workforce provided a positive example for Brazil. *Ron Walters* of the University of Maryland underscored the importance of this comparative research for the effort to improve the implementation of affirmative action policies in both countries.

Brazil @ The Wilson Center continued its partnership with the Ministry of Culture in 2003, and over the summer hosted three new scholars. *Liv Sovik* of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, *Katia Santos* from the University of Georgia, and *Debora Carrari* from Nova Southeastern University studied “The Influence of Race and Social Inequality on Brazilian and



American Cultures,” presenting their findings at a seminar on August 13th. The seminar was webcast and included a live teleconference with an audience at the Ministry of Culture in Brazil. The webcast is available for viewing at [www.wilsoncenter.org/brazil](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/brazil). ■

## Creating Community

The Latin American Program has been working on the issue of hemispheric security for over a decade. The series of activities, known as “Creating Community” covers the areas of foreign and defense policy and explores the increasingly murky distinctions between national security and hemispheric security. In several countries in the region, organized crime and transnational criminal activities have made it impossible to draw a clean line between domestic police work and international security threats posed by such actors as terrorist groups, drug traffickers, gangs of car thieves, and money launderers. While traditional security threats—armed conflicts between symmetrical state actors—may be fewer or much reduced from what they were perceived to be in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, the missions of the armed forces in the region still reflect those threats. And over the past decade, there has been considerable debate over the capacity of civilian authorities to manage the armed forces, the budgets allocated to them, and the uses to which they are put within the nation’s frontiers or overseas as part of multilateral peacekeeping. Creating Community has played an important role in promoting the debate and in building civilian capacity to deal with the armed forces within the framework of civilian, constitutional institutions. On July 14, 2003, Creating Community sponsored a series of panels by members of its research team within the framework of the 51st International Congress of Americanists in Santiago, Chile. The next day, the team, which consists of Carlos Basombrío (Peru), Raúl Benítez (Mexico), Luis Bitencourt (Brazil and the Wilson Center), Lilián Bobea (Dominican Republic), Rut Diamint (Argentina), Cristina



**BackRow:** Luis Bitencourt, Rafael Hernández, Lilián Bobea, Joseph Tulchin  
**Front Row:** Cristina Eguizábal, Raúl Benítez, Rut Diamint, Carlos Basombrío

Eguizábal (Ford Foundation), Francisco Rojas (Chile), and Joseph S. Tulchin (Wilson Center), met to plan its activities over the coming year. In addition to writing a set of papers on the current security environment to be published at the end of the year, the group will sponsor a series of sub-regional workshops to explore the features of national and international security peculiar to each sub-region. These workshops will involve prominent policymakers as well as experts from around the hemisphere and encourage a comparative analysis of the security agenda in each area. The first of these workshops was held in Mexico City on September 19, 2003, sponsored jointly with CISAN, the Center for North American Studies of the National Autonomous University of Mexico. ■

## The Geopolitics of Oil: Iraq and Venezuela

On March 19, 2003, the Wilson Center’s Division of International Studies, the Middle East Project and the Latin American Program co-sponsored “The Geopolitics of Oil: Iraq and Venezuela,” with specialists *Alberto Cisneros Lavaller*, Universidad Central de Venezuela, and *James Placke*, Senior Associate, Cambridge Energy Research Associates. The panelists explored the implications the Venezuelan crisis and the war in Iraq could have for the oil market.

Cisneros Lavaller referred to social unrest and political polarization in Venezuela and

suggested three possible outcomes: the current administration stays in power, the opposition finds an institutional exit, or the stalemate is resolved with violence. Cisneros Lavaller described the effects that the national strike in Venezuela had already had on the oil market, including a 16 percent decrease in oil exports to the United States. The strike also had had a negative impact on both the international and U.S. economies and had unsettled oil demand. The price of crude had increased by 30 percent, reaching \$32 per barrel for the benchmark West Texas Intermediate (WTI). According to Cisneros Lavaller, simultaneous disruptions in both Venezuela and Iraq could lead to export shortages, and a longer lag time to respond to demand in a timely manner. He predicted that a spike in oil prices could reach \$80/b WTI.

James Placke said that an immediate consequence of war in Iraq would be that Iraqi oil would be off of the market for some time. He added that U.S. plans had been to let the Iraqi people manage their oil after the U.S. military intervention. Further, Placke stated that “today there isn’t shortage but low stocks, which has to do with severe winters and Venezuela’s conflict in December. That’s why the price [of oil] today is high.” Placke said that the anxieties generated by a major disruption such as the war will keep prices high. The crisis in Nigeria could also trigger further disruption. Placke stated that Iraq will need foreign investment to increase its oil production beyond levels maintained until 1991. Neither he nor Cisneros Lavaller considered likely what they called a “worst case scenario,” in which supply from both Venezuela and Iraq fell and stayed low for a period of several years. ■



### The Latin American Program

The Latin American Program serves as a bridge between the United States and Latin America, encouraging a free flow of information and dialogue between the two regions. The Program also provides a nonpartisan forum for discussing Latin American and Caribbean issues in Washington, D.C., and for bringing these issues to the attention of opinion leaders and policy makers throughout the Western hemisphere. The Program sponsors major initiatives on Decentralization, Citizen Security, Comparative Peace Processes, Creating Community in the Americas, U.S.-Brazilian relations and U.S.-Mexican relations.

# Interns & Researchers

The Latin American Program has been fortunate to have the assistance of an impressive group of interns throughout the year. We would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their invaluable help.

## Fall 2002

*Luis Rodríguez*, Universidad Iberoamericana  
*Fernando Molina*, University of Maryland

## January 2003

*Kristen Berger*, Amherst College  
*Carolina Dallal*, Amherst College

## Spring 2003

*Paul Florence*, Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service  
*Sofía Sebastián*, Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service

## Summer 2003

*Andrew Stevenson*, Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service  
*Dominic Nahas*, University of California-Riverside

We also bid a fond farewell to Junior Scholars *Carolina Fernández* of the Universidad Torcuato di Tella and *Giselle Cohen* from the Universidad de Buenos Aires, who researched U.S.-Argentina relations in collaboration with the Program and assisted with activities of the project *Argentina at the Wilson Center*. At the same time, we warmly welcome Junior Scholar *Tamara Taraciuk*, who holds a law degree from the Universidad Torcuato di Tella. A former Fellow at the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Tamara will contribute to the Latin American Program's work on Argentina, Citizen Security, Creating Community, and Colombia.

We express our sincerest gratitude to *Audrey Yao*. Audrey, a former intern, and current graduate student at Georgetown University, served as a consultant on many LAP projects. She worked in the U.S. Embassy in Paraguay over the summer of 2003 before returning to her second year at Georgetown.

# Recent Publications

## Books

Joseph S. Tulchin and Andrew D. Selee, eds., *Mexico's Politics and Society in Transition* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002).

Hugo Frühling and Joseph S. Tulchin with Heather Golding, eds., *Crime and Violence in Latin America: Citizen Security, Democracy and the State* (Johns Hopkins University Press and Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2003).

## Woodrow Wilson Center Reports on the Americas

Cynthia J. Arnson, ed. *El Salvador's Democratic Transition Ten Years after the Peace Accord*, March 2003.

## Conference Reports

*Peace and Security in Colombia* (WWC, U.S. Institute of Peace, and International Crisis Group), March 2003.

Allison M. Garland, Heather A. Golding, Meg Ruthenberg, and Joseph S. Tulchin, eds., *Crime and the Threat to Democratic Governance*, March 2003.

*Políticas de Defensa: Desafíos Externos y Restricciones Internas*, May 2003.

Cynthia J. Arnson, Raúl Benítez Manaut, and Andrew Selee, eds., *Chiapas: Interpretaciones sobre la negociación y la paz* (UNAM, CISAN, WWC), August 2003.

## Woodrow Wilson Center Update on the Americas

Decentralization, No. 5, "Decentralization and Democracy: A Continuing Challenge for Venezuela," September 2002.

Creating Community, No. 7, "Hemispheric Collective Security in the Post Cold War Era," September 2002.

Creating Community, No. 8, "Armies in Times of Peace: The Division of Labor Between Armed Forces and Police," October 2002.

Creating Community, No. 9, "Mexican Security and Defense Doctrines: From the 19th to the 21st Centuries," November 2002.

Creating Community, No. 10, "Controlling the Armed Forces in Democratic Transitions: Cases from Latin America," December 2002.

Creating Community, No. 11, "Seguridad hemisférica: Debates a inicios del siglo XXI," April 2003.

Creating Community, No. 12, "The Politics of Health Sector Reforms: Cross-National Comparisons," May 2003.

Creating Community, No. 13, "The Politics of Education Sector Reforms: Cross-National Comparisons," June 2003.

Mexico, No. 4, "Democracy in Action: Four Visions of Mexico's Process," January 2003.

Argentina, No. 1, "A Social Contract Abrogated: Argentina's Economic Crisis," June 2002.

Argentina, No. 2, "After Default: Argentina's Role in World Affairs," June 2002.

Argentina, No. 3, "Getting out of the Economic Crisis," June 2002.

Argentina, No. 4, "Políticas de defensa: desafíos externos y restricciones internas," October 2002.

Argentina, No. 5, "Políticas de seguridad pública en una sociedad democrática: perspectivas comparadas," October 2002.

Argentina, No. 6, "Argentina y el default social," November 2002.

Argentina, No. 7, "Camino a las elecciones 2003: el futuro económico de la Argentina," December 2002.

Argentina, No. 8, "Relaciones bilaterales Argentina-EE.UU.: perspectiva histórica y futuros desafíos," May 2003.

Argentina, No. 9, "Analizando las elecciones argentines," July 2003.

Argentina, No. 10, "Interpretaciones acerca del escenario de posguerra," August 2003.

"Prevention and Response to Urban Crime and Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean," August 2003.

## Fellows

We bid farewell to our 2002–2003 Fellows *Ariel Armony*, Assistant Professor of Government, Colby College; *Héctor Schamis*, Assistant Professor of Government, Cornell University; and *Alfonso Quiroz*, Professor of History, Baruch College and Graduate Center, City University of New York. Their presence at the Center greatly enriched the work of the Latin American Program.

We extend a warm welcome to our incoming Fellows for the 2003–2004 academic year.

*Marcos Cueto*, Professor, School of Public Health, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, “Global Bodies: Malaria, International Health, and Latin America.”

*Enrique Peruzzotti*, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Universidad Torcuato Di Tella, “Enforcing the Rule of Law, Controlling Corruption: The Politics of Social Accountability in Latin America.”

## Public Policy Scholars 2002-2003

*Jorge Quiroga*, former President of Bolivia, “Political Engineering in Post-‘Neoliberal’ Democracies in Latin America”

*Hugo Frühling*, Professor, Universidad de Chile, “Police Reforms and Crime Prevention in South America”

*Maria Elena Ducci*, Professor, Universidad Católica de Chile, “The Role of Metropolitan Central Markets: The Case of Santiago, Chile”

*Raúl Benítez Manaut*, Researcher, Center for Research on North America (CISAN), Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, “North American Security: Challenges at the Beginning of the 21st Century”

*José María Ramos*, Professor, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, “The U.S. Border Security Policy: Impacts on the Transborder Cooperation with Mexico”

*Debora Carrari*, M.A. Candidate, Nova Southeastern University, “The Influence of Race and Social Inequality on Brazilian and American Cultures”

*Katia da Costa Santos*, Ph.D. candidate, University of Georgia, “African–American Women, Afro–Brazilian Women, and the Construction of Knowledge”

*Liv Sovik*, Professor, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, “Cultural Policy and Racial Equality in Times of Change”

*Pamela Starr*, Professor, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, “Why Fox Failed: Implications for Mexico, the United States, and the North American Ideal”

## The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Lee H. Hamilton, President and Director

### Board of Trustees

Joseph B. Gildenhorn, Chair; David A. Metzner, Vice Chair. Public Members: James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress; John W. Carlin, Archivist of the United States; Bruce Cole, Chair, National Endowment for the Humanities; Roderick R. Paige, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education; Colin L. Powell, Secretary, U.S. Department of State; Lawrence M. Small, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Tommy G. Thompson, Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Private Citizen Members: Joseph A. Cari, Jr., Carol Cartwright, Donald E. Garcia, Bruce S. Gelb, Daniel L. Lamaute, Tamala L. Longaberger, Thomas R. Reedy

### Wilson Council

Bruce S. Gelb, President. Diane Aboulafia-D'Jaen, Elias F. Aburdene, Charles S. Ackerman, B.B. Andersen, Cyrus A. Ansary, Lawrence E. Bathgate II, John Beinecke, Joseph C. Bell, Steven Alan Bennett, Rudy Boschwitz, A. Oakley Brooks, Melva Bucksbaum, Charles W. Burson, Conrad Cafritz, Nicola L. Caiola, Raoul L. Carroll, Scott Carter, Albert V. Casey, Mark Chandler, Peter B. Clark, Melvin Cohen, William T. Coleman, Jr., Michael D. DiGiacomo, Sheldon Drobny, F. Samuel Eberts III, J. David Eller, Mark Epstein, Melvyn J. Estrin, Sim Farar, Susan Farber, Joseph H. Flom, John H. Foster, Charles Fox, Barbara Hackman Franklin, Norman Freidkin, Morton Funger, Gregory M. Gallo, Chris G. Gardiner, Steven J. Gilbert, Alma Gildenhorn, David F. Girard-diCarlo, Michael B. Goldberg, Gretchen M. Gorog, William E. Grayson, Ronald Greenberg, Raymond A. Guenter, Edward L. Hardin, Jr., Jean L. Hennessey, Eric Hotung, John L. Howard, Darrell E. Issa, Jerry Jasinowski, Brenda LaGrange Johnson, Shelly Kamins, Edward W. Kelley, Jr., Anastasia D. Kelly, Christopher J. Kennan, Michael V. Kostiw, Steven Kotler, William H. Kremer, Raymond Leary, Abbe Lane Leff, Perry Leff, Dennis LeVett, Francine Levinson, Harold O. Levy, David Link, Frederic V. Malek, David S. Mandel, John P. Manning, Jeffrey A. Marcus, Jay Mazur, Robert McCarthy, Linda McCausland, Stephen G. McConahey, Donald F. McLellan, J. Kenneth Menges, Jr., Philip Merrill, Kathryn Mosbacher, Jeremiah L. Murphy, Martha T. Muse, Della Newman, John E. Osborn, Paul Hae Park, Gerald L. Parsky, Michael J. Polenske, Donald Robert Quartel, Jr., J. John L. Richardson, Margaret Milner Richardson, Larry D. Richman, Carlyn Ring, Edwin Robbins, Robert G. Rogers, Otto Ruesch, B. Francis Saul, III, Alan Schwartz, Timothy R. Scully, J. Michael Shepherd, George P. Shultz, Raja W. Sidawi, Debbie Siebert, Thomas L. Siebert, Kenneth Siegel, Ron Silver, William A. Slaughter, James H. Small, Thomas F. Stephenson, Norma Kline Tiefel, Mark C. Treanor, Anthony G. Viscogliosi, Christine M. Warnke, Ruth Westheimer, Pete Wilson, Deborah Wince-Smith, Herbert S. Winokur, Jr., Paul Martin Wolff, Joseph Zappala, Nancy M. Zirkin, Richard S. Ziman

### Honorary Wilson Council Members

Hushang Ansary, Bill Archer, James A. Baker III, Jack S. Blanton, Sr., José Cancela, Richard L. Carrión, Jean Case, Stephen M. Case, William S. Cohen, Jerry Colangelo, Norm Coleman, Philip M. Condit, Denton A. Cooley, Gray Davis, Arturo Díaz, William H. Draper III, David Efron, Dianne Feinstein, Luis Ferré, Charles Foster, Esq., Sam Ginn, Richard N. Goldman, Slade Gorton, Allan Gottlieb, Dennis J. Hastert, Roger Hertog, Roy M. Huffington, Ray L. Hunt, Bobby Inman, Dale M. Jensen, E. Floyd Kvasz, Joseph P. Lacher, Dan Lewis, Howard Lincoln, Thomas Loeffler, Robert J. Lowe, Donald B. Marron, John McCain, Michael S. McGavick, Robert A. Mosbacher, Sr., Peter Munk, Marilyn Carlson Nelson, George E. Pataki, Nelson Peltz, Alex Penelas, Richard Perry, Robert Pincus, Lee R. Raymond, William T. Solomon, James R. Thompson, Jr., R. E. (Ted) Turner III, Paul A. Volcker, Thomas W. Weisel, David H. Williams, Reba Williams

## The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Lee H. Hamilton, President and Director

The Center is the living memorial of the United States of America to the nation's twenty-eighth president, Woodrow Wilson. Congress established the Woodrow Wilson Center in 1968 as an international institute for advanced study, "symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relationship between the world of learning and the world of public affairs." The Center opened in 1970 under its own board of trustees.

In all its activities the Woodrow Wilson Center is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, supported financially by annual appropriations from Congress, and by the contributions of foundations, corporations, and individuals. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Center publications and programs are those of the authors and speakers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center staff, fellows, trustees, advisory groups, or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to the Center.

ONE WOODROW WILSON PLAZA, 1300 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20004-3027



**Woodrow Wilson  
International  
Center  
for Scholars**

**SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300**