

Cooperation, Coordination and Collective Action in Non-Military Security Matters

Francisco Rojas Aravena
Secretary General, FLACSO

Cooperation and the coordination of policies are key for dealing with the new challenges and vulnerabilities in the Western hemisphere. They have an essentially non-military character, but the use of force is in fact present, and, in addition, it will be necessary to look for parallel solutions to the development agenda, which is linked to security matters and influences them.

The coordination and the development of cooperative initiatives will be a progressive process, of a cumulative nature, which will make progress to the extent that there is a concretion of the political will to establish, formalize, pursue and operationalize the political will of the States in the hemisphere.

The positive or reluctant expressions of political will are connected to the historical memory of cooperation in the realm of security and defense. The weight of history is quite significant when it comes to defining policies and setting links of coordination. In Latin America's linkage to the United States, the memory of interventions, of interference and of invasions has strongly marked these relations. Intra-Latin-American and pan-American tensions in the 19th and 20th centuries are still vibrating in the 21st.

The changes that took place in the wake of the Cold War opened new and renewed opportunities for cooperation, while better spaces for a multilateral dialogue entered the scene. Thus, important agreements were developed in matters concerning the consolidation of democracy, the Democratic Charter of the Americas, and the establishment of new international systems related to the control of arms and drug traffic.

The United Nations accorded a central role to the agenda of development, expressed in terms of the Millennium Objectives, and in the topics related to the impact of globalization, with its consequences on the whole planet. The focus of attention became increasingly centered on people. It was thus that the concept of human security emerged, as a complement to state security, and closely linked to human development and human rights.

The change stemming from the emergence of global-reaching terrorism and the unilateral response by the United States closed many of the opportunities that had opened in the period 1989-2001. The differences manifested themselves with a special force in the larger countries in the region. Latin America became divided—some countries sought to “return” to the Cold War situation, thinking they could benefit from cooperation by supporting the coalition promoted by the USA. In the new context of strong unilateralism and the lack of use of soft power, this was not possible. The negative costs surfaced quite easily.

Latin America and the Caribbean in the current international context

Looking at Latin America and its political, economic, social and integration processes, with a view towards establishing how the region is linked to the international system, we find mixed points of view. On the one hand, it is possible to identify important advances, and on the other there seem to be significant weaknesses that are eating away at those advances and their perspectives of global insertion.

Among the main advances one could highlight:

- Electoral democracy

- Interstate peace
- Growing respect for human rights
- Advances in justice (less impunity)
- Partial advances towards accountability
- No weapons of mass destruction
- Constant and persistent search for regional integration
- Strong state continuity that has been maintained since the time of independence

Among the main weaknesses are:

- Eroding democracy (in the last decade nine presidents have resigned before concluding their mandate, including one coup d'état)
- Increasing violence
- Increased homicide rates
- Expanding corruption
- Lack of social integration
- Serious inequality and maintenance of poverty
- Growing division between Northern and Southern Latin America
- Weak integration processes. Lack of trust and political will are the main obstacles

Within this context, Latin America shows certain paradoxes such as the demand for multilateralism, while the region is still divided on the issue of the Iraq war and the reforms to the UN Security Council. The region is also divided on issues like the election of OAS authorities, Cuba and FTAA, to cite a few examples.

Building Solid Bases of Mutual Trust

Dealing with the topic of basic trust is essential for generating spaces of cooperation and coordination of policies. Building trust in the hemisphere involves addressing two critical aspects—that of sovereignty, as related to territorial integrity, and that of autonomy, as related to non-intervention and non-interference of external stakeholders in political, economic, social and cultural affairs. The former is connected to the continuity of the State, and the latter to the abilities of its political regime for decision. Developing spaces of political dialogue and specific measures of trust and security will make it possible to move forward in the first of these dimensions. Developing a practice that is consistent with the Democratic Charter of the Americas will allow us to tackle the matters having to do with interference.

The development of MMT&S has made it possible to generate a new climate of relating in Latin America. This is an area in which it will be necessary to continue making progress and setting new goals in order to consolidate stability in a context of sovereign states.

The subject of political interference is more complex. In recent times, in the context of elections in the region, several governments have been accused of interference. Respect for the Democratic Charter is the best guide to avoid difficulties in this area.

Building Common Ways of Thinking and Attitudes

If perceptions are different, they will translate into different, diverging policies. Building spaces for dialogue and exchange in which facts, processes and trends are reviewed will make it possible to assess the views expressed there, to understand the standpoints from which different points are perceived and, on that basis, to examine the opportunities for building shared views.

The Organization of American States (OAS) is a privileged forum in this area. It is the only institutionalized hemispheric space from which it is possible to make binding agreements in the

most varied matters. In the area of security, it has become possible to make important progress since the Hemisphere Security Commission was established.

Initial designs related to the creation of mechanisms of trust emerged in the early 90's and came to fruition in 1995 with the First Hemisphere Conference on Measures of Mutual Trust and Security, which was held in Chile that year. The two subsequent meetings in El Salvador and Miami allowed for the development of effective actions and for drawing up a list of measures that should be fostered in the hemisphere. Nevertheless, an effective, systematic follow-up of what is being done by the countries in the region shows significant deficiencies. This could result in a lower level of activity, in transforming some activities into a mere formality detached from the substantial aspects whose development is being sought. Continuity, and making MMT&S more dense, is an unfinished task in hemispheric relations.

The weight of asymmetries affects the way in which reality is perceived and in which the interests of the different stakeholders manifest and express themselves, from the superpower to the Caribbean micro-states. Hence the practice of cooperative multilateralism becomes one of the keys to effective dialogue. This practice seeks to tackle the major global challenges in a collaborative, effective, associated manner. Most of these challenges can only be overcome through joint, associative action.

Shared values will be a fundamental basis for moving forward in the perspective of collaboration and in setting the ethical frameworks to orient the policy choices to face the challenges in the hemisphere. Values such as solidarity, cooperation, respect for sovereignty and human rights contribute towards consolidating peace, holistic development, social justice and the strengthening of democracy.

Likewise, academic work is essential. This will be the basis for conceiving the different issues and situations and for seeking the theoretical keys that will allow the design of alternatives of solution to the problems and challenges in the subjects being addressed.

The use of "track II" in diplomacy allows for a wide dialogue among the most significant actors involved in the issues of conflict and cooperation. In these forums of second-track diplomacy, official actors participate in an academic debate "outside" of the "official" framework, which makes it possible to clearly highlight the perceptions and consequences of actions and their projection. Academics have a facilitating role and, on the basis of the exploration of new views, they can open opportunities to generate spaces of constructive dialogue in the context of multilateral institutions, out of which should come recommendations for policies and binding agreements.

The development of summit meetings, such as the Defense Ministers' Conference, allows an open dialogue in which national views are presented. However, it is still necessary to develop a deeper exchange on the most pressing matters. Effective complementation with second-track diplomacy will make it possible to move forward in a more effective way in the institutionalized official milieu.

One of the major lacks in the processes of summit diplomacy has to do with the fact that the agreements, consensuses and priorities defined at that level and transformed into mandates do not acquire a binding character. They do not become norms, nor are international systems set up to attain the designed goals.

A second deficit stems from the fact that the agreements and orientations do not have a specific addressee charged with the task of making them operational and putting them into practice.

A third weakness is that no terms for implementation or follow-up mechanisms are set. A timetable for execution is not formulated.

A fourth issue that makes execution difficult has to do with human and material resources, which are not defined or incorporated into the respective budgets.

Finally, no effective mechanisms exist for monitoring, follow-up, evaluation and oversight that will ensure success in the accomplishment of mandates. In this last area, some progress has been made by passing on monitoring to the OAS and other international bodies. As far as Ibero-American Summits are concerned, one step forward was the creation of the General Ibero-American Secretariat (SEGIB, initials in Spanish).

In short, they do not possess a clear, binding mandate, nor is there a definition of the actors that should carry them out. Additionally, it must be mentioned that they do not have a timetable or a stable body for supervision. Likewise, the human and material resources necessary for execution are not defined.

The Development of Norms

Recognizing that an effective security community can be built in the hemisphere requires the development of norms and the establishment of international systems.

The development of international law is a guarantee for all actors. Setting up specific norm systems makes it possible to move forward in an efficient manner in the presence of the emerging challenges.

An important series of binding international norms and agreements has been developed in the hemisphere, linked to core challenges such as drugs, the traffic of arms and corruption. The same applies to terrorism and the preservation of democracy.

Despite the above, the process of national ratification and the implementation of these norms is slow. In many instances, the norms of national implementation are not established and the degrees of operationalization are much reduced. Consistency in this matter is critical for consolidating a global legal framework.

A flexible security structure: a slow process still under construction

The region has not yet consolidated a common perspective on the matter of security. The weight of bilateralism established by the United States has caused problems in building more effective international, regional and sub-regional regimes.

One significant conceptual void is regarding the difficulties in understanding the relationship between international security, state security, and human security. The conceptual links of this interrelationship still have not been established in such a way as to allow them to be put to proper use.

The regional security architecture rests upon four main pillars:

- *The pillar of dialogue.* This is rather broad and appears in different regional and international arenas. Summit diplomacy is forcefully exercised within this environment. Its essential function is to provide an opportunity to different stakeholders for articulation, incorporation participation, and for the publicizing of proposals. To summarize, they build common perspectives based on which international organisms and governments guide themselves.
- *The legal pillar.* This pillar has the broadest and most complex development so far, and is perhaps the most important. Here is where formal consensus is reached. However, the weaknesses inherent in the other pillars (the institutional and conflict resolution pillars) frequently limit the scope and degree in which treaties and international conventions are complied with.

- *The pillar of conflict resolution.* This is the weakest pillar. There is an absence of institutional legitimacy in this field and its early warning mechanisms are weak or non-existent. Although there have been some very positive experiences in the region in terms of building mutual trust, they have not been systematized and have not occurred broadly enough throughout the countries as a whole. In the bilateral arena it is possible to point out advances in the resolution of traditional border disputes (Chile, Argentina) and in power balances (Brazil, Argentina on nuclear issues).
- Institutional legitimacy. This fourth pillar is also weak. There are no formal structures to make broad, effective follow-up possible in this area. Levels of inter-institutional coordination are low. In the context of summit diplomacy, there has been no co-ordination of agendas, and there even appear to be compatibility problems in terms of putting these issues on calendars and with their thematic focus. Within this context we have seen that the pillar of dialogue produces a multiplicity of conflicts that have no institutional frameworks to facilitate dealing with them.

The multidimensional nature of the issue of security and how to confront new and traditional threats is pointing out ever more frequently the need to create a flexible security architecture: one that is able to recognize sub-regional advances and specificities within the regional context, which in turn is more and more linked to the global system.

Setting Shared Areas of Action

Given the eminently non-military nature of the new challenges and risks, which were defined for the current stage by the Declaration of Security of the Americas, it is essential to define areas for dialogue, coordination and partnering in various areas and institutions, which are different from military institutions.

The area of military cooperation and coordination has experienced significant progress. The greatest successes are concentrated in the South Cone and the Central American region. However, in terms of inter-institutional cooperation in security in non-military milieus, the practice is limited and sometimes inexistent. Many of these institutions, which are responsible for dealing with matters related to non-military risks and threats, have their own guidelines for international cooperation and dialogue. However, the processes are weak and sporadic in many cases. These instances of dialogue have not been placed in the perspective of a coordinated action in the face of common challenges. The most successful instances up to this time have to do with the neighborhood level.

Ministry Dialogue in Security

This matter becomes most evident is in the highest-level dialogue in the area of security. This is the only area where a regular hemisphere mechanism for dialogue does not exist. While the meetings of different ministers and secretaries of Economics, Trade, Tourism and other areas, as well as those of Foreign Affairs ministers, are regular, there is no body that would gather the ministers of the Interior or those responsible for security. This is a significant paradox, since the larger the demand for security, the larger the absence of hemispheric and Latin American coordination in this matter. Such is the case of the progress made in coordination that has taken place in the sub-regions, though not in the region as a whole.

An instance of dialogue that would gather the Ministers of the Interior and/or Public Security would be able to establish and prioritize the major demands and to bring together national, sub-regional and hemispheric actions able to face threats in an associative, cooperative manner, which have a strong border-crossing component and a multi-dimensional character.

This instance would be complementary to the Defense Ministers' Conference and to the meetings of Foreign Affairs Ministers, as well as to those of the officers in charge of areas of development and trade.

Setting up a community of civil security in the region and in the hemisphere is one of the most important demands in the different societies of North, Central and South America.

We do not have in the region any permanent instruments that would serve as an early warning in the areas of security. Developing a "Latin American Outlook Yearbook" could allow a yearly global review and account for emerging situations that can affect security in the region. In the area of defense, the regular Ministers' meetings, the role of the Hemisphere Security Commission and the Inter-American Defense Board allow a closer follow-up, although a comprehensive publication in these matters would be desirable too.

Actors and Institutions in Non-Military Security Matters

Institutions and actors with responsibilities in non-military security matters are quite varied, both in central administrations and in local governments and the civil society. Among the latter one could mention both enterprises, many of them now transnational, and NGO's.

The tasks of defense and security in most Latin American countries, as well as in the United States and Canada, are clearly differentiated, with specific roles and institutions in each case. The situation is more diffuse in the Caribbean, given the existence of micro-states. Hence, focalization to face non-military risks and threats must take place in the area of security. The area of defense already has forms of coordination that have made progress in the last 15 years.

The authorities in domestic government with responsibilities in law enforcement and in operationalizing the rule of law are the primary actors in security matters. Police forces occupy a prominent position, as well as civil intelligence bodies and "civil defense" forces, as well as national and sub-regional Red Cross bodies. Next to them are the National Emergency Bureaus, Firefighters, Park Guards, sea and land search and rescue teams, as well as various volunteer corps.

In emergency situations, countless institutions and bodies mobilize human and material resources. A certain order and hierarchy in responsibilities exists in every national situation. Within such mobilizations, the armed forces occupy more or less broad roles, of a subsidiary nature, since, due to the emergency itself, many local institutions and even the central government have been stretched beyond their ability and are finding it difficult to meet day-to-day tasks.

Neighborhood agreements are very important, especially in the event of natural disasters. At that level, immediate cooperation can help reduce the number of victims, mainly in borderline areas.

The same can be imagined in the event of a large-scale terror attack. In the face of such an event, the key factor is previous cooperation to avoid the emergency of the threat, and the development of measures for prevention and risk management. The coordination of preventive policies in matters of terrorism is critical in areas where tourism is one of the major sources of income, given their volatility, such as in the Caribbean and Central America.

Cooperation in migration control is essential in order to avoid overflow and to contribute to managing situations that antecede a migratory emergency. Migration movements can only be tackled through adequate policies, rather than with "containing walls."

Police coordination constitutes a privileged area for cooperation. This is structurally linked to the rule of law, and its effectiveness will depend in many instances on the quality of the laws and judicial systems. Coordination is essential in matters of extradition and deportation. The lack of previous information and cooperation in this area has been shown to be one of the aggravating factors of current violence in the Caribbean Basin, notably Jamaica, El Salvador and Honduras.

Police coordination, such as the one established in Europe with EUROPOL, does not exist in the region. The demands that have appeared as a result of the activity of organized crime demand

progress towards a more effective coordination level. This could be established through LatinPOL or HemisphericPOL.

Information, transparency and development tailored to international norms are key in the development of nuclear technologies for peaceful use. The demands of energy in the world and in the region will pose new options for construction of nuclear centers for producing electric power. Compliance with the regional norms of OPANAL and OIA is essential.

Major Dimensions of Cooperation and Coordination

1. Cross-border issues
2. Nuclear cooperation
3. Coordination for facing organized crime (drugs, assets laundering, traffic of light arms, of persons, etc.)
4. Natural disasters (earthquakes, fires, floods, droughts, landslides, pollution)
5. Culture of legality
6. Security as a dimension of the processes of association and integration
7. HemisphericPOL and/or LatinPOL

Main Areas for Collective Action

1. Anti-terrorism
2. Intelligence
3. Harmonization of doctrines and policies
4. Homogenizing terminology and symbols
5. Standardizing communication equipments; greater inter-operative ability
6. Developing units for joint rapid response
7. Staff training and skills-formation

By Way of Conclusion

The great changes in communications in the context of globalization are opening new opportunities for shaping communities that can associate their interests, especially in the areas of civil security, personal security and human security. They also offer tools for more effective exchange among the different stakeholders.

Widening the involvement of non-state stakeholders is one of the keys for improving the performance of governmental organizations in security matters.

Joint responsibility in facing new threats, challenges and risks is evident. Similarly, cooperation is the most effective tool to face and overcome these challenges in a globalized world.

The above requires greater dialogue and exchange, as well as greater inter-institutional coordination and effective collective action, in the context of a flexible security architecture. The simultaneous and parallel development of activities associated with defense, on the one hand, and security, on the other, will constitute spaces where mutual feedback will take place.

All of this will be possible on the basis of strengthening cooperative multilateralism.

San José, Costa Rica
November, 2006.