PROGRAM

WORKSHOP “HEMISPHERE IN FLUX:
International Relations, Multilateralism and Prospects for
Democratic Deepening of Inter-American Affairs”

November 12-14, 2012

Organization: Instituto Nacional de Ciência e Tecnologia para Estudos sobre os Estados Unidos (INCT-Ineu, Brazil); Center for Latin American and Latino Studies at American University (CLALS-AU, USA), and Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales (CRIES, Argentina)

Support: Instituto de Políticas Públicas e Relações Internacionais (IPPRI/Unesp, Brazil)

Monday, November 12, 2012

OPENING SESSION

- Tullo Vigevani (Unesp, INCT-Ineu and Centro de Estudos de Cultura Contemporânea – Cedec, Brazil)
- Eric Hershberg (CLALS/AU, USA)
- Andrés Serbin (CRIES, Argentina)

COUNTRY STRATEGIES AND CAPABILITIES TOWARDS ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS) AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- Hemisphere in flux: introducing the shifting landscape of inter-American affairs - Eric Hershberg (CLALS-AU, USA)
- The sources of U.S. conduct in Latin America – Philip Brenner and Eric Hershberg (CLALS-AU, USA)
- Estrategias y potencialidades de Argentina en relación a la OEA y organismos regionales – Federico Merke (Universidad San Andrés, CRIES, Argentina)
- Estrategias y potencialidades en relación a la OEA y organismos regionales: la política exterior de Colombia – Sandra Borda (Universidad de los Andes, Colombia)
• La política exterior de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela: continuidades, cambios y desafíos en el contexto hemisférico y global – Andrés Serbin and Andrei Serbin Pont (CRIES, Argentina)

• Country strategies and capabilities of Ecuador towards Organization of American States (OAS) and regional organizations – Sebastian Bitar (CLALS-AU, USA)

• Estrategias y potencialidades en relación a la OEA y organismos regionales: el caso de México - Natalia Saltalamacchia Ziccardi (Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México – ITAM, México)

18h30 – Memorial da América Latina: Public event “Hemispherical Relations: OAS and the new Latin and South-American Organizations”

Tuesday, November 13, 2012

• Estratégias e potencialidades do Brasil em relação à Organização dos Estados Americanos (OEA) e as organizações regionais - Paulo de Tarso Vannuchi (Instituto da Cidadania) and Cristina Timponi Cambiaghi (Funai), Brazil

REGIONALISM AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE AMERICAS: ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES

• Post-liberal regionalism – José Antonio Sanahuja (Universidad Complutense de Madrid and CRIES, Spain)

• Relações interamericanas na perspectiva da nova agenda sul-americana – Maria Regina Soares de Lima (Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Políticos – IESP, Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro – UERJ, Brazil)

• A percepção nos Estados Unidos do multilateralismo latino-americano: Congresso e Think Tanks – Luis Fernando Ayerbe (Unesp and INCT-Ineu); Tullo Vigevani (Unesp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec); Débora Figueiredo Mendonça do Prado (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia - UFU and INCT-Ineu); Haroldo Ramanzini Junior (UFU, INCT-Ineu and Cedec), Brazil

• Regionalism and intergovernmental institutions in the Americas: multiplication of multilateral institutions in Americas after Cold War - Carlos Portales (CLALS-AU, USA)
• **Unasul e a convergência intergovernamental na segurança hemisférica** – Gilberto Rodrigues (Universidade Católica de Santos - Unisantos and CRIES, Brazil)

**Wednesday, November 14, 2012**

**REGIONAL MECHANISMS ACROSS KEY ISSUE AREAS IN THE AMERICAS**

• **The politics of regional environmental and climate cooperation in the Americas** – Leslie Elliott Armijo (Portland State University, USA) and Sybil Rhodes (Universidad del CEMA, Argentina)

• **Economic issues, trade and investments and their consequences on inter-American relations** – Diana Tussie (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales - Flacso and CRIES, Argentina)

• **Direitos humanos e as relações hemisféricas** – Sebastião Velasco e Cruz (Unicamp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec, Brazil)

• **Os mecanismos regionais de proteção dos direitos humanos e os Estados Unidos: uma análise do padrão de ativismo e das respostas governamentais norte-americanas nos casos de acusação de violações junto à Comissão Interamericana de Direitos Humanos da OEA (1971-2011)** – Débora Alves Maciel (Unifesp and INCT-Ineu); Marrielle Maia Alves Ferreira (UFU and INCT-Ineu); Andrei Koerner (Unicamp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec), Brazil

• **El rol de la sociedad civil en las políticas externas y las organizaciones regionales y subregionales de las Américas** – Andrés Serbin (CRIES, Argentina)

**DISCUSSANTS**

• **Arlene Beth Tickner** (Universidad de los Andes, Colombia)

• **Glenda Mezarroba** (INCT-Ineu, Brazil)

• **Matthew Taylor** (School of International Service at American University, USA)

• **Matias Spektor** (Getulio Vargas’ Foundation - FGV-RJ, Brazil)

**CONCLUSIONS**

• **Tullo Vigevani** (Unesp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec, Brazil)
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COUNTRY STRATEGIES AND CAPABILITIES TOWARDS ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS) AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- HEMISPHERE IN FLUX: INTRODUCING THE SHIFTING LANDSCAPE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS - Eric Hershberg (CLALS-AU, USA)

This paper provides an overview of the context motivating the collaborative study entitled “Hemisphere in Flux,” reviewing key trends in the international system that have altered the external orientations of countries throughout the Americas and impacted their relations with one another and with a proliferation of multi-lateral institutions. The paper introduces several issues related to these
regional organizations, highlighting concern with the future of the Organization of American States, which despite well known shortcomings has overseen the most significant advances in democracy promotion and human rights protection.

**Eric Hershberg** ([hershber@american.edu](mailto:hershber@american.edu)) is Professor of Government and Director of the Center for Latin American and Latino Studies at American University. A former President of the Latin American Studies Association (2007-2009), he holds a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and has taught at Columbia, Princeton, NYU, the New School and Simon Fraser University, in Vancouver, Canada. He is the author or editor of a dozen books and several dozen articles on the comparative politics of democracy and development in Latin America, and on Latin America’s place in an increasingly globalized world.

- **THE SOURCES OF U.S. CONDUCT IN LATIN AMERICA** – Philip Brenner and Eric Hershberg (CLALS-AU, USA)

President Barack Obama's Latin American policy has been, in essence, similar to the policies of his two post-Cold War predecessors, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. This twenty years of continuity in U.S. policy is remarkable, because there is a broad consensus that the policy serves neither the United States nor Latin American countries well, and there have been significant changes in the region to which U.S. policy has not adapted or responded. The paper examines the sources of continuity in U.S. towards Latin America, and highlights five factors that explain U.S. behavior: 1) lack of interest in the region by U.S. political elites; 2) organizational factors in the U.S. executive branch that discourage new initiatives; 3) conflicts between the Congress, the President, and the bureaucracy over the direction in which U.S. policy towards Latin America should go; 4) lack of a significant domestic set of interests to shape U.S. policy, except with respect to Cuba; 5) reduced U.S. capacity to engage with Latin American countries to solve problems, due to increasingly scarce political and economic resources available to the United States.

**Philip Brenner** ([pbrenne@american.edu](mailto:pbrenne@american.edu)) is professor of International Relations and affiliate professor of History at American University. He received his PhD from Johns Hopkins University in political science. A specialist on the U.S. foreign policy process, and U.S. policy towards Latin America, he is on the board of directors of the Center for International Policy, and the advisory boards of the National Security Archive and the Center for Democracy in the
• ESTRATEGIAS Y POTENCIALIDADES DE ARGENTINA EN RELACIÓN A LA OEA Y ORGANISMOS REGIONALES – Federico Merke (Universidad San Andrés, CRIES, Argentina)

El propósito del trabajo es comprender la orientación estratégica de la Argentina hacia la OEA vis-à-vis otros organismos regionales. El foco estará puesto en los tres asuntos centrales que trabaja la OEA: seguridad, democracia y derechos humanos. Tres preguntas orientan la investigación. Primero, ¿Cuál es el grado de "inversión institucional" que realiza la Argentina ante la OEA vis-à-vis otros organismos regionales? Segundo, ¿Qué consecuencias han tenido los diversos grados de inversión realizados por la Argentina? Tercero, ¿Cual es el peso de los factores internacionales y domésticos para explicar esta orientación? La hipótesis inicial que presenta este trabajo sugiere que la inversión institucional de la Argentina ante la OEA muestra heterogeneidad (según se hable de seguridad, democracia y derechos humanos) y cambios puntuados por variables internacionales y domésticas. Sigue, además, que la inversión institucional ha estado influida por los cambiantes intereses de las distintas agencias involucradas, como la Cancillería y el Ministerio de Defensa. Finalmente, introduce la hipótesis de que dos aspectos regionales han marcado también la disparidad de inversión institucional de la Argentina ante la OEA vis-à-vis otros organismos regionales. El primero tiene que ver con la conformación de un espacio Sudamericano de concertación regional. El segundo tiene que ver con la menor presencia de los EEUU en la región.

Federico Merke (federico.merke@gmail.com), investigador del Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONICET), Argentina, profesor de Relaciones Internacionales en la Universidad de San Andrés y Fellow Associate del Latin American Programme, IDEAS Institute, London School of Economics. Hizo Master of Arts in International Studies, University of Warwick (Reino Unido) y Doctorado en Ciencias Sociales, Flacso (Argentina). Sus áreas de investigación tienen que ver con la política exterior argentina, brasileña y el regionalismo en América Latina. Su último trabajo, de próxima publicación en un libro editado por Carlos Acuña, es "La política exterior argentina como política pública", en co-autoría con Juan Gabriel Tokatlian.
La política exterior colombiana ha experimentado cambios durante los últimos años y especialmente desde el inicio de la administración de Juan Manuel Santos. Sin embargo, no hay consenso sobre la naturaleza y profundidad de esos cambios: mientras el gobierno sugiere que se inaugura una nueva era en materia diplomática, algunos analistas califican el cambio como poco trascendental. En este texto propondré dos argumentos: en primer lugar, que se ha adoptado una política más pragmática frente a las organizaciones regionales evitando caer en el juego de la polarización política. En este sentido, Colombia le apuesta a la Unasur, a la OEA y a los tratados de libre comercio con Estados Unidos y los países del pacífico con igual contundencia y sin caer en contradicciones. En segundo lugar, si bien la forma multilateral se ha acentuado, el contenido grueso de la política exterior y su énfasis en seguridad y en la contención de la influencia internacional que presiona a favor de un mayor cumplimiento con los derechos humanos se mantiene casi intacto. Esta tensión entre la forma y el contenido resulta en parte, del intento por construir una política exterior que busca ejercer liderazgo regional, pero que simultáneamente se ve limitada por las restricciones que impone el todavía latente conflicto interno, nutrido por el crimen organizado y el tráfico ilícito de drogas.

Sandra Borda (sandraborbag@gmail.com) es Profesora Asociada del Departamento de Ciencia Política de la Universidad de Los Andes y co-directora del Centro de Estudios Estadounidenses (CEE) en la misma universidad. Es Ph.D en Ciencia Política de la Universidad de Minnesota, MA en Ciencia Política de la Universidad de Wisconsin y MA en Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad de Chicago; ha sido investigadora invitada en la Universidad de Groningen en Holanda, el Munk Centre de la Universidad de Toronto en Canadá y el Centro de Estudios y Programas Interamericanos del ITAM en México. Sus principales líneas de investigación están relacionadas con la internacionalización de conflictos internos, la política exterior colombiana, su relación con organismos multilaterales y con el régimen internacional de derechos humanos.

LA POLÍTICA EXTERIOR DE LA REPÚBLICA BOLIVARIANA DE VENEZUELA: CONTINUIDADES, CAMBIOS Y DESAFÍOS EN EL CONTEXTO HEMISFÉRICO Y GLOBAL – Andrés Serbin and Andrei Serbin Pont (CRIES, Argentina)
El trabajo analiza los cambios en las prioridades de la política exterior venezolana a partir de la elección de Hugo Chávez a la presidencia en 1998, las continuidades y diferencias con respecto a las etapas anteriores de esta política, y los retos con los que se enfrenta en el contexto de las próximas elecciones presidenciales y de la enfermedad del Presidente Chávez. Especial énfasis se pone en el análisis del viraje hacia el Sur y la orientación estratégica para la construcción de una Comunidad de Naciones Latinoamericanas a través de la creación de la Alianza Bolivariana de las Américas (ALBA), de la participación en la Unión de Naciones Sudamericanas (Unasur) y en la fundación de la Comunidad de Estados de América Latina y el Caribe (CEALC), y de la utilización de la diplomacia petrolera y de la llamada “diplomacia de los pueblos”, y en particular de Petro Caribe como uno de los instrumentos privilegiados de esta estrategia. El argumento principal del capítulo plantea que los cambios en la política exterior de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela han estado condicionados por dos factores relevantes: la visión ideológica y geopolítica del Presidente articulada a las transformaciones del país en la última década, y la priorización de la dinámica política doméstica.

Andrés Serbin (aserbin@cries.org), doctor en Ciencias Políticas, presidente ejecutivo de CRIES; chair de la International Coalition for the Responsability to Protect (ICRtoP), miembro de la directiva del Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) y consejero del CARI. Ha sido profesor titular ® de la Universidad Central de Venezuela; investigador emérito del CONICIT, y es presidente emérito del Instituto Venezolano de Estudios Sociales y Políticos (INVESP). Sus más recientes publicaciones son, como compilador y autor, De la ONU al ALBA: prevención de conflictos y espacios de participación ciudadana (Buenos Aires/Barcelona: CRIES–GPPAC–Icaria, 2011); como autor, Chávez, Venezuela y la reconfiguración política de América Latina y el Caribe (Buenos Aires: Editorial Siglo XXI – Plataforma Democrática, 2011).

Andrei Serbin Pont (andrei@cries.org) es Licenciado en Humanidades con Orientación en Estudios Políticos de la Universidad Nacional de San Martín, y egresado del Curso Superior de Defensa Nacional de la Escuela de Defensa Nacional. Es Oficial de Enlace CRIES/PLACPaz/GPPAC en el marco del Programa de Prevención de Conflictos que llevan adelante las tres organizaciones. En la actualidad está realizando la Maestría de Relaciones Internacionales con especialización en Paz, Defensa y Seguridad Internacional en el Programa de Pos-Graduación en Relaciones Internacionales, San Tiago Dantas, de la Unesp, Unicamp e PUC-SP, en Sao Paulo, Brasil.
Ecuador experienced a major shift in its foreign policy since the start of the twentieth century. Whereas some Ecuadorian presidents formerly praised themselves of being “Washington’s closest allies” in the region, the current administration openly contests US engagement in Latin American affairs. The paper asks why this transformation took place throughout the first decade of this century. The paper argues that while Ecuadorian political leaders before Correa attempted to align their policies with the interest of the United States, they suffered great internal instability due to the strengthening of the indigenous movement and other base organizations. As a result, no Ecuadorian president was able to complete a constitutional term between 1996 and 2006. The paper further argues that to understand Ecuador’s foreign policy, one has to look at two main factors. First, the domestic political dynamics in Ecuador restricted the choices of political leaders, making it too costly to pursue a strategy of dependent association with the United States. Second, the United States decreased both its strategic interest in the region and its operational capacity to respond to challenges in Latin America, including Ecuador, and was no longer capable of providing effective support for its allies in the country. Using this framework, the paper examines contemporary Ecuadorian foreign policy and reflects on Ecuador’s relations with Venezuela, Ecuador’s position towards South American integration and towards the OAS, US-Ecuador relations, and the issues of human rights and freedom of the press.

Sebastian Bitar (sebastianbitar@gmail.com) is a Ph.D. candidate from the School of International Service, American University, in Washington DC. His current research focuses on US-Latin American relations, sovereignty, and foreign policy making in Ecuador and Colombia. He has received funding for research and academic activities from the Tinker Foundation, Fulbright, the International Studies Association, the Kettering Foundation, American University’s School of International Service and the Center for Latin American and Latino Studies, the Colombian Institute of Science (Colciencias), and the Universidad de los Andes in Colombia. He is the author of the book Los primeros pasos de los derechos humanos en Colombia (Universidad de los Andes Press, 2007). He has also published articles in the Colombian academic journals Colombia Internacional and Perspectivas Internacionales.
**ESTRATEGIAS Y POTENCIALIDADES EN RELACIÓN A LA OEA Y ORGANISMOS REGIONALES: EL CASO DE MÉXICO** - Natalia Saltalamacchia Ziccardi (Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México – ITAM, Mexico)

El trabajo se propone analizar cuál es el papel que durante la última década la política exterior de México ha asignado a las organizaciones y los foros de concertación multilateral en el ámbito del hemisferio americano. Se parte de la premisa de que el regionalismo o las asociaciones multilaterales han proliferado en América Latina en parte como respuesta a la globalización y en parte como reacción ante la cambiante distribución de poder global. Los nuevos esquemas conviven y compiten con las viejas organizaciones, entre ellas la OEA. México se ha subido a la ola asociacionista impulsando nuevas entidades como la CELAC y la Alianza del Pacífico, pero a la vez ha desplegado incrementalmente una posición de respaldo a la OEA en momentos en los que dicha organización es cuestionada por varios países latinoamericanos y, de manera conspicua, por el bloque de ALBA. ¿Cómo se acomodan todas estas piezas en el rompecabezas de la diplomacia mexicana? ¿Cuáles –si es que existe- la estrategia general que alienta a esta vertiente de la política exterior?


18h30 – Memorial da América Latina: Public event “Hemispherical Relations: OAS and the new Latin and South-American Organizations”
O sistema interamericano de direitos humanos vive hoje tensões e vulnerabilidades que refletem o impacto das profundas mudanças políticas vividas pelos Estados nacionais da região no final do século 20. O fortalecimento da CIDH e da Corte nas últimas décadas resultou em natural elevação do rigor com que esses organismos monitoram e tensionam os governos dos países a eles vinculados, gerando reações conflitivas. Tal litígio possui um passado e uma dinâmica histórica que não podem ser desprezados na busca de interpretação adequada dos fatos recentes, com vistas a encontrar soluções e garantir novos ciclos de fortalecimento. A América Latina é hoje a região do planeta onde prevalecem governos de esquerda ou centro-esquerda, decorrendo disso um interesse crescente pelos temas dos Direitos Econômicos, Sociais e Culturais, vis-à-vis os clássicos direitos liberais. A indivisibilidade proclamada em Viena em 1993 não pode ser tratada como mera retórica. Nem pelos governantes e autoridades dos Estados-parte, nem pelos integrantes do sistema, sejam eles comissionados e juízes, sejam os organismos peticionários. Pressões necessárias e indispensáveis sobre governos de esquerda naturalmente seguirão desencadeando reações e discursos que evocam as incoerências da própria OEA. Ou a pesada herança proclamada em Viena de que ela firmou como (quase) consenso o bloqueio continental a um país que decidiu enveredar por uma via autônoma e revolucionária. Qualquer subestimação na compreensão do peso dessa herança e da profundidade das mudanças políticas ocorridas na região será danosa à busca de um novo ponto de equilíbrio. Sem esse debate, o sistema corre o risco de ressuscitar a falida anteposição entre direitos de liberdade e direitos de igualdade, como se fosse admissível estabelecer hierarquia entre eles.

**Paulo Vannuchi** ([paulo.vannuchi@uol.com.br](mailto:paulo.vannuchi@uol.com.br)) é diretor do Instituto Lula, tendo graduação em Jornalismo, com mestrado em Ciência Política. Foi ministro dos Direitos Humanos no Governo Lula, entre dezembro de 2005 e dezembro de 2010.

**Cristina Timponi Cambiaghi** ([cristina.cambiaghi@sedh.gov.br](mailto:cristina.cambiaghi@sedh.gov.br)) é advogada, mestre em direito internacional público pelo Instituto de
REGIONALISM AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE AMERICAS

• POST-LIBERAL REGIONALISM – José Antonio Sanahuja (Universidad Complutense de Madrid and CRIES, Spain)

The paper will address “post-liberal regionalism” as a renewed concept and practice of regionalism and regional integration in Latin America. It will deal with its origins, developments, political and economic rationale, and its functionality as a development strategy, and as a strategy for improving the international stance of the Latin American countries, as well as a framework for regional security. The main objective of the paper will be the characterization and conceptualization of this model, recognizing their characteristics and their distinguishing features relating to other regionalist strategies present in Latin America, including “open regionalism” and its variants focused to the north-American and Pacific areas.

José Antonio Sanahuja (sanahuja@cps.ucm.es), Phd in Political Science, full professor of international relations and Vice-dean of Research and Doctorate at the Faculty of Political Science and Sociology, Complutense University of Madrid, Spain. He has worked for the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), and as a research and consultant of the European Commission, the European Parliament, and the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation. In two different terms he has been appointed as a member of the Development Cooperation Council (a consultative body to the Secretary of State for International Cooperation of the Spanish government). He has an extensive record of publications about international political economy, development cooperation, and regionalism and regional integration in the EU and Latin America.

• RELAÇÕES INTERAMERICANAS NA PERSPECTIVA DA NOVA AGENDA SUL-AMERICANA – Maria Regina Soares de Lima (Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Políticos – IESP/Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro – UERJ, Brazil)

O trabalho objetiva analisar criticamente o modelo de governança regional hemisférica, concebido a partir dos EUA no pós-Segunda...
Guerra, e as diversas iniciativas posteriores de governança e cooperação regional, tais como a ALBA, Unasul e Conselho de Defesa Sul-Americano. Qual o grau de compatibilidade e de divergência entre eles em questões afetas às temáticas da segurança regional e global tendo em vista seus objetivos, participantes e estratégias de política externa regionais de seus membros? Partindo do suposto que coexistem diferentes concepções de ordem regional, quais as perspectivas da construção de uma ordem regional sul-americana tendo em vista a estrutura das polaridades regionais e o desempenho de distintas tarefas de liderança, proteção e custódia regional?


• **A PERCEPÇÃO NOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DO MULTILATERALISMO LATINO–AMERICANO: CONGRESSO E THINK TANKS** - Luís Fernando Ayerbe (Unesp and INCT-Ineu); Tullo Vigevani (Unesp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec); Débora Figueiredo Mendonça do Prado (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia – UFU, INCT-Ineu and Cedec); Haroldo Ramanzini Junior (UFU, INCT-Ineu and Cedec), Brazil

O trabalho está relacionado ao projeto de pesquisa desenvolvido no âmbito do Instituto Nacional de Ciência e Tecnologia para Estudos sobre os Estados Unidos (INCT-Ineu), que tem como tema o estudo do sistema interamericano e do multilateralismo latino-americano na perspectiva das agências norte-americanas relevantes. Para compreender a política dos Estados Unidos para a América Latina é importante analisar como os atores domésticos norte-americanos percebem as dinâmicas regionais. O objetivo do trabalho é analisar as percepções dos Estados Unidos sobre as organizações multilaterais
latino-americanas (Mercosul, Unasul, ALBA e Cealc), tomando como referência o Congresso e os think tanks daquele país, buscando identificar em que medida análises, interpretações, percepções e ideologias presentes nessas instituições determinam o posicionamento dos Estados Unidos frente ao regionalismo latino-americano.

Luís Fernando Ayerbe ([lfayerbe@uol.com.br](mailto:lfayerbe@uol.com.br)), professor da Unesp; coordenador do Instituto de Estudos Econômicos e Internacionais da Unesp–IEEI e pesquisador do INCT-Ineu. Em 2011 publicou o livro *Cuba, Estados Unidos y América Latina ante los desafíos hemisféricos* (Barcelona: Icaria Editorial - Ediciones CRIES).


Débora Figueiredo Mendonça do Prado ([debfbp@gnail.com](mailto:debfbp@gnail.com)) é doutoranda em Ciência Política na Universidade Estadual de Campinas – Unicamp e pesquisadora do INCT-Ineu e do Cedec.

Haroldo Ramanzini Júnior ([hramanzinijunior@gmail.com](mailto:hramanzinijunior@gmail.com)), professor da Universidade Federal de Uberlândia – UFU e pesquisador do INCT-Ineu e do Cedec.

- **REGIONALISM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE AMERICAS: MULTIPLICATION OF MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS IN AMERICAS AFTER COLD WAR** - Carlos Portales (CLALS-AU, USA)

To explain the proliferation of regional and sub-regional international organizations in the Americas after the end of the Cold War, it is necessary to study the purposes of such organizations, their objectives (integration or political cooperation) and the place they play in the foreign policy strategies of the main actors in the Hemisphere, including how they are building their relationships with the new global system. A review of the interplay among old and new regional and sub-regional organizations (taking into account its purposes, resources, and capabilities for policy coordination), the reach of their mandates, and the role they could have vis-à-vis global institutions and extra-hemispheric powers will illuminate the new structure of multilateralism in the Americas.
Carlos Portales (portales@wcl.american.edu), Director of the Program on International Organizations, Law and Diplomacy at the Washington College of Law (American University). Professor at Flacso, Chile (1977-1990), at the Institute of International Studies of the Universidad de Chile; in the Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill) and at American University. Director General for Foreign Policy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile (1990-2010), Ambassador to the United Nations (Geneva), to the OAS and to Mexico. He was an active participant in most of Latin American international organizations during more than ten years leading the diplomatic representation of Chile. He is a political scientist (M.A. and doctoral studies at Stanford University) and Licenciado en Ciencias Juridicas y Sociales, Universidad de Chile. He is currently writing on Chilean foreign policy and international organizations in the Americas.

**UNASUL E A CONVERGÊNCIA INTERGOVERNAMENTAL NA SEGURANÇA HEMISFÉRICA** - Gilberto Marcos Antonio Rodrigues (Unisantos and CRIES, Brazil)

Um dos elementos presentes na Carta Constitutiva da Unasul é a sua missão de criar convergência entre os processos existentes de integração sub-regional na América do Sul. No campo da segurança – compreendida em sua multidimensionalidade – a Unasul vem empreendendo ações para construir não apenas uma agenda própria, mas para conectar estratégias e políticas com outras organizações sub-regionais existentes. Esse é o caso da Organização do Tratado de Cooperação Amazônica (OTCA). Com sede em Brasília, a OTCA atua em uma das áreas mais estratégicas do planeta, cuja geopolítica tem gerado históricas tensões e enfrentamentos políticos-diplomáticos no eixo Norte-Sul: a Amazônia. O objetivo do paper será analisar como a Unasul tem atuado para convergir políticas de segurança no âmbito da OTCA.

Gilberto Marcos Antonio Rodrigues (gr@unisantos.br) (professor@gilberto.adv.br) é professor do Programa de Doutorado em Direito da Universidade Católica de Santos (UniSantos), onde coordena o Setor de Relações Internacionais e a Cátedra Sergio Vieira de Mello, em convênio com o ACNUR e lidera o Grupo de Pesquisa “Sociedade Civil, Direitos Humanos e Meio Ambiente” (CNPq). Professor do Curso de Relações Internacionais da Faculdade Santa Marcelina (FASM), em São Paulo. Integrante do Grupo de Prevenção de Conflitos Internacionais (GAPCon) da Universidade Candido Mendes. Membro da Diretoria da Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales (CRIES) com sede em Buenos
The paper draws on a comprehensive framework, developed by the authors, for analyzing the national sources of multilateral cooperation in international public policy arenas. Our core proposition suggests that such state-to-state cooperation derives from the foreign policy preferences of a key state or states in the geographic [or socio-politically-constructed] neighborhood, which becomes an explicit or implicit “regional project.” There are currently several competing regional projects in the Americas, of which the three most significant are those championed by the U.S. (NAFTA, Summit of the Americas, FTAA/ALCA), Venezuela (ALBA, Banco del Sur), and Brazil (Mercosul, Unasur). We ask how these competing regional projects have played out in the public policy arena of environmental and climate-change cooperation, which is often perversely intertwined with the energy issue-arena. Our initial expectations are that national private commercial interests are particularly influential in both the U.S. and its key regional partners, Canada and Mexico, yet that transnational civil society groups also play a significant role in high-profile decisions. In Venezuela, state interests, both party-linked and in state-owned enterprises, dominate, although a change of government likely would lead to a resurgence of private actors. Brazilian policymakers confront a complex, two-level game, struggling to control independent domestic actors — including Petrobras, the BNDES, commercial associations, and campaigners for the rainforest and indigenous rights — while negotiating and implementing regional accords promoting both economic development and environmental sustainability.

Leslie Elliott Armijo (leslie.armijo@gmail.com) holds a Ph.D. in Political Science/International Relations from the University of California, Berkeley, and is currently a Fellow at the Hatfield School of Public Policy, Portland State University (Oregon) and at the Center for Latin American and Latino Studies at American University. Her
publications analyze the political economy of finance, the emergence of the BRICS countries, the interaction of democratization and economic reform, and the role of ideas in national policymaking.

Sybil Rhodes (sybil.rhodes@wmich.edu) earned a Ph.D. in Political Science from Stanford University in 2002. Currently, she is an associate professor of political science and international relations at the Universidad del CEMA in Buenos Aires, Argentina. She previously served as assistant and then associate professor of political science at Western Michigan University. Her research and teaching interests include comparative and international politics and public policy. She is the author of *Social movements and free-market capitalism in Latin America* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006) and various professional articles and book chapters.

- **ECONOMIC ISSUES, TRADE AND INVESTMENTS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES ON INTERAMERICAN RELATIONS** - Diana Tussie (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (Flacso) and CRIES, Argentina)

  The paper argues that to understand “the hemisphere in flux” we need to move beyond trade integration which was the underpinning of the neoliberal age. By looking at different factors we can open a broader discussion about the ways and extent to which we can talk about “post-hegemonic” and “post-liberal” regional projects. South America is characterized by a vast availability of energy resources, both renewable and nonrenewable. A net energy exporter, the region will play a relevant role in the area of global energy security during the next decades. Nonetheless, the countries in the region are not able to guarantee adequate energy security levels for their internal markets. Energy rationing and governance conflicts are commonplace in the region. Extractivism, meaning the centering of economies around the export of raw materials, such as minerals, fossil fuels and agricultural commodities has double edged implications. The need to find avenues of cooperation over natural resource extraction is the immediate background to the emergence of one of the new regional cooperation, and especially the Union of South American Nations.

  Diana Tussie (dtussie@flacso.org.ar) heads the Department of International Relations at Flacso (Argentina) and is the founder and director of the Latin American Trade Network (LATN). She has been a member of the Committee for Development Policy of the United Nations. Her recent books include, *Nación y región en América del Sur: los actores nacionales y la economía política de la integración sudamericana* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Teseo; Flacso, 2010); *The
DIREITOS HUMANOS E AS RELAÇÕES HEMISFÉRICAS – Sebastião Velasco e Cruz (Unicamp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec, Brazil)

O regime internacional de proteção aos direitos humanos é marcado pela tensão entre os seus dois elementos constitutivos: a afirmação de exigências normativas de caráter universal sobre os direitos subjetivos dos indivíduos, e o ordenamento jurídico do Estado democrático, através do qual tais expectativas se traduzem em normas precisas, apoiadas em instituições capazes de zelar por sua efetividade. Paradoxo entre o universalismo dos direitos humanos e o particularismo inerente ao Estado. Em outro lugar, o autor discutiu o tema no plano conceitual, e explorou as manifestações da referida tensão em dois contextos históricos distintos: os Estados Unidos e a América Latina, extrair-se-ão algumas ilações a respeito das relações políticas no hemisfério. O trabalho dá sequência a esta reflexão, abordando o tema na perspectiva da conduta externa dos Estados considerados: os Estados Unidos e os países latino-americanos, com ênfase naqueles localizados na América do Sul. A hipótese de base é que, no plano externo também, o referido paradoxo se apresenta, no Norte e no Sul, sob figuras diversas: furto de se comprometer com regras vinculantes de âmbito internacional, os Estados Unidos mobilizam recorrentemente – mas de forma seletiva – a linguagem universalista de direitos humanos como um componente essencial de sua política externa, ao passo que os países latino-americanos tendem a subscrever acordos e tratados internacionais que criam obrigações relativas à observância dos direitos humanos em seus respectivos territórios, mas ao mesmo tempo reafirmam o princípio da soberania – com seus corolários, a não interferência nos assuntos internos dos Estados – como um dos pilares da ordem internacional.

Sebastião Velasco e Cruz ([svelasco@globo.com](mailto:svelasco@globo.com)), doutor em Ciência Política pela USP (1984) e docteur d’État em Ciência Política pelo Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris/Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques (1986). É professor titular de Ciência Política (IFCH/Unicamp), pesquisador colaborador do Cedec, vice-coordenador do INCT-Ineu e diretor do Observatório Político dos Estados Unidos (OPEU). Tem experiência na área de Ciência Política e relações internacionais, atuando principalmente nos seguintes temas: reforma econômica, transição, democracia, política externa dos Estados Unidos e segurança internacional. Entre suas publicações

- **OS MECANISMOS REGIONAIS DE PROTEÇÃO DOS DIREITOS HUMANOS E OS ESTADOS UNIDOS:** uma análise do padrão de ativismo e das respostas governamentais norte-americanas nos casos de acusações de violações junto à Comissão Interamericana de Direitos Humanos da OEA (1971-2011) – Débora Alves Maciel (Unifesp and INCT-Ineu); Marrielle Maia Alves Ferreira (UFU and INCT-Ineu); Andrei Koerner (Unicamp, INCT-Ineu and Cedec), Brazil

A comunicação apresentará resultados da pesquisa sobre denúncias de violação de direitos humanos acolhidas pela CIDH/OEA contra os EUA no período de 1971 a 2011. Serão analisados três tipos de casos (imigração ilegal, pena de morte, intervenções externas), focalizando: a mobilização da CIDH pelas organizações de direitos humanos, as iniciativas da CIDH e as respostas das instituições estatais norte-americanas. A análise parte do reconhecimento da existência de distintas concepções de intelectuais, ativistas e políticos daquele país sobre a integração dos EUA às instituições multilaterais de direitos humanos. A hipótese é de que tais concepções têm peso diferenciado nas instituições do país em virtude da tradição política, da estrutura normativa e do predominio de doutrinas do excepcionalismo ou da soberania estatal.


- **EL ROL DE LA SOCIEDAD CIVIL EN LAS POLÍTICAS EXTERNAS Y LAS ORGANIZACIONES REGIONALES Y SUBREGIONALES DE LAS AMÉRICAS** – Andrés Serbin (CRIES, Argentina)

El trabajo analiza la nueva etapa del regionalismo en América Latina, caracterizada por tres “retornos”: el retorno a un rol protagónico del Estado, el retorno a la política en las relaciones regionales, y el retorno al desarrollo y a una agenda social, en el contexto de la emergencia de nuevos organismos regionales de carácter inter-estatal y de un nuevo rol de los presidentes respectivos. En este marco se analiza el rol de la sociedad civil y las apelaciones a una participación ciudadana, especialmente en relación a la inclusión de una agenda social en la agenda regional. El principal argumento de este trabajo apunta a señalar que, pese a las apelaciones existentes, desde 2005-2006, los mecanismos de participación de los movimientos sociales y de la sociedad civil en general, en los
organismos regionales, han tenido a reducirse, al igual que la capacidad de incidencia de los actores sociales no-gubernamentales sobre la formulación e implementación de una agenda social regional, incrementándose el déficit social existente en el ámbito regional. A los efectos de fundamentar esta argumentación se analiza la evolución de estos mecanismos y de los actores sociales tradicionalmente involucrados en la agenda regional.

DISCUSSANTS

- **Arlene Beth Tickner** (atickner@uniandes.edu.co) has a Ph.D. in International Studies from the University of Miami and a M.A. in Latin American Studies from Georgetown University. She is professor of International Relations in the Political Science Department at the Universidad de los Andes (Colombia), where she has worked since 1991. Her main areas of research include Colombian foreign policy, U.S.-Colombian relations, hemispheric and Andean security, the sociology of knowledge in the field of International Relations and the evolution on IR in non-core settings. Some of her most recent publications include: & BLANEY, D. L. *Thinking international relations differently* (London: Routledge, 2012); & BOTERO, F. *Colombia y el mundo 2010*: opinión pública y política internacional (Bogotá: Ediciones Uniandes, 2011); & ARNSON, C. “Colombia and the United States: strategic partners or uncertain allies?”. In: DOMÍNGUEZ, Jorge I.; FERNÁNDEZ DE CASTRO, Rafael (eds.). *Contemporary U.S.-Latin American relations*. Cooperation or conflict in the 21st century? (New York: Routledge, 2010).
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WORKSHOP AIMS

“HEMISPHERE IN FLUX:
International Relations, Multilateralism and Prospects for
Democratic Deepening of Inter-American Affairs”

São Paulo, 12–14 November, 2012

Organization: Instituto Nacional de Ciência e Tecnologia para Estudos sobre os Estados Unidos (INCT-Ineu), Brazil; Center for Latin American and Latino Studies at American University (CLALS-AU), EUA, and Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales (CRIES), Argentina

Support: Instituto de Políticas Públicas e Relações Internacionais (IPPRI/Unesp, Brazil)

The INCT-Ineu was established in the end of 2008 as the result of a CNPq call, in association with FAPESP, for projects based in the state of São Paulo. It is an initiative by a number of Brazilian institutions — Unesp, Unicamp, PUC-SP, Cedec, UFSC, UFPI, UEPB, UFPB and UFU —, whose research, much of which jointly, in the field of international relations and American studies, started in the 1980s. One of the Institute’s core research areas is the one focused on inter-American relations from multiple angles. A most important one focuses on US relations with the region, including issues related to Latin and South American integration processes. Known by CNPq and FAPESP, research findings have yielded significant publications not only in Brazil, but also in many other countries including the United States and Argentina. This body of research encompasses, among others, studies on U.S.–Brazil relations and on international and regional security.
American University is a leading institution in the fields of International Relations and Regional Studies, and the recently created campus-wide Center for Latin American and Latino Studies integrates and promotes research on Hemispheric affairs. As the largest International Studies School in the United States, AU’s School of International Service has a diverse faculty and an established research reputation. The School of Public Affairs and the Law School are also home to some of the Hemisphere’s most prominent authorities on Inter-American relations.

CRIES, a Buenos Aires-based regional think tank, has researchers from renowned Latin American universities and research centers. CRIES promotes research and has a lengthy track record as an advocacy network promoting increased civil society participation in policy-making, particularly around issues of conflict resolution and democracy promotion. Its concern with regionalism is made evident by its Anuario de la Integración, published since 1998, and its sponsorship of state of the art studies on civil society and the dynamics of regionalism in the Hemisphere.

The INCT-Ineu has a history of joint research and scholarly activities with CLALS at AU and CRIES. In furtherance of these activities, a team of researchers from American University, led by Eric Hershberg, organized the workshop “Hemisphere in flux: International relations, multilateralism and prospects for democratic deepening of Inter-American Affairs”, from 13 – 15 October 2011. The project we submit herewith is a follow-up to that workshop, and is staffed by the same researchers who attended the 2011 workshop, plus others who will contribute with their expertise and make it possible to confront ideas. The seminar for the presentation of this project will be held in São Paulo, from 12–14 November 2012, with the same name as the 2011 event – “Hemisphere in Flux”.

HEMISPHERE IN FLUX

Important changes are underway in inter-American relations. Traditionally, the Americas have been regarded as the epitome of a
hegemonic system, with the United States as the principal power and unchallenged leader of hemispheric relations. Nonetheless, the traditional *de facto* regime characterized by the political and economic predominance of the United States is being replaced gradually in the 21st century by a more multipolar order. Particularly noteworthy is the economic growth that has fueled Brazil’s role in regional and even global affairs, the decline in US economic influence amidst the growing importance of Asian trade and investment in Latin America, and the greater importance of intra-regional trade and investment cooperation across an array of fields ranging from security to environment to development assistance (Velasco, 2008; Bitar and Hershberg, 2012; Sabatini, 2012). At the same time, countries such as Canada, Mexico and Venezuela have exhibited greater diplomatic assertiveness, seeking to make the Americas a significant focus of their foreign policies. Alongside these developments involving individual states, there have been numerous innovations at the intergovernmental level. The past five years have witnessed the establishment of different organizations – UNASUR, established in May 2008 in Brasília, including all of South America’s States; the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), in February 2010 in Cancún, gathering all the governments of Latin America and the Caribbean in a widely supported proposal to exclude the United States and Canada. This incipient entity in effect brings the Rio Group to fruition, even while its mandate remains to be fully defined. At any rate, what is most relevant for the purposes of the research and, specifically, of the seminar we are proposing is to focus on the Sixth Summit of the Americas, held in April 2012 in Cartagena, a summit seemingly suggesting that inter-American relations have reached an impasse. An impasse with regard to the century-long reference framework being built since 1889, with the first official Pan American meeting in Washington, and consolidated in Bogotá, in 1948, when the Pan-American Union is replaced by the Organization of American States (OAS).
The evolving reconfiguration of hemispheric relations challenges our understanding of foreign affairs in the region, and poses fresh questions for scholars, policy-makers, and civil society organizations alike. What are the factors that drive changes in the strategies that governments adopt with regard to the Americas? How do different constituencies – both within governments and in civil society – influence policy choices adopted by governments or intergovernmental institutions and in what ways and why might this be changing? To what extent are common objectives such as enhanced security, economic development or environmental preservation advanced by current trends in Hemispheric relations, and what can we conclude regarding the consequences of these trends for the strengthening of democracy or the protection of human rights? These questions are important not only because they can frame a reevaluation of core assumptions of international relations scholarship on the Americas, but also, more significantly, because they have very real consequences for the wellbeing of peoples throughout the Hemisphere.

Thus we point out a core objective of the research being conducted. The November 2012 seminar will be a moment for evaluating the work each of the researchers is developing. The key goal is to measure the level of erosion the inter-American system has been submitted to, including its framework organization, the OAS. We are targeting both an evaluation and results, so as to move forward in the construction of new scenarios. We may say that the seminar, an outcome of the previous one of November 2011, will be the first scholarly meeting to focus on understanding the changes underway in the Hemisphere.

Researchers affiliated with the three institutions sponsoring this initiative have held iterative discussions in recent months in order to define strategies for analyzing these pressing issues in regional affairs. The São Paulo seminar, organized by INCT-Ineu, will have the participation of 20 researchers acknowledged for their leadership in international relations studies, coming from various countries, especially from Brazil and the
United States. The presentation of the texts derived from the ongoing research will provide an opportunity to further hone the research.

At this juncture, it is clear to us that our analysis of a “Hemisphere in Flux” will include three main areas for research that, though inter-related, can be separated analytically to facilitate their comprehension.

The first area, “Country strategies and capabilities towards Organization of American States (OAS) and regional organizations”, aims at understanding how individual governments throughout the Hemisphere are elaborating policies toward the region, and the factors that motivate them to adopt the strategies that they pursue regarding bilateral, subregional and multilateral relations. Hence, the seminar will present the findings of studies conducted on the cases of the United States, Argentina, Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela, Ecuador and Brazil. Researchers will follow a common template.

A second area of inquiry, “Regionalism and inter-governmental institutions in the Americas”, concerns the evolving role of intergovernmental institutions ranging from the OAS to Unasur, Mercosul, CELAC and ALBA. We believe that there is much to be gained from analyzing the potential and limitations of these entities, and we are particularly interested in understanding the meaning of new and old institutions and how they relate to each other in connection with themes historically addressed by the OAS. Of particular interest will be the analysis of certain themes that prompted intense debate and in relation to which great strides have been made in the American States since the end of the military dictatorships that ruled the different countries until the 1980s. These themes are hinged on democracy promotion, considering the Democratic Charter and human rights protection, mostly through the Inter-American Commission. The analytic purpose of the papers that will be discussed in this second area of inquiry concerns the question of how themes that have been steadily formulated in the context of the inter-American system as from the 1980s on, thus, over the last thirty years, retain their importance outside the context of the OAS and in a situation
where institutions are spreading that surely compete and undermine the very OAS. Moreover, we will discuss the question of how the OAS might fulfill its goals in a context of potential competition with the newly-formed institutions. These strike us as questions that merit systematic inquiry.

In the third area of inquiry, “Regional mechanisms across key issue areas in the Americas”, we are keenly interested in the role of civil society in shaping policy-making regarding Hemispheric affairs, both in national and intergovernmental arenas, and particularly with regard to the priority assigned to human rights protection and democratic deepening. The literature on the determinants of foreign policy in the Americas is relatively thin, and pays virtually no attention to the impact of civil society on the positions that national governments adopt regarding the Americas. In the seminar the question of the relation between civil society and international organizations holds a specific place since this place has been institutionalized in the OAS in order to allow access to civil society, particularly in the field of human rights. As from the first decade of the 2000s some States increasingly begin to challenge that venue on the argument that it interfered in and conflicted with principles of sovereignty. This relation and the outcomes of the conflict will be addressed by the various sectorial papers focusing on the relations between economy and environment, on the consequences of the economic and trade- and investment-related agendas for hemispheric relations and, particularly, on human rights and the role of civil society. At a time when the OAS itself appears weakened, indeed in crisis, and a growing array of parallel spaces offer settings for intergovernmental dialogues around a common policy challenges, a priority for democratic deepening in the Americas must be to develop mechanisms that facilitate meaningful engagement of civil society in Hemispheric affairs (Serbin, 2011). Given the United States’ salient historical role in the inter-American system, special attention will be given to that country’s policy, whose action in the international arena broadly and in the regional arena in particular, especially in the 2000s, may have further contributed to weaken the OAS system. By focusing our attention
on the role of social actors on both the foreign policies of key governments and on the actions of intergovernmental institutions, we believe that the research and this seminar have the potential to contribute to the debate on the democratization of international relations in the Americas.

**RESEARCH AREAS – ORGANIZATION OF SEMINAR**

1. **COUNTRY STRATEGIES AND CAPABILITIES TOWARDS ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS) AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

   Scholars and policy-makers need to better understand how power dynamics are shifting in the Americas, and how individual countries are both shaping and responding to emerging reconfigurations of power. Claims about the rise of Brazil have become commonplace in diplomatic and academic parlance, and for that matter even in Wall Street investment circles, but the full magnitude and regional implications of Brazil's growing prominence are not yet sufficiently clear. Despite Brazil’s growing prominence in the global arena, as its strategy of “autonomy through diversification” (Vigevani and Cepaluni, 2009) as well as its economic power resound undeniably across much of the region and beyond, the United States has hardly disappeared as a central player in Hemispheric affairs. However much observers decry the US “neglect” of Latin America, it remains the region’s principal trade partner, its most important supplier of arms, security assistance, and remittances; and a key player in countless domains through both bilateral and multilateral engagements. The discussion in the United States is often centered on criticizing the administration for its powerlessness in rebuilding modern relation ties, particularly with some countries (Lowenthal, Whitehead and Piccone, 2011). Moreover, despite the failure of the U.S. during the two previous administrations, particularly those of George W. Bush (2001-2008), to establish a U.S.-led Free Trade Association for the Americas, a failure that was mostly prompted by the economic and strategic interests of the
Mercosur countries and ideological resistance from the Venezuela-led ALBA, the Americans have established numerous bilateral Free Trade Agreements, are likely soon to establish more, and maintain leadership in an array of bilateral and multilateral cooperation schemes in areas ranging from development assistance to security. With regard to the latter, some of these schemes are robustly-funded and significant, such as Plan Colombia, the Merida Initiative, the Central American Regional Security Initiative and the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative. These are precisely the contradictions that underscore the importance of the seminar “Hemisphere in flux”. Our hypothesis is that the previous inter-American relations, as shaped in the late twentieth century, are changing, driven either by the new configuration of the international system or by the new relational structure between Latin-American countries or between some of them and the United States (Bitar and Hershberg, 2012).

As Brazil and the US reach out to the rest of the Hemisphere, governments in several other countries are also attempting to exercise influence over the continent’s shifting political, economic, institutional and even ideological dynamics (Gardini and Lambert, 2011). President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela has spearheaded the creation of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas (ALBA), in December 2004, portrayed as a limited alternative to the Free Trade Area of the Americas. Venezuela and Cuba were ALBA’s founding member states; Bolivia joined them in April 2006, followed by Ecuador, Nicaragua, Dominica, Antigua and Barbuda, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Mexico, in turn, has shifted its attention back to Latin America after nearly a quarter century, during which period it paid little attention to projecting its presence in regional affairs, particularly as a consequence of its close ties with the United States, further accentuated with the signing of the NAFTA in 1992. Nonetheless, Mexico has played an important role in the creation of the Rio Group and its proposed transformation into a more comprehensive regional body of Latin American and Caribbean states. The Rio Group is an offshoot of the Contadora group, created by Mexico,
Colombia, Panama, and Venezuela in 1983 to mediate in Central American conflicts. In 1986, together with Peru and Uruguay, the original members of the Contadora Group created the Rio Group regional forum as an alternative to the Organization of American States. While the new group excluded the United States and Canada, it accepted the participation of Cuba in 2008. Moreover, in hosting the second CELAC summit in Cancún in 2010, Mexico showed more concern for a policy of closer rapprochement with Latin America, irrespective of its ties with the U.S. and Canada.

It is still unclear whether there is policy convergence across Latin-American countries, yet traits thereof can be distinguished that point towards greater autonomy in relation to the United States. Within the context of the inter-American institutions the question is of the utmost importance, one that is surely explanatory of part of the hardships challenging the capacity of the OAS, at least from the Honduras crisis of July 2009 onwards, to continue as a major institutional reference in Hemispheric affairs. Other states have also tried to exert influence on particular domains and institutions, from a non OAS regional perspective. For example, Argentina played an important role in the creation of Unasur. Colombia has maintained its ‘special relationship’ with the United States, but has also tried to play an active role in Unasur (Dominguez and de Castro, 2010).

Growing interest in Hemispheric affairs has not been limited to Latin American countries. In the case of Canada, interest was kept on the previous inter-American agenda of support to Hemispheric institutions, the OAS namely. Canadian foreign policy under the Harper administration, from 2006 to date, has assigned importance to the region, as indicated in his government’s Americas Initiative, which encompasses both the economic and political dimensions and underscores Ottawa’s commitment to the expansion of democracy, the consolidation of market institutions, and the enhancement of security. As Canadian business continues to expand investment across Latin America, particularly in extractive industries, and as the Americas’ northernmost country retains its emphasis
on strengthening of democratic institutions and protection of human rights, there is reason to expect an ongoing engagement of Canada with the Hemisphere.

We propose to carry out systematic case studies of the policies of eight countries (United States, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Ecuador and Venezuela), in an attempt to document the strategies that individual countries employ to grapple with the unfolding multipolarity and to assert their place within it. We aim not only to understand changes in regional power and leadership, but also to investigate the specific decision-making processes that are shaping policymaking. In each of the countries mentioned above, including the U.S., there exist a complex array of institutional spaces where policy priorities are defined and implemented, and these spaces are impacted invariably by a diverse constellation of domestic interests that shape both policy debates and outcomes (Ayerbe, 2011). To understand each State’s Hemispheric policymaking process is one of the seminar’s goals, which accounts for the emphasis on civil society engagement and on how civil society impacts on government attitudes.

Latin Americanist political scientists have made important strides in recent years to unlock the keys to understanding policy processes in a growing range of domains. Similarly, while relations between the U.S. and Latin America have long been a subject of study, few publications have analyzed the ways in which Washington’s roles in the Hemisphere are being re-defined in a context of increasing pluralism. In studying decision-making processes we want to understand the specific domestic and external factors that produce particular approaches to foreign policies directed at Hemispheric affairs. Throughout our inquiries, we expect to discover variation across policy domains: approaches to trade may be influenced by one configuration of actors, whereas policies regarding security cooperation, or protection of human rights and democratic institutions, may be the focus of other agents. In effect, in carrying out this component of our project we will be engaged in a multi-dimensional mapping process, the product of which will be a far more nuanced picture than we now have
of the complexities of international relations in the Americas of the early 21st century.

Our sense is that the most ambitious recent study of foreign policies in the Hemisphere (Gardini and Lambert, 2011) has done a great service by enumerating policies of most key governments in the region, but has failed to provide an analytical framework for conceptualizing the terrain in which these policies are put forth, more precisely with regard to inter-American relations. Gardini and Lambert (2011) identify a combination of “ideology and pragmatism” as motivating individual country strategies, yet this is not sufficient to allow outlining the contours of the new scenarios that are being drawn. The questions we want to answer include, who are the actors, what are their interests, and through what institutions do they operate?

2. REGIONALISM AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE AMERICAS

While for many decades inter-American policies were heavily determined by the leadership of the United States and its economic and security agendas, in the new century we encounter important loci of regional decision-making spearheaded by other countries, as well as a growing number of regional bodies that exclude the U. S. Indeed, alongside shifting approaches toward hemispheric relations evident in the behavior of individual states, we are witnessing a major re-configuration of the hemisphere’s multilateral organizations, a process that raises numerous questions. For example, there are ambiguities with regard to the competences of sometimes overlapping regional forums for dialogue, dispute-resolution, and mediation. Similarly, we know surprisingly little about decision-making processes in these new institutions, many of which are still defining their missions and organizational forms and have yet to institutionalize important components of their activities.

How the proliferation of multilateral institutions will reinforce, change or undermine the existing regimes that monitor and enforce standards
related to protection of human rights and strive to incorporate citizen participation in Hemispheric affairs are fundamental questions that constitute the focus of this aspect of the proposed collaboration between INCT-Ineu, AU and CRIES. Clearly, the new multilateral organizations take on a variety of forms and affect a range of policy domains. Alliances such as Mercosur and the Andean Community, like the NAFTA, are concerned principally with trade and economic integration, even while the Andean Community’s former strength is fast fading away. Unasur and the new organization born at Cancun, CELAC, by contrast, are political/diplomatic groupings, as is the ALBA, though the latter also has an economic mission. In the more recent organizations institutional design and goals are still being drafted.

These political/diplomatic entities may come to play a significant role in alleviating tensions in given circumstances, acting as peacekeepers and enforcing democratic rule. This has happened already, as when Unasur helped defuse a rift between Colombia and Venezuela at the end of President Uribe’s administration. It remains unclear the degree to which organizations such as Unasur will consolidate institutional frameworks for defense and security policies, regimes for the assurance of constitutional governance, or mechanisms for enabling member states to coordinate policies on matters ranging from the environment to energy to migration. Some advances are evident, but ambiguities remain. While the rules of the game and decision-making processes are relatively clear in the more conventional groupings focused on economic integration (Mercosur and NAFTA), those that frame the activities of other types of organizations still require studying, which is what is intended by the ongoing research through the presentation of papers during the November 2012 seminar.

Beyond that, conceptual work is needed to clarify the relationship of these new regional organizations (Unasur, ALBA, and CELAC) to traditional visions of regionalism. Arguably, the new organizations reflect a distinct approach to regionalism, one that some observers have labeled as post-liberal (Sanahuja, 2009), but the question cries out for further analysis by
international relations theorists. These new organizations not only depart from the economic and political logics of their predecessors, but also follow new procedures of institution building whose underpinnings we wish to identify. For instance, overall these organizations are mainly driven by the incorporation of the concepts of national sovereignty, self-determination and the idea of multilateralism. Understanding the role of civil society organizations in these institutions and how they come to engage in decision-making processes is also under inquiry. Their degree of institutionalization varies and their prospects of consolidation are far from uniform.

In the seminar and ongoing research we will study these differences between the new regional organizations, and their consequences for the future of Hemispheric institutions, paying attention throughout both to the stances assumed by national governments and the influence played by civil society organizations. As we investigate multilateralism’s changing landscape, this project will advance both theories of inter-state cooperation and empirical studies of the decision-making processes in the various multilateral organizations that are emerging in the Americas.

One component of Hemispheric relations that has to be closely observed as it faces the challenges of new regionalisms is the Inter-American system for human rights protection, which includes the Inter-American Human Rights Commission and the Inter-American Court. The latter has established a body of jurisprudence that has undermined impunity for rights violation and has advanced the cause of accountability in numerous countries of the region. Together, the Commission and the Democratic Charter have been vital instruments for the promotion of democratic rule and respect for human rights throughout the Hemisphere. On a number of occasions the Commission played an important role in monitoring human rights violations that accompanied attempted interruptions of democracy, and in denouncing fraud and other conditions making elections less than free and fair. At the same time we will place special interest on studying and understanding the causes for the existing
tension between some States and these institutions, bearing in mind that human rights protection was long consolidated by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of December 1948, and ratified in the 1993 United Nations Conference in Vienna, when human rights were further advanced as a global value.

3. REGIONAL MECHANISMS ACROSS KEY ISSUE AREAS IN THE AMERICAS

Over the course of its 50 years of existence, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) has contributed to democracy and the rule of law in the hemisphere, from standing up to military dictatorships in the 1970s to drafting important multilateral instruments against torture and disappearances. It has also perfected its system of individual complaints and assisted newly democratic governments in bringing their laws, policies and practices into compliance with international standards. In particular, the IACHR has pioneered a unique way of protecting rights by conducting on-site visits to countries and publishing comprehensive reports on the situation of human rights. Those reports are then followed-up on a yearly basis, so as to encourage positive change. The Commission’s reports on individual complaints, adopted after careful consideration of the State’s views and evidence, also serve to provide faithful and progressive interpretations of the State’s obligations under the American Convention on Human Rights and other treaties. For its part, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, created in 1979, has established itself as the ultimate interpreter of the content of human rights treaties in the hemisphere. The Court’s decisions have invariably been issued on highly sensitive matters such as the obligation to hold accountability for mass atrocities, the rights of indigenous communities to land and natural resources, elimination of discrimination against women and children, freedom of expression and association, and the independence of courts and other institutions of control. Although those decisions have been of breathtaking scope and bold in the orders issued to States as remedies for
violations found, they achieve a high level of compliance. Indeed, the Commission and the Court have built on their records and today enjoy legitimacy and credibility among Latin American political and legal circles.

One implication of these achievements is that the Inter-American system has introduced important mechanisms for safeguarding human rights and, in the process, for protecting rights that are fundamental to democratic rule. Significantly, moreover, it is through these mechanisms that the participation of civil society in the Inter-American system has been most noteworthy. Indeed, these mechanisms have generated the first spaces for dialogue between civil society and the OAS, and beginning during the 1990s, with the creation of spaces for dialogue between civil society and foreign ministries in the context of the General Assemblies of the OAS and the Summits of the Americas, have opened avenues for civil society organizations to exert influence on the broader activities of the OAS.

This arguably is an underappreciated feature of the political landscape in the Americas that coincides with the widespread consolidation of democratic regimes following the so-called Third Wave of democratization. Discussions internal to some governments and also at regional level are taking place towards allowing the new regional organizations, particularly Unasur and CELAC, to develop similar instruments: democratic charter, safeguarding of human rights and civil society access. In the Mercosul they exist and have proven effective in some situations, especially after the signing of the 1998 Ushuaia Protocol. Analysis of the consequences that the weakening of the OAS may bring about—eventually undermining protection regimes and their corresponding institutions—will be an important theme in the seminar, together with analysis of how the new organizations process these issues on their agendas. Interestingly, as yet there appear to be no analogous mechanisms in place for such participation of civil society in the workings of emerging multilateral institutions. Whether these might arise, and what
form they can and should take, is a question of considerable import for the future of democratic governance in the Americas.

It is unclear how a diminished prominence of the OAS would impact the influence of its two institutions (the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Court), but there can be no doubt that it would pose a major challenge to the inter-American institutional landscape that has both advanced the cause of human rights and encouraged democratic rule. There can be little doubt that it would undermine the system of protection, as the Commission and the Court would lose essential political support, and evidence that they could be replaced by other bodies in the new regional organization or in the other multilateral institutions emerging in the region is building up. Efforts to replace them could be less independent and effective as bodies of protection, and could or not contribute to undermine the existing system of human rights protection. Our project, this seminar seeks to understand the state of the art concerning human rights bodies and the mechanisms that enable civil society participation. The question that arises concerns the impact of these new organizations. In other words, since the 1980s OAS agencies have consolidated themselves as rights’ protection instruments, yet always underpinned by the principle of sovereignty, however subject to power asymmetry this might be. Balance is achieved on the basis of the rationales of non-intervention and peaceful settlement of disputes. The question we will seek to answer, building on the assumption that there exists no a priori answer, is whether the new organizations will relax, uphold, or further reinforce protection mechanisms. We shall take into account the idea that human rights protection depends on the capacity and willingness of political entities, the States, to act (O’Donnell, 2010; Smith, 1997), States that, for one, if democratic, must live by universal, human values. The seminar will keep in mind the tensions arising from these parallel parameters.

It would be premature to sound alarms about the direction of changes that are underway. It is noteworthy that numerous governments
in Latin America and the Caribbean have made human rights a fundamental pillar of their foreign policies, and that alliances such as Mercosur have established human rights commissions. At the same time, new diplomatic and political alliances have expressed commitments to both rights protection and civil society participation (as is the case of Unasur), even if the formal mechanisms for monitoring compliance, enforcing norms and fulfilling proclaimed objectives have yet to be defined.

A specific issue in this third area of research and seminar builds directly from those outlined above, and focuses specifically on the role of civil society in shaping foreign policies in the Americas – both with regard to country-to-country ties and relationships of particular governments to intergovernmental institutions, and in the context of regional bodies which may be taking on greater importance. We seek to map the role of civil society in the shaping of new regional institutions, and how they adapt their traditional work related to human rights and democracy promotion as new spaces of participation are negotiated. We want to know which actors most strongly influence the shaping of policies not only in the practices of particular countries throughout the Hemisphere, but also at the regional level. This is important, because with regard to human rights, in particular, societal participation often operates through Transnational Advocacy Networks (TAN), instead of country-specific entities. The successes of TANs in fostering better human rights practices have been well documented (Risse, Ropp and Sikkink, 1999), and in many of these cases the OAS and its human rights bodies have been critical to their achievements. It is arguable, nonetheless, that the overall landscape of regional governance exhibits a “democratic deficit,” in that there is only scant participation of civil society organizations in decision making processes and in the formulation of policies at the regional level. Moreover, at this juncture, it is not clear how existing TANs will adapt to the emergence of new regional bodies with human rights mandates. The project will draw on and supplement existing theoretical and empirical work in this area in order to better understand the implications of the emerging Hemispheric landscape
for human rights and for open governance, two key pillars of democratic deepening across the region.

The seminar will place special attention on the role of the United States, as the country, historically and concretely, has been and still is a key and most decisive actor in the system. Starting in 2001, the US “war on terror” policy brought about, among other consequences, rising demobilization of interest for Latin America and the inter-American system. This feature, coupled with the US’s weakened capacity for international intervention based on the idea of soft power, with which it has sustained part of its foreign policy since the early twentieth century, undoubtedly weighs heavily on the weakening of the inter-American system and the OAS.

The advancement of democratization in Latin America has opened space for the emergence of new visions of human rights, including strong participation of civil society, widening rights, rights directly related to the ideas of development and better social conditions for all people. Assessing the degree to which newly created regional organizations can contribute to the accommodation of such views into the regulatory framework of the system of human rights in the region is among the core objectives of this research initiative and of the seminar. Returning to core concerns of the initial component of our project, we hypothesize that a key factor in determining the degree to which multipolarity will be consistent with democratic deepening will be the degree to which rising players incorporate issues of human rights and democracy into their foreign policies, including US and Brazil. To date, the record appears to be quite mixed, but there is considerable controversy about both the current state of play and the direction of change. Our project aims to provide thorough analysis that will enable scholars and advocates to better understand how a “Hemisphere in Flux” will both advance and reflect principles of human rights and democratic practices, civil society participation and multilateral, symmetrical and cooperative regional relations.
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

With these preoccupations as a point of departure, a partnership was established between the National Institute of Science and Technology for Studies on the United States (INCT-Ineu), the Center for Latin American and Latino Studies at American University (CLALS at AU), and the Regional Coordination for Economic and Social Research (CRIES) toward a multi-pronged initiative of research that was launched in Washington in October 2011 and will proceed in São Paulo in November 2012. The initiative includes research, publications and public events aimed at:

- assessing how major governments in the region, beginning with the U.S. and Brazil but encompassing as well Argentina, Colombia, Mexico, Ecuador and Venezuela, formulate policies with respect to regional and multilateral affairs, encompassing both their bilateral relationships and their participation in diverse regional institutions, and recognizing differences that may operate across policy domains.

- illuminating the nature of the trends underway in the inter-American system, with particular attention to the diffusion of influence across countries in the Hemisphere, the proliferation of multilateral institutions, and the evolving competencies of those institutions.

- assessing the impact of the existing constellation of regional institutions for human rights and democracy, focusing on diplomatic aspects as well as jurisprudence, and exploring the compatibility of emerging alliances and institutional innovations with those that have spawned the Democratic Charter and the Inter-American System of protection of human rights embodied by the Commission and the Court.

- exploring the emerging channels of civil society participation in both foreign policy-making and regional governance, including their relationship to intergovernmental decision-making processes. Central to this component of the project is the aspiration to reduce existing
democratic deficits in regional governance, a challenge that takes on special relevance in a context where the past quarter century has witnessed the proliferation of consolidated democracies across the region. Not only is there a need to better understand how individual countries and intergovernmental institutions seek to advance the protection and deepening of democratic life in the Hemisphere—including through augmenting participation of actors from civil society—there is also a need to explore avenues for making more robust the existing procedures for fostering meaningful societal participation at the level of regional institutions.

The effort we propose will draw on international relations scholars, diplomatic historians and political scientists from throughout the region. In particular, foreign policy specialists at INCT-Ineu and AU will collaborate with researchers from other institutions around the world to undertake systematic studies of the policy-making processes that are shaping the contours of the emerging Hemispheric order. The network of researchers affiliated with CRIES will contribute with its expertise on civil society participation in regional affairs.

In conclusion, the discussions stemming from the papers aim at identifying the motivations and deep causes of the new Hemispheric dynamics underway, which new realities are being shaped and which new scenarios are emerging. This goal will be achieved by examining what is new in terms of institutions, interests, strengths. The period to be studied is the more recent, the 2000s, which entails considering the roots of the phenomena.

Our overarching objective is to produce relevant, state-of-the-art knowledge about shifting dynamics of power in the Americas, to assess the challenges and opportunities of new regionalisms, and to identify ways for preserving and enhancing progress made to date with regard to the Democratic Charter.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES


