

**Aalborg University**  
**Department of Culture, Communication, and Globalization**

**Master Thesis**



**The Role of Regional Security Dynamics in Regionalism:**

**An alternative approach to evaluate the successes and failures of regionalism**

**Case study: UNASUR, South America.**

**A research proposal by Louise Kirk, May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017**

**Supervisor: Peter Wilgaard Larsen**

## Abstract

For decades, South American regionalism has by scholars persistently been labelled a failure in the absence of deep economic integration and common political interests, ideologies, and visions. Indeed, the many theoretical perspectives on South American regionalism struggle to make sense of the coherence between deeper integration as the regional project of UNASUR proposes and the contrasting economic and political interests and visions characterizing the many sub-regional projects that have shaped the finalized union. However, as recent events illustrate, the endurance of widely acknowledged successful economic and political regional projects is increasingly under pressure. Accordingly, with the recent Brexit from the European Union and the rise of political figures such as Marine Le Pen and Donald Trump and their respective anti-globalization agendas, popular nationalism and issues of domestic sovereignty and security have gained a new momentum. Inspired by these observations, this thesis rests on an assumption that the cause and effect and successes and failures of regionalism are intrinsically tied to questions of security and should be interpreted accordingly. Thus, this research explores the relationship between the cause and effect of regionalism and regional security dynamics with the aim of contributing to a more nuanced and universal understanding of regionalism from where to measure the successes and failures of distinct regional projects. Serving this purpose, the research applies the framework of “Regional Security Complex Theory” by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, to map the security constellation of South America to determine the cause and effects of South American regionalism as expressions of regional security dynamics, in a bid to overcome the theoretical fixation on economic and political convergence as the dominant criteria from where to understand and measure meaningful regionalism. While the thesis takes the form of a case study of UNASUR, the focus of this research is centred on the security dynamics that changed the regional environment between the initial proposal for regional cooperation in the 1990s and the final creation of UNASUR in 2008. Following this approach, the research offers some valuable insight into the sub-regional projects that have shaped the union along the way, from where a broader understanding of South American regionalism emerges. The main findings reveal that the criticism of South American regionalism fails to value the role of the various regional projects in the establishment of solid democratic norms, better conditions for autonomous development, regional stability, the emergence of a strong social agenda, and the visibility and acknowledgement of indigenous communities in politics. This research has thus led to the conclusion that by understanding South American regionalism as

expressions of regional security dynamics, a more nuanced picture has emerged of South America's political and economic failures and successes. Moreover, this research sheds light on the overarching issues that tie the contrasting economic and political interests together in UNASUR from where the future of the union, in an international context, is determined by the individual members' ability to sustain and build upon this convergence. As such, bearing in mind that this approach to regionalism is universal in its application, this thesis recommends to better include understandings of regional security dynamics in regional policy debates and development. Finally, this research emphasizes a need to better integrate insights of regional security dynamics into the wider study of regionalism.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	2
List of Abbreviations.....	6
Introduction .....	8
Research Question .....	10
Purpose of Thesis .....	10
Thesis Outline.....	11
Selection of Case: UNASUR.....	12
Literature Review: Theoretical Perspectives on Latin American Regionalism.....	14
Spaghetti Bowl Regionalism .....	15
New Regionalism .....	16
Post-Liberal Regionalism .....	17
Post-Hegemonic Regionalism .....	17
Third Wave Regionalism.....	18
Methodology.....	20
Ontological underpinnings of RSCT .....	20
Epistemological Considerations .....	21
Sources and Method of Collecting Data.....	23
Method of Analysis and Interpretation.....	24
Theoretical Chapter: Regional Security Complex Theory .....	25
RSCT Framework.....	25
RSCT: Main Structural Features .....	27
Sub-complexes .....	29
Strong and Weak States.....	30
The classification of States .....	31
RSC Typologies.....	32
Case: UNASUR.....	34

Analytical Chapter.....	39
Historical Prelude.....	39
The Cold War.....	39
Post-Cold War.....	40
The Southern Cone: Domestic and State-to-State Key Developments.....	41
Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay.....	41
Chile.....	42
The Andean North: Domestic and State-to-State Key Developments.....	43
Columbia.....	43
Venezuela.....	44
Bolivia.....	46
Ecuador.....	47
Peru.....	49
Sub-Conclusion: Domestic and State-to-State Key Developments.....	50
Regional Level: The Mercosur Sub-complex RSC.....	52
Regional Level: The Andean North sub-complex RSC.....	57
Interregional Level: ALBA.....	59
The RSC of UNASUR.....	61
Sub-conclusion on UNASUR and South American Regionalism.....	63
Conclusion.....	63
References.....	66

## List of Abbreviations

ALBA	The Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AU	African Union
BRIC	Grouping Acronym of Brazil, Russia, India, China
CAN	The Andean Community of Nations
CDS/SADC	South American Defence Council
CONAIE	Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador
EU	European Union
FARC	The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
GUAM	Organization between Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova
IIRSA	Initiative for the Integration of the Regional Infrastructure of South America
ISI	Import Substitution Industrialization
MAS	Movement for Socialism
Mercosur	The Common Market of the South
MILA	Mercado Integrado Latinoamericano
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Area
OAS	Organization of American States
PA	Pacific Alliance
RSC	Regional Security Complex

MA proposal by Louise Kirk, CCG

RSCT	Regional Security Complex Theory
SACN	South America Community of Nations
SAFTA	South American Free Trade Area
UNASUR	The Union of South American Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
WTO	World Trade Organization

## Introduction

Regional integration, by all means, is not a novel idea to the twentieth century. Yet, various regional integration schemes did mushroom in the latter part of this era when the obsessively intruding bipolar competition for global dominance rescinded, leaving room for states to concentrate on autonomous paths of development in a regional setting. Over the years, scholars on regionalism have offered a vast number of theories addressing the question of why regional projects of economic and political nature have formed among states. A large portion of this work is focussed on the economics of regionalism, though it is widely acknowledged that economic factors alone are insufficient to make sense of the causes and effects of regionalism. Under the heavy influence of Kantian views on liberalism the cause of regionalism is often depicted as deriving from a conviction that free trade produces an interconnectedness between states that effectively reduces the possibility of war and actively promotes democratic values.<sup>1</sup> The cause and effect of regionalism is thus often understood in terms of convergent political interests among states that take the form of economic integration. Accordingly, the Kantian-inspired success of the European Union (EU) in overcoming post-war animosities and going on to creating a new era of cooperation and peace through economic and political institution-building, is largely viewed as the model inspiration for regions around the world to venture into their own regional projects. Yet, as Robert Keohane asserts, in contemporary times, states treat sovereignty as a bargainable resource, surrendering portions of it in return for substantial benefits, often economic in nature.<sup>2</sup> This view underpins a widespread assumption that regional formations serve as geopolitical instruments for states to manage the interdependence of economic interaction caused in their pursuit of economic self-interest.<sup>3</sup> Other scholars view regionalism as a political and economic means to regain some control over the uncontrollable global market forces.<sup>4</sup> In the face of globalization, Mary Farrell and Björn Hettne, underpin the different assumptions and perspectives on regionalism asserting that post-sovereign political rationality assumes that solutions to economic and political concerns must be found in transnational structures.<sup>5</sup> From here, the drive and legitimacy of regionalism is depicted as the rational choice of

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, *Political Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 257-259.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Keohane, "Ironies of Sovereignty: The European Union and the United States." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 40, no. 4 (2002), 743-765.

<sup>3</sup> John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 431.

<sup>4</sup> Baylis, Smith and Owens, 432.

<sup>5</sup> Mary Farrell and Björn Hettne, *Global Politics of Regionalism: Theory and Practice* (London: Pluto Press, 2005).



actors. Thus, regional political projects with no economic dimension, or conversely, informal market-led projects, have persistently been subject to criticism in the study of regionalism due to their perceived failure to merge political and economic interests into meaningful integration. This in return presupposes that successful regionalism is measured in terms of such convergence.

Yet, in recent years the prevalent logic of the relationship between rational choice and successful regionalism is increasingly contested. This truth is observable e.g. in the surprising British exit from the EU and the popular impetus of the anti-EU political platform of Marine Le Pen. Likewise, the unexpected rise of Donald Trump and his anti-globalization agenda and threat to leave the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is curious both from the perspective that the US for long has been practically synonymous with neoliberal development and from the perspective that bilateral and multilateral trade agreements, such as NAFTA, are active pillars of US national security. However, as Janusz Symonides asserts, the increasing interdependencies characteristic of regionalism undermine the autonomy and policy-making-capabilities of states.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the consensus underpinning these relatively new developments in the developed part of the world is arguably embedded in perspectives on domestic security and autonomy versus the restricting nature of formal economic and political integration.

In a South American context, claims of the failure of South American regionalism have persisted for decades, in the absence of deeper economic integration and the creation of an effective common market, combined with a profound disaccord between different states' political ideologies, interests, and regional visions. The lack of deep economic integration has led many scholars to conclude that the various sub-regional initiatives propose nothing more than ineffective, incoherent region-building efforts, from where South American regionalism should be understood as little else than a series of disappointments.<sup>7</sup> The historic formation of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), for the first time comprising all South American countries with the exception of French Guyana, has largely suffered the same criticism, from its missing emphasis on a regional trade-agenda and the perpetual conflicting political ideals characterizing the member-states. To this end, the criticism of South American regionalism appears largely reasonable, with a few exceptions, if successful regionalism is to be viewed solely in terms of economic integration and convergent

---

<sup>6</sup> Jack Mahony, *The Challenge of Human Rights: Origin, Development and Significance* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 163.

<sup>7</sup> Pia Riggirozzi and Jean Grugel, "Regional Governance and Legitimacy in South America: The Meaning of Unasur, *International Affairs* 91, no. 4 (2015), 781.

political ideals. However, as the British exit from the EU and the rise of Marine Le Pen and Donald Trump all illustrate, the successes and failures of regionalism hinges on more than a solid convergence between economic and political interests. If we bear in mind the changing global context that inspired a mushrooming of regional projects and considering recent events, the causes and effects and successes and failures of regionalism thus appear to be intrinsically tied to profound questions of security and its changing structure and dynamics. From here it follows:

### **Research Question**

If processes of regionalism are underpinned, shaped, and transformed by domestic, regional, and global security dynamics, are the causes and effects of regional projects not better understood in terms of these dynamics? And if so, can this understanding of regionalism provide a more nuanced perspective on the successes and failures of distinct regional projects such as the South American projects and UNASUR?

### **Purpose of Thesis**

Accordingly, this thesis seeks to investigate the relationship between processes of regionalism and regional security dynamics. The aim of this thesis is to explore if the cause and effect of regionalism can be sensibly understood as expressions of regional security dynamics, and thereby transcend the traditional emphasis on political and economic integration as the dominant criteria from where to understand and measure the successes and failures of distinct regional projects such as the various South American projects and more specifically UNASUR. As such, by applying the case of UNASUR this thesis proposes to explore the South American security constellation as the determining element behind processes of regionalism, which presupposes expressions of economic and political cooperation as shaped and guided by these processes. The focus of this research is centred on the security dynamics that changed the regional environment between the initial proposal for regional cooperation in the early 1990s to the final conception of UNASUR in 2008. By applying this particular timeframe to the research an emphasis is put on the various sub-regional projects and how they have shaped the final outcome of UNASUR. From here, the aim is to generate a broader understanding of South American regionalism. This approach offers an

alternative perspective on the political and economic dimensions of regional projects that incorporate, yet transcend, regional peculiarities, and is thus universal in its application. Furthermore, if regional projects are understood as expressions of regional security dynamics, the security perspective as advocated by this research, could serve as a valuable contribution to regional policy debates and development. A mapping of the security constellation of NAFTA, for example, may offer relevant security perspectives to consider alongside Donald Trump's traditional economic cost and benefit analysis of NAFTA integration. I shall briefly return to both NAFTA and the EU in the conclusion. Following the observations outlined in the introduction the overall aim of this thesis serves a dual purpose. One, by applying the case of UNASUR this research attempts to explore the validity of the criticism of South American regionalism from a security perspective. And two, to emphasize a need to better integrate insights of regional security dynamics into the study of regionalism for a more nuanced interpretation of individual projects.

### **Thesis Outline**

The structure of this thesis is divided into four parts. The first part comprises a presentation of the specific choice of case where the aspects that make UNASUR an interesting object for this research are elaborated. Following this, the literature review will provide a working definition of regions and regionalism and present the dominant theories on Latin American regionalism. The purpose of the literature review is to provide insights into dominant theoretical perspectives on Latin American regionalism and to highlight the perceived shortcomings of some in accordance with the objective of this research. Moreover, the literature review serves to integrate the scope of this research into a broader framework on regionalism while the differing focuses that shape each dominant theoretical perspective serve to inform the background of the analysis. In the second part, the methodological considerations are presented. Accordingly, the ontological underpinnings of the framework and the subsequent epistemological considerations are accounted for here. Moreover, this part will account for the chosen sources in this research, the method of collecting data as well as the method of analysis and interpretation.

Following this, part three will elaborate in detail on the structural design of the chosen theoretical framework for this research. The four-level framework is chosen for its ability to systematically organize and analyse regional security dynamics, from where a map of the security constellation

appears. It is pertinent to note that the chosen framework serves the objective of this research and not the other way around. More so, as the theoretical framework originally is designed as a tool to enable a general interpretation of the structure of international security, this thesis is applying this tool to serve a purpose for which it was not intended. As such, the objective is not to advocate the chosen framework as the only means to mapping regional security dynamics but it is, however, deemed fitting and highly capable to serve the purpose of this research. Finally, the fourth part comprises the analysis and conclusion. The structure of the analysis is divided in four interrelated sub-chapters, namely a historical prelude and analysis of domestic and state-to-state key developments followed by an analysis of the regional and interregional level. The sum of these levels provides the security constellation of South America from where the objective of this research will be assessed in the concluding remarks.

### Selection of Case: UNASUR

Accordingly, the regional organization of UNASUR is chosen as the object of this research based on the following unique and interesting merits. First, out of multiple regional projects, UNASUR is the first regional organization in South America to comprise all countries with the exception of French Guiana. The vision for South American regionalism between the initial proposal for regional economic cooperation in the early 1990s up until the final creation of UNASUR some fifteen years later, has profoundly changed over time and is highly shaped by existing sub-regional projects. With the emergence of UNASUR, a new type of post-trade, politically and socially orientated regionalism is conceived in South America. The puzzle of and for some also the questionable functionality of UNASUR largely derive from the contradictive nature of the highly diverse sub-regional projects comprised in the union. Accordingly, out of twelve member-states, three of these members, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Ecuador, belong to the anti-US, anti-neoliberal, social and identity orientated union of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA). Four countries, Bolivia, Peru, Columbia, and Ecuador, currently belong to the customs union of the Andean Community of Nations (CAN), established in 1969. Six UNASUR members, Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Chile, belong to the trade-bloc, the Common Market of the South (Mercosur), established in 1991. Additionally, Columbia, Peru, and Chile, seek deeper economic integration in the stock exchange market, Mercado Integrado Latinoamericano (MILA)

from 2009 and the ensuing free trade union of the Pacific Alliance (PA), established in 2011. The majority of these sub-regional projects were conceived pre-UNASUR and the question of how and why such contradicting, even conflicting, interests have merged into a coherent regional instrument of governance and functionality of the same, has drawn endless scholarly criticism and bewilderment. It is pertinent to note that there are several more Latin American and Inter-American projects in play than the ones highlighted here. However, the acknowledgement of the above-listed sub-regional and inter-regional arrangements is sufficient for the scope of this research. Accordingly, the fact that so many sub-regional arrangements have taken part in shaping the regional institution of UNASUR will provide the analysis some solid insight into these diverse projects, which will allow a conclusion that addresses the criticism of South American regionalism of which UNASUR is a part, more broadly.

Second, South America is characterized as an “under-conflictual anomaly”<sup>8</sup> in the developing world by Buzan and Wæver. Indeed, while many domestic and interstate conflicts have persisted in the historical evolution of South America, the region is characterized by relatively few wars and threats of war.<sup>9</sup> As such, the void of traditional state-centric conceptions of security in the military realm provides a less obvious correlation between security dynamics and expressions of regional cooperation which makes UNASUR all the more interesting as the object for this research.

And third, South America’s geographical proximity to the world’s only superpower (a questionable fact today but a prevalent opinion in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War when the seed of UNASUR was planted) presupposes regional dynamics to be shaped by this unique proximity. Yet, as the US, unlike China or Russia, is largely considered a benign hegemonic power (again a debatable fact today but a prevalent opinion at the time), South American security dynamics are not generated from a US-posed threat of traditional territorial expansion or war. These factors combined make UNASUR an excellent object for this research. Following the presentation of the case-study, the literature review serves to highlight the current dominant interpretations of South American regionalism and the perceived short-comings of same.

---

<sup>8</sup> Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 304.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

## Literature Review: Theoretical Perspectives on Latin American Regionalism

Serving the purpose of this research, regions are tentatively understood as groupings of countries that may be characterized by shared goals, and/or sharing similar historical, religious and ethnical experiences, or cultural heritages.<sup>10</sup> As such, geographic spaces are not perceived as automatic contexts for the collective life characteristic of regions.<sup>11</sup> From here it follows that the concept of regionalism proposes a tendency for intensified cooperation through institutional or non-institutional, formal or informal interaction among countries who share some common characteristics, such as a common identity and common visions for and interests in cooperation.<sup>12</sup> The nature of regionalism has different dynamics and characteristics from one region to another but largely apply the common feature of varying degrees of integration.<sup>13</sup> The European experience has long served as the prototype for developing new theories of regionalism. Consequently, tracing the historical evolution of the EU, theories on European integration, e.g. neo-functionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism, have largely concerned themselves with the causal links between economic and political integration as a rational and irreversible process of gradual integrational spillover. Furthermore, Eurocentric theoretical explanations of integration have often been applied to regional projects around the world, serving as a comparative blueprint from where regionalism is characterized, explained, and assessed.<sup>14</sup> However, as Söderbaum argues, the focus on the European Union has created a false sense of universalism that does not sufficiently address the historical evolution, patterns, factors, and underlying dynamics that lead to the arrival of specific forms of regionalism and the functional purpose of the same.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, successful informal processes of economic integration, evident in regionalist projects such as the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), defy the logic of Eurocentric thought with its staunch opposition to political integration.<sup>16</sup> Also, the African Union (AU), with no economic integration to speak of, has long been discarded, from a European perspective, as an ineffective political rhetorical-only type of

---

<sup>10</sup> Nicholas J. Entrikin, "Regions and Regionalism", in *The Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, ed. John A. Agnew and David N. Livingstone (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2011), 344-356.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Frederik Söderbaum, "What's Wrong with Regional Integration? The Problem of Eurocentrism." *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*, 2013, IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc, 2013.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Masahiro Kawai, "East Asian Economic Regionalism: Progress and Challenges." *Journal of Asian Economics* 16, no. 1 (2005), 29-55.

regionalism.<sup>17</sup> In response to the fallacy of the universal application of Eurocentric theories, a plethora of anti-EU modelled theories with an extreme focus on regional particularities, have emerged to make sense of individual regional projects.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, the following serves to briefly clarify the key elements of the dominant theories that have emerged to make sense of the particular nature of Latin American regionalism.

### **Spaghetti Bowl Regionalism**

The perhaps not so refined metaphor of Spaghetti Bowl Regionalism in academia, addresses the conundrum of Latin American countries subscribing to multiple overlapping, sometimes contradictory, regional projects, and essentially questions the viability and meaning of South American regionalism.<sup>19</sup> Accordingly, the theory perceives the relentless proliferation of regional ventures and the, often, incompatible visions and policies of the 'Spaghetti Bowl' as diluting any chance of meaningful integration or collective decision-making.<sup>20</sup> According to Abugattas, the diversity of domestic political and economic interests and a fear of exclusion are the key drivers of the various incompatible regional projects.<sup>21</sup> The Spaghetti Bowl argument highlights the complexity of South American regionalism very well and scholars adhering to this perspective are often the most staunch critics of the various projects and UNASUR. However, the inherently negative connotation of the argument tends to ignore or overlook the role of South American regional initiatives in any positive developments that may have occurred e.g. transforming the state-legacy of military rule into solid democratic platforms.

---

<sup>17</sup> Daniel C Bach, "Africa in International Relations: The Frontier as Concept and Metaphor." *South African Journal of International Affairs* 20, no. 1 (2013), 1-22.

<sup>18</sup> Söderbaum.

<sup>19</sup> Malamud, Andrés, and Gian Luca Gardini. "Has Regionalism Peaked? The Latin American Quagmire and Its Lessons." *The International Spectator* 47, no. 1 (2012), 116-33.

<sup>20</sup> Richard E. Baldwin, "Multilateralising Regionalism: Spaghetti Bowls as Building Blocs on the Path to Global Free Trade." *World Economy* 29, no. 11 (2006), 1451-518.

<sup>21</sup> Luis Majluf Abugattas, "Swimming in the Spaghetti Bowl: Challenges for Developing Countries Under the "New Regionalism"." 27 (2004).

## New Regionalism

New Regionalism/Open Regionalism is an umbrella term for a large body of scholarly thought on the changing political and economic landscape inspired by meta-narratives stressing the triumph of neo-liberalism in a Post-Cold War regionally orientated context. Conversely, Old Regionalism/Closed Regionalism refers to the Cold War context where regionalism was characterized by attempts to insulate the region from outside competition by cultivating domestic industries and markets in order to break financial dependence on the core developed countries.<sup>22</sup> A shared perception on New Regionalism is the causal link between globalization and regionalism. Gamble & Payne, Söderbaum, and Hettne among others, identify New Regionalism as a primary response to economic globalization and the established hegemony of neo-liberalism.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, New Regionalism perspectives tend to focus on regionalism as an expression of the political influence and interests of key constituencies in shaping national preferences. Hveem identifies transnational regionalism as the result of either corporate or societal regionalization.<sup>24</sup> In accordance with this perspective, Bøås and Marchand de-emphasize the role of the state and identifies NGO's, Social Movements, and large companies, to name but some, as the core influential actors shaping region-building initiatives.<sup>25</sup> All in all, the common denominator of New regionalism is the interpretation of regionalism as the inherent result of globalization and neo-liberal hegemony.<sup>26</sup> Accordingly, the new architecture of Post-Cold War South American regionalism, most notably the sub-regional trade-blocs of Mercosur and the PA, has largely applied itself well to the narrative of New Regionalism. Also, the social movements resulting in the indigenous arrival into politics in Bolivia and Ecuador go some way to explain ALBA from this perspective. Yet, the post-trade agenda of South America reflected in both ALBA and UNASUR, openly contest the neo-liberal orthodoxy that provides the dominant rationale for theories on New Regionalism. In this sense, New Regionalism falls short in addressing other factors beyond market-based considerations in the arrival of specific forms of regionalism such as ALBA and UNASUR.

---

<sup>22</sup> Gian Gardini, "Towards Modular Regionalism: The Proliferation of Latin American Cooperation." *Revista Brasileira De Política Internacional* 58, no. 1 (2015), 210-229.

<sup>23</sup> Fredrik Söderbaum and Timothy M. Shaw, *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

<sup>24</sup> Söderbaum and Shaw, 83.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 197.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.



## Post-Liberal Regionalism

Contrary to theories on New Regionalism, Post-Liberal Regionalism finds its intellectual roots in the negative interpretation of the Latin American neoliberal experience and the ensuing return of the centrality of the state.<sup>27</sup> Scholars such as Sanahuja, Chodor and Mccarthy-Jones view Latin American Regionalism as expressions of the different reactions and subsequent alternative solutions to the perceived failure of neoliberalism in the late 1990s. Adding credence to this perspective, the post-trade agenda of both ALBA and UNASUR reflect a desire to move beyond the neoliberal recipe for integration.<sup>28</sup> However, if UNASUR is the sum of its parts, how do Mercosur and the creation of the PA fit into the equation if the unifying element of Latin American regionalism is a rejection of the neoliberal agenda? Moreover, as Gomez-Mera points out, the Latin American state has always and consistently remained central in responding to domestic and international pressures and so the theoretical emphasis on the return of state in Post-Liberal Regionalism, or the de-emphasis on the role of the state in New Regionalism, appear to be moot points.<sup>29</sup>

## Post-Hegemonic Regionalism

Conversely, Post-Hegemonic Regionalism finds its origin in a broader debate about the declining hegemony of the United States and the questions it generates about regionalism. Prominent scholars on Latin American regionalism, among them Riggiozzi and Briceño-Ruiz, have promptly equated the declining unipolar moment with the emergence of new regional arrangements, now understood as mechanisms to move away from US-led patterns of integration highlighted by the incorporation of strong normative dimensions.<sup>30 31</sup> Accordingly, the incentive for Latin American regionalism is linked to the perceived regional failure of neo-liberal policies and its corollary of open regionalism

---

<sup>27</sup> Tom Chodor and Anthea Mccarthy-Jones, "Post-Liberal Regionalism in Latin America and the Influence of Hugo Chávez." *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research* 19, no. 2 (2013), 211-23.

<sup>28</sup> Jose Antonio Sanahuja, *Post-Liberal Regionalism in South America: The Case of UNASUR* (EUI Working Papers: Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Research, 2012),

[http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/20394/RSCAS\\_2012\\_05.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/20394/RSCAS_2012_05.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

<sup>29</sup> Laura Gómez-Mera, *Power and Regionalism in Latin America: The Politics of MERCOSUR* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), 222-224.

<sup>30</sup> Pía Riggiozzi and Diana Tussie, "The Rise of Post-Hegemonic Regionalism," in *The Rise of Post-Hegemonic Regionalism: The Case of Latin America*, ed. Pia Riggiozzi and Diana Tussie (Dordrecht: Springer, 2012), 1-16

<sup>31</sup> José Briceño-Ruiz and Andrea Ribeiro Hoffmann, "Post-hegemonic Regionalism, UNASUR, and the Reconfiguration of Regional Cooperation in South America." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* (2015), 1-15.

and the subsequent new opportunities for autonomous agenda setting deriving from the relative decline of US influence.<sup>32</sup> Thus, regionalism in the post-hegemonic area (often depicted as driven by anti-US sentiments) proposes a recapture of the political space from Washington empowered by a post-trade model with a focus on political integration and welfare commitments, consistent with the idea that domestic drivers increasingly gain in importance over exogenous factors.<sup>33</sup> While UNASUR and ALBA in many respects have moved away from US-promoted models of regionalism, open regionalism and free trade still provide the founding pillars of most other integration schemes in South America and the US remain an important economic partner to many of the members of UNASUR. Therefore, post-hegemonic regionalism sheds no light on the missing links between the post-trade agenda of UNASUR and the continued embrace of open regionalism and free trade exhibited by most sub-regional initiatives and South American countries.

### **Third Wave Regionalism**

Like Post-Hegemonic Regionalism, Third Wave Regionalism transpires following the decline of US hegemony and the reconfiguration of the global polarity structure. The basic proposition of Third Wave Regionalism views regionalism as political projects within a counter-imperialist rationale and has largely been applied to the European Union.<sup>34</sup> Yet, the theory has been linked to explain key aspects of UNASUR, underpinned by an assumption of the union's potential to exercise a type of extra-regional actorness in shaping global governance.<sup>35</sup> The formulation of this type of regionalism rests on three principles:

---

<sup>32</sup> Pia Riggiozzi, "Region, Regionness and Regionalism in Latin America: Towards a New Synthesis." *New Political Economy* 17, no. 4 (2012), 421-443.

<sup>33</sup> Gardini, 214.

<sup>34</sup> Frederik Söderbaum, Patrik Stålgren and Luk Van Langenhove, "The EU as a Global Actor and the Dynamics of Interregionalism: A Comparative Analysis." *Journal of European Integration* 27, no. 3 (2005), 365-80.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

Firstly, regional organizations (but basically the EU) are increasingly engaged with out-of-area policies and concerns. Secondly, they are more and more active in inter-regional dealings and global agreements. Thirdly, regions become more actively involved in the United Nations.<sup>36</sup>

This understanding of regionalism may in itself shed some light on the international/global dimension of the aspirations for UNASUR, and perhaps even ALBA, but largely neglects the role, incentives, and aspirations of non-counter hegemonic organizations such as the PA, CAN, and Mercosur in shaping the regional structure of UNASUR.

Accordingly, in a South American context, a complex web of culture and identity, differing ideological persuasions and regional/global aspirations, contrasting economic models and asymmetrical development, sub-regional alliances, and conflicting views on US hegemony, characterize the countries comprised in UNASUR. While each of these theories profess some observable truths about individual South American regional projects, they fail to connect how the widely contrasting patterns of multiple region-building sub-alliances come together, leading to a complete reconfiguration of South American regionalism, and so they appear too rigid in their own explanations. South American regionalism is the sum of many contrasting, even conflictual, sub-regional narratives and the purpose of this research is to make sense of how these narratives fit together in UNASUR, or in other words, connecting the dots between the observable truths for a coherent understanding of UNASUR and the underlying security dynamics generating South American regionalism. Accordingly, this research proposes to investigate how and why contrasting regional visions and projects come together in UNASUR from a security perspective, to see if this approach offers an alternative and better understanding of South American regionalism. This is not to claim that existing perspectives on Latin American regionalism neglect to incorporate security aspects, as most theories to varying degrees' touch upon context-driven security patterns as they arise. The impact of US presence in the region or interstate-conflict, for example, are often presented as a supplementing dimension of theoretical explanations of particular projects such as ALBA, yet rarely considered relevant in the interpretation of trade projects such as Mercosur. Still,

---

<sup>36</sup> Gardini, 215.

none of these perspectives places an emphasis on security as the underlying key-component to questions of why regional projects form, why some evolve, why some do not, why some rupture, or why some fail in the study of Latin American regionalism. Accordingly, this research proposes to investigate the role of regional security dynamics in regionalism.

Thus, to facilitate this research, the help of Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver and their theoretical framework, Regional Security Complex theory (RSCT) is enlisted. The theoretical framework is chosen from its intended ability to map the security dynamics, or in RSCT language, the regional security complexes (RSCs) of the worlds' regions. However, it is important to point out that RSCs are not to be confused with regionalism, yet the structure of RSCs is here expected to inform a coherent understanding of regionalism, as regionalism is conceived within, and as this research proposes, by these structures. While the larger theoretical framework is elaborated in the theoretical chapter, the ontological underpinnings of the theory will be accounted for here.

## Methodology

### **Ontological underpinnings of RSCT**

Accordingly, the following research aims to investigate whether it is meaningful to think of transnational regionalism as a response to, and as shaped by, patterns of security practices. Setting aside geographical proximity, regions are viewed as social constructs that are contingent on the security practice of actors. If it is accepted that regions are socially constructed and thereby politically contested, regional dynamics are subject to constant reconfiguration. As such, global causes, e.g. a financial collapse leading to conflict and disintegration in some regions, may provide the incentive for stronger integration in other regions. To grasp the meaning of such outcomes, the security dynamics among actors become central to the understanding of regional projects

In RSCT, regions are understood as socially constructed by their members and the ways in which their processes of (de)securitization are linked together in RSCs. RSCs, a theoretical construct coined by Barry Buzan, are defined as groups of countries that possess “a degree of security interdependence sufficient both to establish them as a linked set and to differentiate them from

surrounding security regions”.<sup>37</sup>As such, RSCs are conceptualized as structures that modify and mediate the action and interaction of units.<sup>38</sup> The theory rests on a synthesis between realist and constructivist interpretations of security interaction. Realism builds on the assumption that threats are aligned with state interests and has traditionally emphasized military issues as the dominant elements of security. Power maximization is viewed as the domestic driver of state behaviour relative to the anarchical structure of the international system and the threats this structure proposes to territorial and political security. A returning critique of realisms’ focus on the global level, rather than the regional one, is in this theory mediated by the constructivist understanding of security. Accordingly, constructivists emphasize the context and process in which security is constituted. From a constructivist perspective, anarchy is in itself meaningless if not interpreted through a set of intersubjective norms shared by actors.<sup>39</sup> As such, RSCT moves away from the realist paradigm of state/global interaction to focus more on interaction at the regional level. Moreover, constructivist readings of regional interaction emphasize the role of ideology, culture, identity, norms, ideas, and/or other shared understandings in the construction of security issues.<sup>40</sup> Along those lines, RSCT moves away from traditional military processes of securitization to encompass democracy and human rights, food and poverty, economic development, health, culture, the environment, and other non-traditional issues of security. Thus, processes of (de)securitization are created by the interaction of internal/external conditions and the individuals/groups who respond to them. Issues of security do not exist independently but are always questions about what issues are securitized by whom, when and under what conditions.<sup>41</sup>

### **Epistemological Considerations**

The RSCT framework in its application proposes the philosophical position of critical realism. Unlike positivists, who take the position that the Scientist’s understanding of reality is an actual reflection of reality, critical realists acknowledge that the categories they employ to understand

---

<sup>37</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 47-48.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>39</sup> Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992), 396.

<sup>40</sup> Michael C. Williams, "World, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics," *International Studies Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (December 2003), 514

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

reality are likely to be provisional.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, unlike positivists, critical realists are content to allow theoretical terms not directly amenable to observations into their explanations.<sup>43</sup> Hypothetical entities or ‘generative mechanisms’ accounting for regularities in the social or natural orders are admissible for realists.<sup>44</sup> Generative mechanisms are characterized as “the entities and processes that are constitutive of the phenomenon of interest”<sup>45</sup>. Accordingly, the critical realist accepts the observable effects of the generative mechanism even if the mechanism itself is not observable, making the context that interacts with the observable effects of these mechanisms a crucial variable.<sup>46</sup> The context sheds light on the conditions that promote or obstruct the operation of the causal mechanism from where the identification of generative mechanisms offers the prospect of introducing changes to the status quo.<sup>47</sup> The reasoning involved in the identification of generative mechanisms is referred to as retroductive reasoning which entails “making an inference about the causal mechanisms that lie behind and is responsible for regularities that are observed in the social world”<sup>48</sup>.

Furthermore, it was the late Max Weber who described the modern social sciences as “science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action in order to arrive at a causal explanation of its cause and effects”<sup>49</sup>. Action is considered social by virtue of the subjective meaning attached to it by the acting being, insofar as it takes into account the behaviour of others and from there is oriented in its course.<sup>50</sup> Following this, Alfred Schutz’ often quoted position on the subject states that social reality “has specific meaning and relevance structure for the beings living, acting, and thinking within it”<sup>51</sup>. The human experience of social reality is thus pre-selected and pre-interpreted by a series of common-sense constructs and it is these “thought objects” that determine and motivate the behavior of human subjects.<sup>52</sup> Accordingly, in order to grasp this reality, the construction of thought objects by the social scientist has to be founded upon the thought objects constructed by the people living within their own common-sense structured social reality.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Alan Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 29.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), 88.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Bryman, 30.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

Along those lines, the constructivist element of RSCT enables the researcher to bypass the ontological entanglement of identifying what objectively constitutes a threat and encourage an interpretive understanding of the cause and effect of security-driven social action. Also, the musings behind this research proposal transpires from a returning puzzling question, namely, if the cause of security dynamics is constructed by a social actor's subjective meanings attached to the behavior of other actors, may the social action of regionalism or lack of same not be viewed as the effect oriented in its course by these dynamics? In this respect, the hermeneutic- phenomenological tradition that emphasizes social action as being meaningful to social actors and thus needs to be interpreted from the point of the actor, underpins a stream of thought referred to as interpretivism, which serves as the epistemological position on this research.

### **Sources and Method of Collecting Data**

Both the scope of and timeline for this research predominantly focussing on the years between 1990 and 2008, underpins that this thesis predominantly relies on qualitative information from secondary sources, and to a much smaller degree, quantitative, data. The chosen theoretical framework is the brainchild of Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver from the Copenhagen School, both accredited and influential scholars within the academic stream of international relations and the sub-field of security studies. The design, concepts, and categories of the RSCT framework are the bearing structural elements of the analysis. Following this, the framework proposes to write up structural history and to aid this process this research relies on J.A.S. Greenville's, 'A History of the World' and, even more so, on Edwin Williamson's critically acclaimed work, 'The Penguin History of Latin America'. Furthermore, the analysis builds upon arguments, findings, and/or observations made by prominent scholars on Latin American regionalism, integration, and development, including Pia Riggirozzi, Diana Tussie, and José Briceño-Ruiz, who all adhere to what is characterized as an optimistic research agenda on Latin American regionalism. To establish a consensus on events from where to build a credible argument, the optimist perspective is assessed from a point of convergence with arguments advanced by renowned sceptics on Latin American regionalism, among others notably Andrés Malamud, Richard Baldwin, and Majluf Abugattas. Moreover, a few primary sources such as the constitutive treaty of UNASUR and quantitative data collected from the World Bank are used or referred to when they provide relevant support.

However, these primary sources are not bearing elements of the analysis. Finally, news articles are necessary secondary sources of information since the analysis in large parts seeks to incorporate actual framings of security or reported details on security issues in context-specific situations. Using news outlets as credible secondary sources is sometimes a risky affair, and therefore any direct quotes or specific details described after the given event by the news sources used, are cross-referenced with other news articles to establish the quote or details as valid and correct in the form presented. In itself, a cross-referencing method for collecting credible empirical data from the news media weeds out any potential political or social bias that may characterize certain media outlets. Accordingly, when possible, credible Latin American news outlets, such as MercoPress and TeleSUR, are favoured albeit other equally credible news outlets like the New York Times and the Washington Post are consulted.

### **Method of Analysis and Interpretation**

RSCT provides a comprehensive and complex four-level framework from where to systematically organize empirical evidence around a coherent set of interrelated categories and concepts. The framework serves to analyse the security constellation of any given RSC through a thorough examination of the interrelated security dynamics between the domestic level (notably their vulnerabilities), regional level (state to state relations), interregional level (regional interaction with neighboring regions), and global level (the role of regional and/or global powers in the region). Following constructivist thought, the theory shifts away from old state-centric conceptions of security to encompass processes of (de)securitization, not only in the military realm but also in the economic, environmental, social, and not least, political spheres.

The framework structures the analysis in the following way. The first two levels compose a write-up of structural history in which key developments in domestic and state-to-state relations are analysed. The subsequent analysis is structured around the key-findings and questions arising from the preliminary historical analysis and the guiding inputs from secondary sources that address these findings and questions. A consistent element of the analysis is a constant weaving back and forth between history and context-specific events while using the theoretical tools and concepts provided by the framework to make sense of all these inputs. Following the ontological underpinnings, the constructivist approach serves to identify processes of securitization, while the analytical tools and



concepts borrowed from the realist school of thought interpret the cause and effects of these processes.

The theory offers a conceptual frame for thinking about processes of regionalism in the context of a wider security agenda. RSCT enables the researcher to analyse, explain, and to some degree anticipate developments within a region if necessary for the objective of the research. In its empirical application, RSCT provides a framework which links historical factors with contemporary events to identify the most important referent objects for security and how these contribute to the evolution of a given RSC and the overall dynamics shaping regional integration. The following chapter will elaborate in detail on the interrelated variables, concepts and modes of analysis comprised in the broad theoretical framework chosen for this research.

## Theoretical Chapter: Regional Security Complex Theory

### **RSCT Framework**

While RSCT is applicable to all regions in the world, it seeks not to test a single formal relationship of cause and effect but rather acknowledges the individuality of each region. The framework thus allows a focus on the particularities and contradictions of the interrelated national, regional, interregional, and global dynamics which, according to Buzan and Wæver, decide the fate of distinctive regional congregates.<sup>54</sup> The analytical power of the RSCT framework stems from its intended ability to map out the security constellation of a given region by dissecting, both the historical and contemporary fabrics that forms, transforms, influences, and/or hinders the formation of RSCs. This, in return, enables an understanding of the relationship between cause and effect generating the regional dynamics that shapes the structure of RSCs.<sup>55</sup>

Thus, as established so far, descriptive RSCT produces an overarching framework, applicable to all types of regional arrangements and appropriate to the understanding of regions in their own right. The theory emphasizes what to look for at the domestic, regional, interregional, and global level and

---

<sup>54</sup> Buzan and Wæver

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

how to interrelate these four levels to map the security constellation of a given region. The four levels are:

1. domestically in the states of the region, particularly their domestically generated vulnerabilities (is the state strong or weak due to stability of the domestic order and correspondence between state and nation (Buzan 1991b)? The specific vulnerability of a state defines the kind of security fears it has (Wæver 1989) – and sometimes makes another state or group of states a structural threat even if it or they have no hostile intentions);
2. state-to-state relations (which generate the region as such);
3. the region's interaction with neighbouring regions (this is supposed to be *relatively* limited given that the complex is defined by interaction internally being more important. But if major changes in the patterns of security interdependence that define complexes are underway, this level can become significant, and in situations of gross asymmetries a complex without global powers that neighbours one with a global power can have strong interregional links in one direction); and finally
4. the role of global powers in the region (the interplay between the global and regional security structures).

Taken together, these four levels constitute the security constellation (Buzan et al. 1998:201ff.).<sup>56</sup>

Thus, to define a given area as an RSC, defined practices of (de)securitization need to be present between the members of that area. Moreover, as social constructs, RSCs are durable but not permanent and thereby subject to change depending on “the relative depth or shallowness of the way in which the social structure of security is internalised by the actors involved”<sup>57</sup>. By mapping the security constellation, the strengths and weaknesses of and the influencing factors on, the members of a given area, reveal the structure of the RSC in question. For all sakes and purposes, as issues of security travel better over short distances, South America's relative geographical isolation

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 481.

at the global level and its proximity to the world's only superpower, presupposes the global level as relevant only in relation to the United States. As the United States' historically has considered Latin America its sphere of influence, patterns of security practices shaped by this proximity are deemed to transpire in all levels of analysis and therefore, the domestic, state-to-state, regional, and interregional levels subsume the analysis of the global level in this research.

### **RSCT: Main Structural Features**

Subsequently, RSCs are defined by durable patterns of amity and enmity which take the form of "subglobal, geographically coherent patterns of security interdependence"<sup>58</sup>. The distinctive character of RSCs are often shaped by historical factors such as longstanding enmities in state to state relations (e.g. Khmers/Vietnamese or Greeks/Turks), or a common cultural embrace of a civilization area (e.g. Europeans or Arabs).<sup>59</sup> RSCs emerge from the interplay between the anarchic structure and its balance-of-power consequences and the pressures of geographical proximity.<sup>60</sup> Adjacency is potent for security as most threats travel better over shorter distances than over long distances.<sup>61</sup> According to Buzan and Wæver, "the impact of geographical proximity on security interaction is the strongest and most obvious in the military, political, societal, and environmental sectors"<sup>62</sup> though much less consistent in the economic sector.<sup>63</sup> In sum, the essential structure of an RSC embodies the following variables:

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 45-46.

1. boundary, which differentiates the RSC from its neighbours;
2. anarchic structure, which means that the RSC must be composed of two or more autonomous units;
3. polarity, which covers the distribution of power among the units; and
4. social construction, which covers the patterns of amity and enmity among the units.<sup>64</sup>

Accordingly, ‘polarity’ and ‘balance-of-power’ are two of the main analytical components in RSCT. Polarity is investigated at the regional and interregional level. At all levels, the balance-of-power is categorized as either unipolar, bi-, tri-, or multipolar, depending on the number of powers, or institutions with actor quality, with the ability to influence other less powerful members of the RSC, either from within (the regional level) or from the outside (the interregional or global level).<sup>65</sup> Following this, the capabilities and wide-ranging interests of superpowers imply that they largely transcend the logic of adjacency in their security relationships and as such, tend to override the regional imperative.<sup>66</sup> At the opposite end of the power spectrum are states whose limited capabilities confine their security interests to their closest neighbours, which tend to reinforce the regional imperative.<sup>67</sup> Accordingly, while states with less capabilities tend to lock themselves to their neighbours in clusters of RSCs, great powers typically penetrate one or more adjacent regions and superpowers range globally.<sup>68</sup> Thus, the link between the overarching pattern of distribution of power between global powers and regional RSCs is the mechanism of ‘penetration’ or in the extreme form, ‘overlay’. To elaborate, patterns of amity and enmity in RSCs, are typically generated internally by a mixture of history, material conditions, and politics.<sup>69</sup> Penetration occurs when external powers make security alignments with states within an RSC, often as the result of domestic or state-to-state rivalries that either demand external penetration (intervention), or simply provide the instability necessary for external powers to project their self-interests into regional dynamics.<sup>70</sup> In some cases, penetration may merely impinge on or support existing enmities. In other cases, penetration may alter otherwise amicable relations and become the cause of new rivalries.

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 62.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

Conversely, overlay is operationalized as the ultimate penetration by an external power, dominating the overall security structure of a region and thereby preventing autonomous patterns of security to form, causing regional fragmentation.<sup>71</sup> However, the concept of overlay is predominantly relevant in a colonial or Cold War context. Accordingly:

The standard form for an RSC is a pattern of rivalry, balance-of-power, and alliance patterns among the main powers *within* the region: to this pattern can then be added the effects of penetrating external powers.<sup>72</sup>

Finally, relations of ‘amity and enmity’ are important components of the overall social structure of an RSC. Historical friendships and hatreds combined with explicit events triggering cooperation or conflict, are all components of the constellation that define an RSC. In this sense, (sub)regional integration and/or multilateral institutionalism often emerge as a balance-of-power initiative stemming from a perceived threat from, either, internal actors (GUAM to balance Russia or EU to contain Germany) or external actors (ALBA in reaction to the US or ASEAN as a bulwark against communism). While history, religion, culture, and geography are contributing factors to patterns of amity and enmity, these relationships are, to a large extent, path-dependent and therefor become their own best explanation.<sup>73</sup> Any shifts in the structural components will result in a redefinition of the complex.

### **Sub-complexes**

A sub-complex is characterized as a ‘half-level’ embedded within a larger regional RSC and is defined in the same terms as RSCs.<sup>74</sup> Sub-complexes have distinctive patterns of security interdependence that often overlap, and sometimes directly affects, the wider pattern defining the RSC as a whole. Accordingly, depending on its power and regional ambition, a sub-complex may

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 67.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 51.

shape, dictate, or disrupt the structure of the security constellation of the wider RSC.<sup>75</sup> Sub-complexes are neither necessary features of RSCs, nor are they uncommon. However, upon the presence of one or more sub-complexes within an RSC, they become essential elements for analysis. In the context of this research, the identification of any sub-complex RSCs in the vast array of regional arrangements in South America, and the significance of these in relation to UNASUR are thus imperative for the analysis.

### **Strong and Weak States**

The structure of an RSC is highly shaped by the relative strengths and weaknesses of its members. In this context, strength is measured against “the degree of socio-political cohesion between civil society and the institutions of government”<sup>76</sup>. The better the cohesion between civil society and government is, the stronger the state is, why threats are less likely to come from within.<sup>77</sup> Conversely, weak states lack much in the way of empirical sovereignty and are more likely to be forums in which sub-state actors compete for their own security or in extreme cases, attempt to overthrow the government.<sup>78</sup> Accordingly, weak states tend to have more internal threats e.g. increasing poverty, autocratic governance, or civil disobedience, as a lack of cohesion between state and society make them fragile and divided. Thus, as weak states tend to focus predominantly on domestic security, they are much more vulnerable to most types of external threats and penetration compared to their stronger counterparts. However, no regions are composed entirely of weak or strong states but typically a mixture of both. The classification of strong and weak states offers a way to make sense of the interplay between types of states and types of security dynamics and provides some essential explanatory leverage when mapping the security constellation of particular regions.

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

## The classification of States

Following closely the trajectory of the strong/weak spectrum, the classification of states emerges. States are classified in three types: postmodern, modern, and premodern states. Accordingly, the postmodern state is a relatively new phenomenon. Postmodern states are mainly concentrated in the capitalist core and they are all pluralistic and democratic with an open and tolerant attitude towards cultural, economic, and political interaction. All postmodern states are within the strong state end of the spectrum and have all opened their economies and, perhaps to a lesser extent, their politics and societies to a wider range of interactions.<sup>79</sup> Postmodern states are more prone to securitize the transnational interaction in the political, cultural, and economic spheres through integration and interdependence (the European Union being the epitome of this development) and are rarely driven by traditional military security concerns, e.g. armed invasions.<sup>80</sup> For the strong postmodern state, globalization is viewed “as its principal generator and beneficiary”<sup>81</sup> though issues such as “migration, terrorism, economic cycles, ‘democratic deficits’, and sovereignty”<sup>82</sup> reveal that they also feel threatened by it.

Conversely, modern states are considered the most common type of state in the world. Accordingly, the classification as such applies to states that vary considerably along the strong/weak spectrum. Based on a strong sense of territoriality, modern states tend to securitize in inside/outside terms.<sup>83</sup> The modern state is generally viewed as having a solid governmental control of civil society and both democratic (e.g. Singapore, India) and totalitarian states (e.g. China) may be classified as modern states.<sup>84</sup> Moreover, the modern states’ borders define a closure towards outside influences and their sovereignty is sacrosanct.<sup>85</sup> However, while transnational ‘openness’ in the political, cultural, and to a lesser extent, economic spheres, is approached with caution and scepticism, the modern state often embraces trade policies and development strategies.<sup>86</sup> For modern states, globalization poses the dual threat of exclusion and inclusion. Exclusion is predominantly a threat to modern states adjacent to the postmodern core (e.g. Turkey or Mexico), as exclusion relegates

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

these states to second-class status and denies them many of the benefits reserved for members of the core.<sup>87</sup> Conversely, to modern states, the threat of inclusion arises from “conflicts between their indigenous cultural and development projects on the one hand, and outside influences and penetrations on the other”<sup>88</sup>. For the modern state, economic and political relations with the premodern core, either in the shape of aid, recognition and/or trade, may be conditional on legal reforms, adherence to norms of multiparty democracy, human rights performance, fewer restrictions on the movement of capital and goods, and other issues that compromise the sovereignty of the modern state.<sup>89</sup>

Finally, at the opposite end of the spectrum we find what can loosely be categorized as the premodern states. Sprinkled throughout the third world, most notably in Central Asia and Africa, premodern states are defined by poorly developed structures of government and low levels of socio-political cohesion.<sup>90</sup> The premodern state is either a failed state, or a state incapable of consolidating itself as a modern state, why all premodern states are classified as weak states.<sup>91</sup> Premodern states are extremely vulnerable and processes of securitization have often moved away from the state to sub-state actors.<sup>92</sup> The threat of globalization to the premodern state emerges from the danger that they may not continue to be internationally recognized as legitimate and capable of self-government, or conversely, they may simply be neglected and allowed to fall into complete chaos.<sup>93</sup> All of the types of states mentioned in the above have their security dynamics shaped both by their regional environment and the international system.

## **RSC Typologies**

RSCs are classified as either centred or standard RSCs. A centred RSC is either a security complex dominated by a regional power/superpower, or a multilateral institutionalized complex sufficiently integrated to have actor quality at the global level.<sup>94</sup> Conversely, three types of standard RSCs exist:

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 489.



conflict formations, security regimes, and security communities. An RSC in conflict formation is characterized by patterns of security interdependence shaped by fear of invasion and the use of violence in political relations.<sup>95</sup> As such, an RSC in conflict formation is highly susceptible to penetration and outside intervention. Security regimes likewise demonstrate patterns of security interdependence shaped by fear of war and expectations of violence in political relations. However, the fears of the security regime are restrained by agreed upon rules of conduct and the expectation that these rules are observed.<sup>96</sup> According to Buzan and Wæver:

Standard RSCs may undergo external or internal transformations. It is difficult to imagine a standard RSC moving directly to integration or conversely, unravelling back to an unstructured region (albeit not impossible if e.g. environmental disasters or interstate wars greatly weakened all units in the RSC).<sup>97</sup>

Conversely, a security community is characterized by patterns of security interdependence in which units do not expect the use of violence, nor prepare for the use of force in their political relations with each other.<sup>98</sup> As such, an RSC in security community form may transform itself into a centred RSC or a plausible new actor through the creation of institutions.<sup>99</sup> Moreover, “a centred great power, unipolar, or super power RSC may do the same though most likely more coercively”<sup>100</sup>. Finally, “Sub-complexes in RSCs serve as markers for potential regional fragmentation if the overarching issues tying the sub-complexes together, fade away”<sup>101</sup>. The analytical element of the classification of weak/strong, modern, pre-/postmodern states, standard and centred RSCs, serves to pinpoint the structural strength and vulnerability of a complex, from where to investigate the subsequent effects and potential consequences of such. Moreover, it guides the analysis by mapping the power relationships among the units at the regional level.

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 491-491.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 491.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

From its configuration, there are three possible evolutions to an RSC:

1. *maintenance of the status quo*, which means there are no significant changes in the essential structure;
2. *internal transformation*, which means that changes in essential structure occur *within* the context of its existing outer boundary. This could mean changes to the anarchic structure (because of regional integration); to polarity (because of disintegration, merger, conquest, differential growth rates, or suchlike); or to dominant patterns of amity/enmity (because of ideological shifts, war-weariness, changes of leadership, etc.); and
3. *external transformation*, which means that the outer boundary expands or contracts, changing the membership of the RSC, and most probably transforming its essential structure in other ways. The most obvious way for this to happen is if two RSCs merge, ...; or less often two RSCs splitting out from one.<sup>102</sup>

The possible evolutions of RSCs as outlined here, are typically applied to the predictive phase of the analysis. However, the predictive dimension falls outside the objective of this research. However, the typically predictive dimension of this theory will still be utilized to serve a different purpose. Namely to guide the analytical focus towards the internal transformations of the South American RSC that inevitably will have occurred in order for the external transformation that enabled the establishment of UNASUR to have occurred. Thus, concludes the outline of the framework from where this research will be conducted. The following chapter will now account for the long process and changing objectives between the initial minimalist proposal to unite the region through trade, to the final result of the post-trade regional institution of UNASUR.

## Case: UNASUR

In May 2008, a new era of South American regionalism began when representatives from twelve nations came together to formally establish the intergovernmental regional organization: The Union of South American Nations (UNASUR). With the launch of UNASUR, a more than a decade long

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 52.

process of regional negotiations about the purpose and principle objectives of such a union, had come to its conclusion. The process was set in motion in 1993, when former Brazilian President, Itamar Franco, put forth a proposal to create a South American Free Trade Area (SAFTA).<sup>103</sup> The SAFTA agenda was minimal in scope and limited to the promotion of free trade only, by excluding any considerations for mechanisms for common regional industrial development or social integration. The proposal essentially mirrored Brazil's idea of autonomy, a pillar of their foreign policy rejecting economic and political intervention and regionalism taking the form of a supranational decision-making body.<sup>104</sup>

Throughout the 1990s, Brazil pursued to negotiate a regional free trade agreement but by the end of the decade, the region was in turmoil. Accordingly, 1998 saw Brazil falling into a severe economic depression, which heavily affected its neighbouring trade-partners in the southern part of the region. Meanwhile, in the northern part of the region, the relationship between Venezuela and Columbia had become increasingly hostile. In this changing regional environment, the then President Fernando Henrique Cardoso of Brazil, called for a regional summit in 2000 to discuss the issues of democracy, stability, development, and peace in South America.<sup>105</sup> At the summit, a shift in the paradigm of Brazilian foreign policy was evident when Cardoso proposed to extend the SAFTA agenda beyond trade under the new heading of 'autonomy by integration'<sup>106</sup>. Though free trade remained at the core of the proposal, the new project included four additional pillars to the construction of a South American regional space: "democracy; physical and infrastructure integration; the combat against drug trafficking; and information, knowledge, and technology"<sup>107</sup>. Four important decisions came out of this summit: to set up a system of regional political and economic cooperation which essentially meant the creation of a regional free trade area; the initiative for the integration of the regional infrastructure of South America (IIRSA) to optimize the conditions for free trade; democracy to serve as a prerequisite to be part of the project; and the development of mechanisms to combat organized crime.<sup>108</sup> In 2004, the Brazilian integration

---

<sup>103</sup> José Briceño-Ruiz, "From the South American Free Trade Area to the Union of South American Nations: The Transformations of a Rising Regional Process." *Latin American Policy* 1, no. 2 (2010), 208-229.

<sup>104</sup> Andrés Malamud, "Moving Regions: Brazil's Global Emergence and the Redefinition of Latin American Borders," in *The Rise of Post-Hegemonic Regionalism: The Case of Latin America*, ed. Pia Riggirozzi and Diana Tussie (Dordrecht: Springer, 2012), 167-187.

<sup>105</sup> Briceño-Ruiz.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 214.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*

scheme was penned into a declaration of intent, announcing the foundation of the South American Community of Nations (SACN).

However, coinciding with the founding years of SACN, oil-rich Venezuela experienced a significant increase in its economic prowess, and from 2004 onwards, former President Hugo Chávez started to play an increasingly dominant role in Latin American integration initiatives.<sup>109</sup> While Chávez position on a South American integration process was favourable, he reserved some criticism for the SACN project. First, Chávez was displeased with the name “South American Community of Nations” as he did not believe it to reflect the force of unity he envisioned for South American integration and instead he proposed the term “Union of the South” (UNASUR).<sup>110</sup> Second, Chávez vehemently objected to the Brazilian focus on trade as the dominant mechanism for regional integration.<sup>111</sup> With the 2005 victory of Evo Morales in Bolivia, the criticism of SACN increased even further. The newly elected Bolivian President soon shared his frank views on the SACN project in an “open letter” in which he stated:

Our integration is and should be the integration of and for the people. Trade, energy integration, infrastructure, and funding should aim at solving the larger problems of poverty and destruction of nature in our region. We cannot reduce the South American Community to an association to build road projects or loans that end up favouring the sectors related primarily to the global market. Our goal must be to forge a real integration to “good living.”<sup>112</sup>

The idea of the “good living” (buen vivir) the Bolivian President subscribed to, derives from an indigenous worldview in which individual rights are subjugated to those of peoples, communities, and nature.<sup>113</sup> A defining characteristic of the worldview is harmony between human beings and between human beings and nature.<sup>114</sup> As a political philosophy, Morales invoked “Buen Vivir” as a criticism to capitalism, a view that resonated well with Chávez who repeatedly referred to neo-

---

<sup>109</sup>Max Azicri, "The Castro-Chávez Alliance." *Latin American Perspectives* 36, no. 1 (2009), 99-110.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 219.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 220.

<sup>113</sup> Eduardo Gudynas, "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow." *Development* 54, no. 4 (2011), 441-447.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*

liberalism and the capitalist system as the “road to hell”<sup>115</sup>. In the 2006 Cochabamba summit in Bolivia, the minimalist proposal advocated for by the Brazilian government was confronted by a maximalist proposal which included mechanisms for social and productive integration and a political and environmental agenda, largely driven by Chávez and Morales and supported by newly elected President of Ecuador, Rafael Correa, as well as the governments of Paraguay and Uruguay respectively.<sup>116</sup> An agreement was eventually reached to further enlarge the South American integration agenda, effectively launching the transformation of SACN into UNASUR.

In 2007, the heads of state once again convened, to initiate negotiations of the objectives, mechanisms, juridical character, and institutional structure of the newly renamed UNASUR. The resulting treaty came into effect at the May 2008 summit in Brasilia, officially establishing UNASUR. The finalized objectives of the union proposed a very different model of integration than the original SACN project intended. Accordingly, the member states agreed to coordinate a variety of specific issues regarding energy, health, social development, the strengthening of democracy, elections, education, culture, science, technology, and innovation, citizen security, justice, economy and finances, infrastructure, and the coordination of actions against transnational organized crime with an emphasis on the drug trade.<sup>117</sup> However, market and trade liberalization were no longer the sacrosanct end-game of the union but were rather articulated as a means to a higher end. As such, point I of article 3 of the treaty states the objective of UNASUR as:

Economic and trade cooperation to achieve progress and consolidation of an innovative, dynamic, transparent, fair, and balanced process, allowing for effective access, promoting growth and economic development to overcome asymmetries through complementarity of the economies of South American countries, and promoting the welfare of all sectors of the population and reducing poverty.<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> Briceño-Ruiz, 222.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>117</sup> “South American Union of Nations Constitutive Treaty,” April 1, 2009, <http://studentorgs.law.smu.edu/getattachment/International-Law-Review-Association/Resources/LBRA-Archive/15-2/SMB213.pdf.aspx>

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*

Likewise, the IIRSA initiative, originally proposed in SACN as a development plan for better regional infrastructure to facilitate the flow of free trade, was formulated in article 3, point E as: “Development of an infrastructure for the interconnection of the region and between our peoples, based on criteria of sustainable social and economic development”<sup>119</sup>. As such, two of the key pillars of SACN were re-framed, now to support the greater social objectives in the new context of UNASUR.

Moreover, in December 2008 at the initial request of Brazil, a South American Defence Council (CDS/SADC) was added as a key sectorial council of UNASUR.<sup>120</sup> The objectives of the CDS was to establish a zone of peace in the region and to create an independent identity for the region in all defence matters.<sup>121</sup> Furthermore, it sought to reinforce regional cooperation for the strengthening and protection of democracy and the sovereign control of natural resources.<sup>122</sup> The action plan of the CDS, adopted in March 2009, included the lines: military cooperation, defence policies, humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping operations, defence industry and technology, defence education and training.<sup>123</sup> Consequently, the objectives of UNASUR had progressed from the minimalist economic articulations of SAFTA, towards an integrated level of cooperation based predominantly on the social aspects of integration. With the conception of UNASUR, South America for the first time in history transformed into a single actor.

Thus, with a firm grasp on the transforming proposals and visions that characterizes the long road leading to the conception of UNASUR, the analytical chapter now follows. The object of this research establishes the years between the SAFTA proposal to the final establishment of UNASUR as the dominant focus. Considering their strong political and cultural link to their Caribbean counterparts, UNASUR members, Guyana and Suriname of the Andean North are omitted in the following analysis as they are perceived to have stronger links with the Central-American and Caribbean RSC. As such, their significance in the South American RSC is deemed irrelevant in the context of this research. Furthermore, following a brief historical prelude, the analysis is structured around a pre-analytical element in which a historical analysis of key-developments and characteristics of the individual states and state-to-state interaction in the given timeframe are

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Babjee Pothuraju, “UNASUR and Security in South America,” *Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses*, October 30, 2012, <http://www.idsa.in/backgrounder/UNASURandSecurityinSouthAmerica>

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Pothurajo.

explored. The pre-analytical element then serves as the foundation for the remaining regional and interregional levels of this analysis.

## Analytical Chapter

### **Historical Prelude**

The early 19th century saw the Iberian occupation of South America coming to an end after centuries of overlay. The newly independent countries soon replaced colonial rule with dictatorships and authoritarian forms of government leaving the region in conflict formation. The following century witnessed the struggling autonomous countries wrestling with domestic and transnational political unrest unfolding as a buffet of riots, border disputes, political assassinations, guerrilla wars, civil wars, and coups d'états, typically executed by the military.<sup>124</sup> Though most of the South American countries, at one point or another, attempted governance of democratic nature, they continually succumbed to authoritarian modes of governance and the region remained in conflict formation for nearly two centuries.<sup>125</sup>

### **The Cold War**

Following the Great Depression of the 1930's, the majority of Latin American countries, in a bid to free themselves from the permanent economic disadvantage and vulnerability of foreign dependency on industrialized countries, adopted import-substituting industrialization (ISI) as a new strategy for economic development. Meanwhile, in the political sphere, the United States, armed with the Monroe Doctrine from 1823 which essentially asserted Latin America as a US sphere of influence, expected unwavering loyalty in the emergent Cold War in return for the flow of US loans and investments necessary to finance the Latin American reorientation towards ISI.<sup>126</sup> Eager to demonstrate such loyalty, the Latin American countries penned their signature to the 1948 US-led mutual defence

---

<sup>124</sup> Edwin Williamson, *The Penguin History of Latin America* (London: Penguin Group, 2009).

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> J.A.S. Greenville, *A History of the World: From the 20<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>st</sup> Century* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

treaty, establishing the Organization of American States (OAS).<sup>127</sup> As a consequence of Cold War penetration, Latin America witnessed a renewed insurgence of military dictatorships, many of which received backing from the United States in its quest to secure its ‘backyard’ against communist penetration.<sup>128</sup> As US political advisor to the Truman administration, George F. Kennan, asserted: “it is better to have a strong regime in power than a liberal government if it is indulgent and relaxed and penetrated by Communists”<sup>129</sup>. As a result, Latin American underground movements, frustrated with their nations inequalities and the hypocrisy of democracy-promoting Washington’s covert support of right-wing dictatorships in the region, found hope in the tenets of Marxism.<sup>130</sup>

## Post-Cold War

In the 1980s, coinciding with the implosion of state-led ISI sweeping the region into unmanageable debt and horrific violence, South America experienced a multiple collapse of the Cold War’s ideologically conditioned dictatorships, followed by a re-emergent democratic orientation and the introduction of a new economic model shaped by the Washington Consensus.<sup>131</sup> The US endorsed, neo-liberal embrace brought with it a newfound inclination towards regional and hemispheric cooperation, with the Free Trade of the Americas (FTAA) scheduled to become the key economic institution by 2005.<sup>132</sup> However, in a post-war context, the South American RSC gradually transformed when key developments in domestic and state-to-state relations altered patterns of regional security practices and divided the region into two distinct sub-regional areas: the Southern Cone, comprising Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay; and the Andean North, comprising Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador.

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid.

<sup>129</sup> Kirk S. Bowman, *Militarization, Democracy, and Development: The Perils of Praetorianism in Latin America* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 149.

<sup>130</sup> Williamson, 351-359.

<sup>131</sup> Bowman.

<sup>132</sup> Paul Kellogg, “Regional Integration in Latin America: Dawn of an Alternative to Neoliberalism?,” *New Political Science* 29, no. 2 (June 2007), 188.



## **The Southern Cone: Domestic and State-to-State Key Developments**

### **Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay**

Accordingly, the Southern Cone experienced a remarkable success in post-Cold War regional integration on the back of primarily two key developments: A rapprochement between Brazil and Argentina, long-standing enemies and rivalling regional powers, and the subsequent creation of a sub-regional customs union, Mercosur. Accordingly, as the result of on-going territorial disputes in the post-independence years, the historic enmity between Brazil and Argentina was sustained by Argentine fear of Brazilian expansion and domination on the one hand, and Brazilian fear of encirclement by an Argentina-led Spanish America on the other.<sup>133</sup> However, Brazil's increasing economic prowess (accounting for more than half of the regions GDP by 1990), slowly consolidated its status as the most economic powerful country in South America, leaving Argentina no other sensible strategic option but to bury the hatchet.<sup>134</sup> The conclusion to the century-long conflict motioned a shift away from military tension towards political cooperation, manifested by the termination of their respective nuclear programs and emergent initiatives to coordinate their energy policies.<sup>135</sup> The recent established amicable relationship was further cemented in the mid-1980s, when the newly elected democratic presidents agreed to bilateral cooperation in the economic sector.<sup>136</sup> The reconciliation of the two powers successfully transformed dominant patterns of amity and enmity, which profoundly altered the security dynamics of the Southern Cone.

The creation of Mercosur marked the second important development of state-to-state relations in the Southern Cone after the Cold War. With Mercosur, Brazil and Argentina formally agreed to interlink their respective economic interests through the promotion of free trade. In 1991, the leaders of Brazil and Argentina, as well as the heads of the minor economies of Paraguay and Uruguay, came together to sign the treaty that officially established the world's third largest trading bloc, Mercosur.<sup>137</sup> The stated objectives of Mercosur were, most importantly, the creation of an internal common market and a common external tariff but the broader scheme, heavily inspired by the EU model of integration,

---

<sup>133</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 310.

<sup>134</sup> Williamson.

<sup>135</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 323.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> Williamson, 569-577.

involved common ID cards and unrestricted movement of goods, labour, services, and currency.<sup>138</sup> The nascent union soon became an economic success for all parties involved which led to the signing of a political declaration, establishing the Southern Cone as a zone of peace.<sup>139</sup> As such, the newly established amicable relationship between Brazil and Argentina led to an overall stabilization of the democracies in the Southern Cone.<sup>140</sup> While the 1997 economic crisis in Brazil and the 2001 economic collapse in Argentina<sup>141</sup>, revealed the grim side to economic interdependency and put immense pressure on the relationship between Mercosur members, the countries did not succumb to old rivalries, testifying to the strength and credibility of the union. In Brazil, growth slowly resumed under president Luiz Ignácio ‘Lula’ da Silva, elected in 2002, due to favourable global conditions boosting Brazilian exports.<sup>142</sup> Lula’s economic policies ensured a sustained surplus in external trade while his widely successful welfare policies for the poor ensured his domestic popularity.<sup>143</sup> By 2005, Brazil had cemented its status as an emerging economic giant alongside China, Russia, and India (BRIC countries).

## Chile

Meanwhile, post-Cold War Chile sought domestic stability through the resolution of old border conflicts and by following closely the recipe for economic development set out by the Washington Consensus. The Chilean governments focus on neo-liberal development and interest in joining the free trade area of Mercosur (Chile became an associate member in 1996, without adopting the common external tariff system), led to the signing of a permanent peace treaty with Peru and, perhaps more relevant to their strategic interests, the resolve of Argentine/Chilean enmities.<sup>144</sup> By the end of the twentieth century, Chile had become one of South America’s most prosperous and stable nations, with a growing positive relationship between economic development and individual empowerment

---

<sup>138</sup> Malamud.

<sup>139</sup> Briceño-Ruiz and Hoffman, 50.

<sup>140</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 325.

<sup>141</sup> John Mchale, “Brazil in the 1997-1999 Financial Turmoil,” The National Bureau of Economic Research, April 14-15, 2000, [http://www.nber.org/crisis/brazil\\_report.html](http://www.nber.org/crisis/brazil_report.html)

<sup>142</sup> Williamson, 581.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Williamson, 579-580.

and prosperity, ensuring the country's repeated entry in the annual top ten of the Economic Freedom Index<sup>145</sup>, ahead of all South and Central American nations.

### **The Andean North: Domestic and State-to-State Key Developments**

By contrast, the Andean North's post-Cold war experiences differed somewhat from those of the Southern Cone. Accordingly, adapting to democratic modes of governance in the changing post-Cold War context proved difficult in the north, with over-all political instability re-igniting old border conflicts (e.g. Venezuela/Guyana territorial dispute resurfaced after Cold War pause).<sup>146</sup> Albeit, the northern region too had created a sub-regional trade bloc, CAN, in 1969, to facilitate economic development through cooperation, integration remained shallow and riddled with overall political tension and suspicion.<sup>147</sup>

### **Columbia**

Additionally, ongoing problems relating to the drugs-trade and rebellious militant groups, perpetuated state-to-state conflicts and the destabilization and fragmentation of most notably Columbia. Consequently, in 2000 the US once again penetrated the region through the implementation of 'Plan Colombia'. The Washington devised Plan Colombia combined US military presence on Columbian territory with economic aid to assist the country in combating the trade and smuggling of drugs, hereunder the long-standing armed conflict with the left-leaning Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC), a guerrilla army funding themselves through the drug trade.<sup>148</sup> After 9/11 2001, the US-sponsored 'war on drugs' in Latin America was reframed to fit the new narrative of 'war on terror', and for the first time US military assistance for Columbia not related to counternarcotic operations was approved, transforming the country into an outpost for combatting terrorism.<sup>149</sup> In March 2008, Columbian troops initiated, what came to be known as the Andean Crisis, when they

---

<sup>145</sup> "Chile, 2017 Index of Economic Freedom," *The Heritage Foundation*, 2017,

[http://www.nber.org/crisis/brazil\\_report.html](http://www.nber.org/crisis/brazil_report.html)

<sup>146</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 327.

<sup>147</sup> Bowman.

<sup>148</sup> James F. Rochlin, "Who Said the Cold War Is Over? The Political Economy of Strategic Conflict between Venezuela and Colombia." *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2011), 252-253.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*

bombed a FARC camp on Ecuadorean territory, prompting both Venezuela and Ecuador to deploy military forces along their borders to Columbia.<sup>150</sup>

## Venezuela

Meanwhile in Venezuela, Hugo Chávez became the first politician in South America to mobilize the poor vote leading to his victory in the 1998 presidential election. Chávez ran and subsequently won on a platform built on Marxist framings of class struggle and social change, from where he vowed to fight social inequality, local oligarchs, and US imperialism.<sup>151</sup> After the election, Chávez embarked on his so-called 'Bolivarian Revolution' of popular democracy, equitable distribution of income and wealth, and economic independence fostered on his centrepiece policy, 'oil sovereignty'.<sup>152</sup> However, a 2002 military coup against the Venezuelan President catalysed an extraordinary polarisation in the country. Accordingly, after Chávez replaced the head of 'Petro'leos de Venezuela' with a leftist compatriot and gained direct political control of the oil industry, his first order of business was to raise the royalties for foreign firms.<sup>153</sup> An ensuing heated strike leading to excessive violence, culminated in an attempted coup by a right-leaning military faction in April of 2002.<sup>154</sup> Shortly after the coup commenced, the US urged the Latin American community to support the new government intended by the coup leaders.<sup>155</sup> However, a mere three days later, Chávez returned to power after a different military faction had staged a counter-coup, while his army of supporters took to the streets in Caracas and paralyzed traffic in protest.<sup>156</sup> Chávez later alleged that the coup was staged to kill him and masterminded by the US government.<sup>157</sup> The US vehemently denied any involvement though leaked CIA documents revealed that Washington knew of the coup weeks in advance.<sup>158</sup> In the aftermath of the coup

---

<sup>150</sup> John Chipman and James Lockhart Smith. "South America: Framing Regional Security." *Survival* 51, no. 6 (2009), 77-104.

<sup>151</sup> Rochlin, 251.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 249.

<sup>153</sup> Javier Corrales and Michael Penfold-Becerra, *Dragon in the Tropics: Hugo Chavez and the Political Economy of Revolution in Venezuela* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), 11.

<sup>154</sup> Chipman and Smith.

<sup>155</sup> Rochlin, 248.

<sup>156</sup> Chipman and Smith.

<sup>157</sup> Rochlin, 248.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*

attempt, the opposition lost all legitimacy and credibility, in large part due to the Washington stamp of approval.<sup>159</sup>

Thus, with his domestic political power firmly asserted, Chávez became increasingly radicalized, changed the name of the country to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, proposed the creation of a “South American NATO”<sup>160</sup>, and in 2004, went on to establish the interregional organization ALBA, in his “fight against a unipolar order”<sup>161</sup>. With ALBA, Chavez and co-founder, Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, proposed to create a regional bloc of power, moulded on a socialist inspired model for Latin American social, political, and economic integration based on solidarity and anti-capitalistic sentiments.<sup>162</sup> Here, the concept of ‘Bolivarian’ represented what Chávez termed twenty-first century Socialism, an, at the time, embryonic ideology emphasizing his growing radicalization. The ideology translated aspects of Marxism into a South American framework, incorporating Marx’s thoughts on inequity and class struggle with Venezuelan independence leader and Bolivia’s first President, Simon Bolivar’s ideas to liberate Latin America from external dominance and visions for a unified Continent.<sup>163</sup> Chávez’ strong beliefs in twenty-first century socialism’ led him to withdraw Venezuela from CAN in 2006 and join Mercosur, in protest against recent signings by Columbia and Peru respectively of free trade accords with the United States.<sup>164</sup> In 2008, coinciding with a large Venezuelan purchase of Russian weaponry and a month into the Andean Crisis, the US reactivated its fourth fleet to operate in Central and South American waters.<sup>165</sup> The official statement from the Pentagon read that the reactivation of the fleet served to demonstrate US commitment to regional partners, here notably Columbia, given their ties through Plan Columbia and the counterinsurgency against the FARC, who by then had been re-classified as a terrorist organization under the Bush regime’s ‘war on terror’.<sup>166</sup> Chávez claimed the redeployment of the fleet to be in violation of sovereign principles and a demonstration of US

---

<sup>159</sup> Williamson, 595.

<sup>160</sup> Briceño-Ruiz and Hoffmann, 51.

<sup>161</sup> Briceño-Ruiz, 222.

<sup>162</sup> Azicri, 100.

<sup>163</sup> Rochlin, 247.

<sup>164</sup> “Venezuela Makes it Official: Leaves CAN to Join Mercosur,” *MercoPress*, April 24, 2006, <http://en.mercopress.com/2006/04/24/venezuela-makes-it-official-leaves-can-to-join-mercosur>

<sup>165</sup> Humberto Santana, “US Navy Resurrects Fourth Fleet to Police Latin America,” *World Socialist Web Site*, posted May 7, 2008, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2008/05/navy-m07.html>

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*

intentions for absolute military dominance over the region.<sup>167</sup> Subsequently, tensions between Bogota and Caracas were augmented even further.

## **Bolivia**

South of Venezuela, Bolivia started the post-war years with alarming levels of unemployment following the collapse of the world price for tin, wiping out the country's biggest export industry.<sup>168</sup> As a result hordes of unemployed ex-miners migrated to the eastern lowlands to grow coca leaf for the drug trade.<sup>169</sup> In 1997, former military dictator and newly elected president of Bolivia, Hugo Banzer, embarked on a mission, backed by US funds, to eradicate the cultivation of coca leaf.<sup>170</sup> The crackdown on coca leaf farmers resulted in mass destitution and cost impoverished Bolivia nearly 5 percent of its annual GDP.<sup>171</sup> Facing ruin, the Cocaleros (coca leaf growers) mobilized under the leadership of an Aymara Indian and fellow cocalero named Evo Morales. In 2000, violent national protests erupted after a privatized water company, owned by US-based multinational conglomerate Bechtel, increased the price of water by up to 43 percent to finance a hydro-electric project.<sup>172</sup> The following year, the country suffered such horrid rain that it was declared a disaster area and shortly after, the repercussions of the Argentine economic crash induced a devastating recession that put growth to a complete halt.<sup>173</sup> Consequently, when the discovery of enormous pockets of natural gas were made, nation-wide anger erupted upon detection that the deposits were foreign owned since the privatization of the Bolivian energy sector in the mid-1990s.<sup>174</sup> The chief-architect behind the privatization of the country's energy sector, former president Sánchez de Lozada, had returned to the presidency in 2002 and planned to export the natural gas to the US via Chilean ports.<sup>175</sup> However, the indigenous movements forcibly opposed these plans and their anger towards the US and president Lozada, was only matched by their anger towards Chile which had seized all Bolivian ports and coastline a century earlier.<sup>176</sup> Additionally, Lozada attempted to

---

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

<sup>168</sup> Williamson, 604.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 605.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid.

impose an income tax which was greeted with violent demonstrations in 2003, leaving thirty people dead.<sup>177</sup> In October of the same year, a two-week blockade of the capital city, La Paz, against the export of natural resources left eighty people dead.<sup>178</sup> Subsequently, Lozada resigned and in the following years violent demonstrations, for and against the renationalization of gas, continued with the indigenous community on one side and conservative elites from the energy-rich provinces on the other.

In 2006, the leader of the cocaleros and the head of the Movement Towards Socialism (MAS), Evo Morales, became Bolivia's first president of Indian descent. Upon his inauguration, Morales pledged to reverse centuries of Indian exploitation with a new constitution designed to empower the indigenous communities and assert state rights over all natural resources.<sup>179</sup> Right-wing opposition towards Morales from the energy-rich provinces grew strong and in September 2008, the governors of four of these provinces called for civil disobedience in an attempt to stage a civic coup.<sup>180</sup> Chaos ensued when armed civilian groups responding to the call ambushed supporters of Morales, killing an estimated thirty women, children, and men, as well as wounding several hundred, in what came to be known as the Porvenir massacre.<sup>181</sup> Morales accused Washington of stirring up the unrest, expelled the US ambassador, and declared his lack of intention to aid the US government in stamping out coca cultivation, on grounds that the coca leaf is part of Bolivia's indigenous heritage.<sup>182</sup>

## **Ecuador**

Much like Bolivia, the smallest of the Andean Countries, oil-rich Ecuador went through the 1990s with negative growth and inflation among the highest in the region.<sup>183</sup> Although economic growth resumed at the turn of the century due to increasing oil prices, the country was marred by political instability and violence, going through no less than eight presidents in the years between 1996 and

---

<sup>177</sup> Ibid.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 606.

<sup>180</sup> Luigino Bracci Roa, "Bolivia: The Massacre in Porvenir," *Global Research* September 15, 2008, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/bolivia-the-massacre-in-porvenir/10213>

<sup>181</sup> Roa.

<sup>182</sup> Williamson, 606.

<sup>183</sup> Williamson, 608.

2006.<sup>184</sup> Poverty provided the main cause of instability with the stigmatized indigenous minority of the Central Andean highlands suffering the most, as they had done for centuries. The Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE), an organization established in the late 1980s, became progressively vocal in its claims of indigenous rights, land rights, and demands of ‘plurinational’ autonomy, with such aggressiveness that in June 1990, Ecuador experienced the largest indigenous uprising in the history of the country.<sup>185</sup> The event subsequently led to the creation of the first indigenous political party called Pachakutik (‘renewal’ in Quechua), which established itself as a force of violent political opposition, responsible for the ousting of Ecuadorian presidents in both 2000 and 2005.<sup>186</sup>

Subsequently, in 2006, Rafael Correa was elected the new president of the country. Correa promised to eradicate governmental corruption and the corrupt party system and to recreate the Republic of Ecuador in the name of inclusion and equality.<sup>187</sup> As such, he promised to rewrite the constitution to include rights for indigenous communities and other disadvantaged groups of society.<sup>188</sup> Under Correa, Ecuador took a significant political turn to the far-left, similar to that of Venezuela under Chávez and Bolivia under Morales. Accordingly, Correa vowed to restore full sovereignty over national resources, refused to sign a free trade agreement with the US, and to renew the lease on a military base occupied by US troops on Ecuadorian territory.<sup>189</sup> The newly elected president enjoyed an overwhelming public support and when congress in 2007 refused to hold a referendum for a constituent assembly to rewrite the constitution, the president’s loyal supporters forcibly took over the building.<sup>190</sup> Congress conceded and Correa went on to win the referendum and a majority in the constituent assembly in September of 2007.<sup>191</sup>

During the Andean Crisis of 2008, Correa cut all diplomatic ties with Bogota, employed the military along the Ecuadorian/Columbian border, and embarked on a five-nation tour of the region to rally support against what he termed a “premeditated violation of sovereignty.”<sup>192</sup> While the OAS, alongside most Latin American governments, officially decreed the attack a grave violation

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibid.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., 609.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid.

<sup>192</sup> Hudson.



of international law and the sovereignty of Ecuador, newly elected US president, Barack Obama, oddly supported Columbia's attack in the name of the war on terror.<sup>193</sup> In an interview on Mexican television, Correa argued that "this is not a bilateral problem, it is a regional problem" and "should this set a precedent, Latin America will become another Middle East."<sup>194</sup> The regions diplomatic heavyweight, Brazil, demanded an official apology to Ecuador from the Uribe-led government of Columbia, with Lula's foreign policy advisor warning that "this conflict ... is beginning to destabilize regional relations"<sup>195</sup>. Correa's firm response to what was his first major international crisis increased his popularity at home as well as abroad.<sup>196</sup>

## Peru

In Peru, the 1990s were characterized by political instability, ongoing conflict with Ecuador relating to border issues, economic depression, and guerrilla violence. Whereas the conflict with Ecuador eventually resolved itself in the mid-1990s, the guerrilla-organization, 'Sendero Luminoso' (shining path) had, since the 1980s, waged a vicious guerilla-war on the Peruvian government in their quest to create a Maoist state in the name of the indigenous communities of the Andes.<sup>197</sup> However, by 1997 the government appeared to have defeated the movement after years of brutal crackdown.<sup>198</sup> In 2001, the then president Alejandro Toledo initiated talks with the US to establish a free trade agreement after he successfully managed to turn the economy around through the growth and diversification of exports in agriculture and minerals.<sup>199</sup> Yet, despite remarkable economic growth, poverty and unemployment figures remained largely untouched and in 2006, Alan Garcia replaced Toledo as the new head of state.<sup>200</sup> Under Garcia, who followed the neo-liberal blueprint modelled by Chile, the economy continued to grow but his presidency was plagued by corruption and civil discontent.<sup>201</sup> In 2008, 'Sendero Luminoso' resurfaced after an indigenous backlash to a huge expansion of gas and oil exploration by foreign companies in the Peruvian Amazon.<sup>202</sup> Funded by

---

<sup>193</sup> Marco A. Gandásegui Jr, "Obama, the Crisis, and Latin America," *Latin American Perspectives* 38, no.4 (2011), 119.

<sup>194</sup> Hudson.

<sup>195</sup> Hudson.

<sup>196</sup> Hudson.

<sup>197</sup> Williamson, 599.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., 600.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., 601.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid.

drug-smuggling, the organization returned to carry out operations against the Peruvian army, killing twelve soldiers and many civilians in October 2008.<sup>203</sup>

### **Sub-Conclusion: Domestic and State-to-State Key Developments**

Thus, the region is characterized by a plethora of sub-regional and interregional alliances, asymmetrical political and economic development, contrasting ideologies and visions for regionalism, all generating the different processes of securitization characterizing the establishment of the UNASUR complex. All in all, post-Cold War domestic and state-to-state levels of the Southern Cone, are predominantly characterized by three interlinked developments: the rapprochement between longstanding enemies and rivalling regional powers, Brazil and Argentina; the turn towards economic cooperation leading to the establishment of the sub-regional arrangement, Mercosur; and the consolidation of democracies. The rapprochement effectively means that historic processes of military securitization among the countries in the Southern Cone are all but eliminated by the newfound willingness to cooperate. In its stead, old processes of traditional securitization are slowly replaced with increasing inter-state securitization of the economic sector. The emergent leading power, Brazil and, to a lesser extent, Argentina, as well as a rapidly developing Chile, gradually evolve into strong modern states with solid democracies, with the much smaller countries of Paraguay and Uruguay following relatively closely behind them. As strong states the Southern Cone are more likely to securitize external issues. Consequently, the establishment of Mercosur provides the tool that effectively transforms the Southern Cone from a historic conflict formation into something reminiscent of a Brazilian-led security community.

Conversely, unlike its southern counterparts, the sub-region of the Andean North remains in conflict formation. The most serious challenges to regional security revolve around the fragmentation of Columbia, where spill-over of domestic conflict into neighboring territory and US penetration encourage state-to-state tensions and processes of military securitization between the Andean countries. Moreover, while the emergence of indigenous peoples in national politics, notably in Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador, was a most necessary step in the modernization of these states, their arrival augment domestic tensions along ethnic and racial lines and the turn towards democracy of

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., 602.

these countries remains troubled and contested. Altogether, Venezuela under Chávez transforms into a relatively strong modern state due to successful populist politics and a booming oil industry. At the opposite end of the spectrum, still characterized as a modern state, yet at the very weak end of statehood, is Columbia. The modern states of Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador are also placed at the weaker end of the spectrum as domestic threats of political instability, poverty, corruption, guerilla warfare, and the drug trade ensure a strong focus on internal security, making them vulnerable to external penetration. A sub-regional polarization gradually develops from the 2000s onwards, with the Marxist/Socialist leaning Chávez/Morales/Correa axis on one side, and Peru/Columbia favoring US ties and neo-liberal development on the other.

Furthermore, Sub-complex RSCs reflect specific security dynamics and patterns of security interdependency, that either directly or indirectly affect the regional RSC. As the security complex of UNASUR is conceived by these dynamics, further analysis of identified sub-complexes is required. Thus, as illustrated in the above, the relative strength of the Mercosur members, most notably Brazil, combined with distinct patterns of economic interdependency, establish the approaching security community of Mercosur as a sub-complex and a Brazilian-led regional pole of power. Through the promotion of Mercosur as the model framework for regionalism, Brazil is highly instrumental in shaping the regional initiatives, from SAFTA to UNASUR. Accordingly, the cause and effect of the changing objectives of Brazilian foreign policy and ambition, between the minimalist SAFTA proposal, to the establishment of the maximalist agenda of UNASUR, are highly relevant to analyse at the upcoming regional level.

The Andean North too, constitutes a sub-complex RSC albeit of conflictual nature, affecting the wider patterns of the regional RSC and is thus the subject for further analysis. Security interdependence among the countries of the Andean North is characterized by domestic instability and poverty, e.g. processes of securitizations relating to spillover refugees, and interstate suspicion and tension, relating to conflictual spillover, predominantly from Columbia. The disruptive structure of the sub-complex RSC of the Andean North implies that CAN, as a sub-regional union, for lack of coherent actor quality, could not be instrumental in the design of UNASUR and thus the institutional aspect of the Andean North is not in itself relevant for detailed analysis.

However, three nation states from the Andean North, Chávez-led Venezuela and his ideological allies in Bolivia and Ecuador, proved dominant forces in shaping the objectives of the finalized

union, which establishes the Venezuelan-led axis as another regional pole of power. This identifies a third element as a significant contributor to the RSC of UNASUR, namely Chávez' interregional creation, the ideology-driven ALBA, comprising both Bolivia and Ecuador as members. The social integration scheme dominating the objectives of UNASUR is highly shaped by the ideology upon which ALBA is founded and as such, the significance of what and whom the union securitizes becomes relevant for further investigation at the interregional level. With Brazil, and to a lesser extent, Chile and Argentina in the Southern Cone, and Venezuela in Andean North, the RSC of UNASUR is multipolar/standard.

### Regional Level: The Mercosur Sub-complex RSC

At this level, the most interesting trend is the increasing differentiation of the two sub-complexes comprised in the regional RSC. In the Southern Cone, the economic sector assumes a more prominent role in sub-regional security dynamics, with the emergence of Mercosur. Accordingly, in RSC a sub-complex has the ability to shape the wider regional RSC, depending on its power and regional ambition. As a regional pole of power, Mercosur under Brazilian leadership becomes the key to the understanding of the transformation of the South American RSC between the minimalist proposal of SAFTA, to the maximalist proposal of UNASUR. By a relatively large margin Brazil is the largest economy in Mercosur which not only enforces the country's ability to shape Mercosur's external policies to suit its commercial interests, it also offers significant political influence. As such, the role of the Mercosur sub-complex in the creation of UNASUR predominantly reflects Brazilian security issues and regional ambitions. Compared to its fellow Bric members, Brazil is smaller and less powerful and best defined as the quintessential 'soft power'. Brazil is not a military power, nor does it demonstrate any intentions to become one, and accordingly self-identifies as a benign power.<sup>204</sup> Following the conventional argument that "it is the neighbouring countries which have to sign up to the lead of emerging powers ... in order to give them the power base necessary for regional as well as global power projection and international coalition building"<sup>205</sup>, Brazil,

---

<sup>204</sup> Malamud.

<sup>205</sup> Malamud, 168.

deprived of hard power instruments as the structural resource of leadership, seeks to assert its status through a promotion of consensual leadership.

In a 1994 essay, Grinspun and Krewlewich defines globalization as a “conditioning framework” that demands the implementation of neo-liberal policies as the only option for economic development, as alternative policies will place a country in perpetual disadvantage vis-à-vis international forces.<sup>206</sup> With Mercosur, Brazil proposes an economic model of regionalism consistent with such meta-narratives of the triumph of neo-liberalism, in the context of the uncontrollable spread of globalization. Likewise, the SAFTA proposal to merge Mercosur, Chile, and CAN into a regional free trade space, follows closely this prevalent logic of neo-liberalism as the sole objective, with no mechanisms for state intervention, social policies, or industrial policies included. In this sense, the creation of Mercosur and the subsequent SAFTA proposal, appear to be context dependent Brazilian attempts, for fear of marginalization in a regionalizing and globalizing economy, to balance the structure of constraints proposed by the general forces of globalization. On the other hand, in the early 1990s, a modality of South-North economic integration emerges with the conception of NAFTA, comprising Mexico, US, and Canada, which spurs on a larger and more ambitious US-initiative for hemispheric economic integration, an interregional all-inclusive NAFTA enlargement/FTAA. As a proposal to thicken regional economic integration, SAFTA was thus likely also intended as a potential bulwark, to improve a Brazilian-led region’s bargaining power in future trade negotiations with the economic giant of the North.

Additionally, as Riggiozzi and Grugel point out, ever since the heat was taken out of Brazilian and Argentine enmities, the Southern Cone has flaunted the theme of democratization as a necessary condition for stronger integration.<sup>207</sup> Though, no mechanisms to support the strengthening of democracy emerge with the institutional matrix of Mercosur, the rhetorical consensus on democracy serves a unifying purpose.<sup>208</sup> Therefore, the rapprochement between Argentina and Brazil and subsequent conception of Mercosur may sensibly be viewed as strategic efforts to solidify the fragile legitimacy and stability of the nascent democratic countries, not only to attract foreign investment in the long run, but also to weaken the possibility for a resurrection of military installed

---

<sup>206</sup> Ricardo Grinspun and Robert Krewlewich, "Consolidating Neoliberal Reforms: "free Trade" as a Conditioning Framework." *Studies in Political Economy*, no. 43 (1994), 33-61.

<sup>207</sup> Pia Riggiozzi and Jean Grugel, "Regional Governance and Legitimacy in South America: The Meaning of UNASUR." *International Affairs* 91, no. 4 (2015), 781-97.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid.

dictatorships. Accordingly, the Southern Cone's status as an approaching security community cannot be viewed as an instance of democratic peace but rather as motivated by the potential loss of democratic governance.

Conversely, with the SACN proposal, Brazil changes its strategy and model for South American regionalism. At this stage, the focus on neoliberal development emerges in co-existence with elaborate economic intervention mechanisms (IIRSA and energy integration), to facilitate stronger regional ties and interdependence. On the surface, the proposal appears to address and reflect two specific regional security issues. First, the growing instability produced by US-backed Columbia's domestic spillover and the ensuing enmities among the states of the Andean North. Second, the financial crash of Brazil and Argentina respectively. For Brazil, the economic crisis and subsequent devaluation of the Brazilian real, are direct results of unsettled international capital markets, following the 1997 Asian financial crisis.<sup>209</sup> For Argentina, an excessive amount of foreign debt and an overvalued fixed exchange rate are the proximate causes of what turned into a great depression, severely augmented by the devaluation of the Brazilian Real.<sup>210</sup> Argentina blames US-policies on the crisis and claims that Washington has abandoned the country due to geopolitical insignificance.<sup>211</sup> Tensions arise in the Southern Cone when the Argentine economics minister, Cavallo, hints at a lesser role for Mercosur and Argentine intentions to negotiate the FTAA without the union.<sup>212</sup> Accordingly, the dual threat of Brazil's own vulnerability in the global market and the threat of Argentina's waning engagement weakening Mercosur, account well for Brazil's slight reorientation in its regional strategy, as illustrated by the new content of the SACN proposal.

Yet, a related dimension may be added to this perspective. A highly controversial side-effect of the NAFTA agreement between developing Mexico and the developed economies of the US and Canada transpires when an estimated five million jobs vanish in the Mexican farming sector, as a high-technological and heavily subsidized US agricultural sector undermines a mutual beneficiary outcome of the removal of tariffs.<sup>213</sup> Only months after Mexico pens its signature to the agreement, US-imported staples such as corn, beans, and wheat increases threefold at the expense of millions of

---

<sup>209</sup> Mchale.

<sup>210</sup> Martin Feldstein, "Argentina's Fall: Lessons from the Latest Financial Crisis." *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 2 (2002), 8-14.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid.

<sup>212</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 326.

<sup>213</sup> M. Angeles Villarreal and Marisabel Cid, "NAFTA and the Mexican Economy," in *Mexico: Background and Issues*, ed. Richard C. Bradley (Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, 2010).

small farmers whose products make up the diet of poor Mexicans.<sup>214</sup> Accordingly, two million Mexican farmers lose permanent employment and for an estimated three million, seasonal employment is the only alternative.<sup>215</sup> In South America, the agricultural sector is one of the principal economic bases, accounting for 23% of regional exports in 2012, and plays a key role in the social fabric.<sup>216</sup> As such, the individual countries' ability to produce and export agricultural commodities plays a vital role, not only in terms of employment and bottom line figures, but also in terms of domestic and regional food security. The devastating demonstration of the collateral damage of free trade, in the context of South-North collaboration, may necessarily have rattled the Brazilian cage, and even more so with the prospect of a potential weakening Mercosur. While Brazil at this point may well be an emergent economic powerhouse, it is, after all, still a developing country. Based on this, it appears reasonable to assess the SACN proposal as an extension of Brazilian securitization to strengthen Mercosur and Argentine commitment to same, vis-à-vis the US, in relation to FTAA negotiations. However, in 2005 due to the arrival of the so-called South American pink-tide of left-wing governments, FTAA negotiations are shelved indefinitely.

Accordingly, the question remains why Brazil, once again, changed its stance on South American regionalism and political institutionalism to accommodate the social oriented maximalist agenda of UNASUR. According to Buzan and Wæver, a country achieves great power status when it is responded to by other major powers on the basis of system-level calculations of economic, political, and military power.<sup>217</sup> Following this, bearing in mind that Brazil is no military power, several plausible perspectives on this change in Brazilian foreign policy emerge. First, by the time of the SACN confrontation with the Bolivarian impetus, Southern Cone democracies are all consolidated and the threat of military overthrow of democracy has long faded. Accordingly, the security argument of economic integration to strengthen democracy has lost its force, at least in the context of Mercosur. Second, even with the convergence of Mercosur and the Andean North into a free trade zone as the only tangible result of SACN, by 2007 Brazil appears to favor trade relations outside the regional forum, with exports to Latin America accounting for just about 25% of total

---

<sup>214</sup> Ramón Eduardo Ruiz, *Mexico: Why a Few Are Rich and the People Poor* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010).

<sup>215</sup> Villarreal and Cid.

<sup>216</sup> Vergara, et al., "Agriculture and Future Climate in Latin America and the Caribbean: Systemic Impacts and Potential Responses," *Inter-American Development Bank* (February 2014), <http://www.unclearn.org/sites/default/files/inventory/idb40.pdf>.

<sup>217</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 35.

exports, centered on Mexico and Venezuela as well as fellow Mercosur members, Argentina and Chile.<sup>218</sup> Brazilian imports from Latin America in this period account for roughly 18%.<sup>219</sup> As such, with the demise of the FTAA negotiations, it appears that the forefront of Brazilian ambitions has become its own insertion into the global economy via Mercosur, rather than inward regionally orientated. However, a strong trade interdependency between Venezuela and Brazil and major Brazilian hydrocarbon and agribusiness investments in Ecuador and Bolivia<sup>220</sup>, the largely US-generated instability surrounding the Andean North, poses a threat to Brazil's significant economic interests in these countries. Though Brazil is the largest economy in Latin America, it is not the richest in terms of GDP per capita and human development where fellow Mercosur members, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, and Venezuela, depending on oil-prices, all outrank the country.<sup>221</sup> As such, Brazil lacks the economic leverage of coercive leadership in regional conflict management.

Moreover, following Goldman Sachs forecast of Brazil as one of four countries to dominate the global market by 2050, Brazil's global ambitions become more transparent. Accordingly, in the mid-2000, the country embarks on an effort to get a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and to secure the position as Director General at the World Trade Organization (WTO).<sup>222</sup> In reaction to the bid for a permanent seat in the UNSC, the country's most important regional partner, Argentina, rallies with Mexico to oppose the Brazilian effort for international recognition.<sup>223</sup> Additionally, Uruguay, with the support of Argentina, lobby their own contender for the WTO<sup>224</sup> which all in all questions Brazil's regional leadership and illustrates a lack of support for its global ambitions.

From this perspective, Brazil's questionable regional leadership, explains the reorientation in foreign policy goals with the establishment of UNASUR and the country's biggest stamp on the union, the Defense Council, a space for dialog and political cooperation on all matters concerning regional security, including conflict management and social and natural resource security.

---

<sup>218</sup> "Brazil Exports by Country and Region 2007," *Wits.Worldbank.Org*, 2008, <http://wits.worldbank.org/CountryProfile/en/Country/BRA/Year/2007/TradeFlow/Export>.

<sup>219</sup> "Brazil Imports by Country and Region 2007," *Wits.WorldBank.Org*, 2008, <http://wits.worldbank.org/CountryProfile/en/Country/BRA/Year/2007/TradeFlow/Import>.

<sup>220</sup> Peter Dauvergne and Déborah B. Farias. "The Rise of Brazil as a Global Development Power." *Third World Quarterly* 33, no. 5 (2012), 903-917.

<sup>221</sup> Malamud.

<sup>222</sup> Malamud, 171.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*



Accordingly, an argument that the initial goal of the CDS is to counter US unipolar activism through the Columbian situation is supported by its active role in diffusing the Andean Crisis, a role that was highly characterized by Brazilian president Lula's strong diplomatic intervention in the crisis<sup>225</sup>, and in recent events, ensuring a peace treaty between the Columbian government and FARC without US involvement<sup>226</sup>. Moreover, historically issues of defense and security have been dealt with in the only forum available, the inter-American system of the OAS. The United States' unparalleled capabilities and power means that the OAS historically has served as an instrument in perfect alignment with US interests. The inconsistency between the OAS condemnation of Columbia's violation of the territorial sovereignty of Ecuador on the one hand, and Washington's diplomatic support for the Columbian attack on the other, augment regional fragmentation and suspicion of US intentions. The conflictual and suspicious elements of the OAS system are implied in Correa's response where he cites the attack as a regional problem and claims the potential of Latin America to become another Middle East. With this specific reference to the Middle East, associations emerge of the United States' invasion of Middle Eastern countries in the name of the War on Terror, some under false pretenses most easily verifiable in the context of the war in Iraq. In this light, the reference of the Columbian attack as a regional problem implies a securitization of the US-serving OAS as the only mechanism for security management in the anti-US, anti-capitalistic, anti-neoliberal, natural resource rich countries of the Andean North. From this perspective, the CDS is established to stabilize the region and balance the unipolar function of the OAS in a South American context. This in return, provides Brazil a consensual platform from where to negotiate its regional leadership to further its own regional interests and global ambitions.

## Regional Level: The Andean North sub-complex RSC

In the Andean North sub-complex, unstable democracies, interstate conflicts and not least, the security dynamics related to the drug-trade, perpetuate a RSC in traditional conflict formation. From 2000 onwards, the biggest conflict-catalyzer is the United States' penetration of Columbia.

---

<sup>225</sup> Emily Achtenberg, "Bolivia's 9/11: The Pando Massacre and the TIPNIS Conflict," *NACLA*, September 18, 2011, <http://nacla.org/blog/2011/9/18/bolivia%25E2%2580%2599s-911-pando-massacre-and-tipnis-conflict>

<sup>226</sup> Nicholas Casey, "Colombia and FARC Sign New Peace Treaty, This Time Skipping Voters," *The New York Times*, November 24, 2016, [https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/24/world/americas/colombia-juan-manuel-santos-peace-deal-farc.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/24/world/americas/colombia-juan-manuel-santos-peace-deal-farc.html?_r=0).

Accordingly, in 2000 the US allocates \$1,3 billion of the intended \$7,5 billion Plan Columbia to fund a largescale military effort against left-wing- guerrillas, which oddly does not include any military effort against the right-wing paramilitaries also involved in the drug-trade.<sup>227</sup> Considering the historically motivated reasons for US interference in Latin American politics, the significance of this US-strategy, or at least the perceived interpretation of the strategy, appears straight-forward. Accordingly, the first rise of regional right-wing paramilitary factions during the Cold War was organized by military forces of the respective countries, heavily backed by US military counterinsurgency groups, to combat Marxist-inspired political activism in the region.<sup>228</sup> The second wave, most easily observable in Columbia, is sponsored by elite landowners, members of the armed forces, multinational corporations, and politicians, primarily target unionists, left-wing political activists, human rights NGO's, peasants, and indigenous communities.<sup>229</sup> Unlike its left-leaning counterparts, Latin American right-wing conservatives are much more inclined to align state-interests with the tenets of neo-liberalism and capitalist development, from where the US agenda is easily interpreted as a coercive attempt to shape the government of Columbia in the mould of US interests. With the pink-tide sweeping South America, starting with Chávez in Venezuela, the implication of this strategy arguably poses a covert threat to state sovereignty. Moreover, Chávez Cuba connection through Alba, strong alliance with Iran, a country in which economic development has been severely hampered by US economic sanctions<sup>230</sup>, his excessive military spending on Russian weapons technology<sup>231</sup>, the overt symbolic value of his oil-based Bolivarian revolution, and his erratic enmity with pro-US Columbia and Peru, make him a natural object of separate US concern. This in return, underpins the widespread belief among Chávez and his allies that not only was the US instrumental in the coup against Chávez but Washington is covertly flexing its muscles to subordinate the sub-regional political arena to US interests through Plan Columbia and the reactivation of the Fourth Fleet. Furthermore, the inconsistency between US rhetoric of eliminating the drug-trade and its actual policy and strategy to do so, leaves the domestic vulnerable Bolivia and Ecuador to favor the political economy of a drugs-based economy rather than subjecting their countries to potential US penetration. According to Buzan and Wæver, a region in conflict formation will only link their security through tighter regional integration in the

---

<sup>227</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 329.

<sup>228</sup> Catherine C. Legrand, "The Colombian Crisis in Historical Perspective." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 28, no. 55-56 (2003), 165-209.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid.

<sup>230</sup> Corrales and Penfold-Beccera, 11.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid.

face of a common perceived threat.<sup>232</sup> Conversely, if no such common threat is agreed upon, security integration has no incentive to develop and sub-alliances will likely emerge.<sup>233</sup>

Accordingly, the polarization between Peru and Columbia favouring US-ties on one side, and the anti- US governments of Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela on the other, underpins a disagreement as to what constitutes a sub-regional threat. This in return explains both the failure of CAN to turn into a coherent sub-regional economic and political actor and the emergence of the ALBA alliance.

### Interregional Level: ALBA

The establishment of the ALBA alliance is significant as it transforms the Venezuelan-led axis into a regional pole of power. ALBA is founded on a co-dependency of interests that circles back to a common core of threats posed by perceived malign US unipolar activism and Washington-promoted policies. This antagonistic view is highly transparent in the name of the union, in which the Latin American alliance establish themselves as an exclusive coalition for ‘the peoples of OUR America’. Along these lines, ALBA terms the grouping as “a political, economic, and social alliance in defence of independence, self-determination and the identity of peoples comprising it”<sup>234</sup>. Launched as an anti-imperialist alternative to the FTAA, ALBA seeks to balance the perceived threats to Latin American identity and state sovereignty, proposed by general US activism and advocacy of neo-liberal policies, which are essentially perceived as imposed tools of political and economic control. In a 2006 UN general assembly, the day after George W. Bush has spoken at the UN, Chávez addresses the assembly calling the US commander in chief “the devil”<sup>235</sup> and continues:

---

<sup>232</sup> Buzan and Wæver.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid.

<sup>234</sup> TeleSUR/JC-MK, “Cuba and Venezuela Celebrate 12th Anniversary of ALBA Creation,” *TeleSUR News > Latin America*, September 20, 2016, <http://www.telesurtv.net/english/news/Cuba-and-Venezuela-Celebrate-12th-Anniversary-of-ALBA-Creation-20161214-0006.html>.

<sup>235</sup> David Stout, “Chávez Calls 'Bush' the Devil' in U.N. Speech,” *The New York Times*, September 20, 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/20/world/americas/20cnd-chavez.html>.

As the spokesman of imperialism, he came to share his nostrums, to try to preserve the current pattern of domination, exploitation, and pillage of the peoples of the world ... The United States is the greatest threat looking over our planet, placing at risk the very survival of the human species.<sup>236</sup>

Following the classical tenets of realism and the observable framing of the enemy in the above quote, a Chávez-led ALBA seeks to replace the unipolar order with a multipolar order, to balance against the perceived exploitation of the periphery countries. Chávez envisions a united Latin America to become one of these poles of power and the means to ensure this is the Bolivarian framework of Latin American unity and the rejection of the Chávez-professed evils of US-promoted neo-liberal policies. Fellow ALBA members, Bolivia and Ecuador, likewise subscribe to the ideal of a multipolar order. For these countries, it is imperative that integration is based on complementary solidarity and serves the higher purpose of reducing asymmetries between South American countries and Latin American regions. Accordingly, a report by the Bolivian Foreign Ministry states:

Bolivia seeks to contribute to building a multilateral international community, harmonious, complementary and with self-determination of nations and peoples, promoting political, economic, and cultural rights based on the principles of complementation and balance.<sup>237</sup>

The convoluted discrepancy between the indigenous worldview of 'buen vivir', evident in the above statement, and the hegemonic order of the US-promoted neo-liberal capitalist system suggests Bolivia and Ecuador's advocacy of a multipolar order and consequent membership of ALBA as acts of cultural resistance. In support of this, the wider demands in the objectives of UNASUR to securitize natural resource sovereignty and protect the integrity of nature and peoples in regional development projects, and Morales' securitization of the coca-leaf as part of the indigenous heritage, are all types of cultural resistance towards neo-liberal development, sprinkled with

---

<sup>236</sup>Ibid

<sup>237</sup>Briceño-Ruiz, 222.

elements of specific anti-US sentiments. All in all, as the name of the alliance as well as the Chávez-inspired name 'Union of the South' both imply, building a regional identity is paramount to ALBA's efforts to empower self-determination and turn a united Latin America into a serious contender able to challenge the existing global power structure.

## The RSC of UNASUR

Accordingly, the analysis reveals multiple security-driven aspects of South American regionalism as it follows the mapping of the changing security constellation surrounding the emergence of sub-regional projects and how these in return have shaped the reconfiguration of the regional RSC, leading to the emergence of UNASUR. As such, the analysis has revealed the security dynamics behind the emergence and subsequent effects of individual sub-regional projects. From here, the build-up and complex co-existence of different visions, political aspirations, ideologies, and economic models comprised in UNASUR reveals the following about the causes and effects of South American regionalism:

Accordingly, from SAFTA to UNASUR, Brazil's patterns of security practices are bearing elements in its changing visions for South American regionalism. The highly informal SAFTA is presented in the framework of a changing political and economic world order in a bid to ensure state autonomy. The SACN proposal, still minimizing political integration, is a response to regional instabilities and FTAA negotiations which essentially is an extension of economic integration for autonomy. With both proposals, Brazil securitizes its national sovereignty and footing in the global economy through the economic spheres of both Mercosur and the wider region. With UNASUR, economic autonomy evolves into a larger political narrative of regional security. As a soft power, Brazil uses the tool of region-building as a strategy to emancipate South America from US influence to protect its economic interests and elevate its own regional influence. The internal transformation of the Southern Cone RSC enabled the platform of Mercosur to consolidate Southern Cone democracies and transform Brazil into the largest regional economic muscle and a certified Bric member. With the conception of UNASUR and the CDS, Brazil gains the substance to take on a stronger role and political voice in regional affairs, which are necessary abilities to accommodate its global ambitions. Conclusively, Brazil's strategic vision for South American regionalism appears to be less about a mutually beneficial development of the region and more about asserting a strong leadership

to protect its regional interests and to promote its ambitions to become a global pole of power, irrespective of its lack of hard power. Conversely, Argentina's, Uruguay's, and Paraguay's concerns regarding a Brazilian leadership are muffled in the economic environment of a Brazilian dominated Mercosur. This perspective accounts well for their respective desires for a post-trade politically oriented regional forum from where to balance their concerns.

Likewise, the internal transformation of the RSC of the Andean North, characterized by the increasing sub-regional polarity between pro- and anti-US governments, accounts for the willingness of the conflict formation to join under the same umbrella of regional governance in UNASUR. While the Chávez-axis sees UNASUR as a strengthening tool to safe-guard political autonomy and state sovereignty, the weaker countries of Peru and Columbia (i.e. compared to the augmented strength of Bolivia and Ecuador in their alliance with Venezuela), see UNASUR as a bulwark to balance potential diplomatic aggression from their closest neighbors. Accordingly, up until the agreement to align their interests in UNASUR the sub-complex RSC of the Andean North has continually destabilized the wider regional RSC which in return proposed a structural barrier to individual interests and the success of CAN. Through the objectives of UNASUR, Chávez, Morales, and Correa gain the necessary clout to embark on a direct securitization of external US-penetration, whereas before the union Columbia was the referent object of such processes. Accordingly, with UNASUR the Andean RSC initiates a transformation from conflict formation to strategic security regime. As such, the RSCs fears of interstate conflict and violence in political relations are now restrained by agreed upon rules of conduct which are expected to be observed in the setting of the institutional nexus, UNASUR.

Furthermore, in the context of ALBA the sub-interregional alliance never gains any real support outside its circle of members, from where its lack of serious regional power and actor quality accounts well for Venezuela's, Bolivia's, and Ecuador's urgent participation in the South American regional instrument of UNASUR. Accordingly, the Bolivarian Framework of sovereign strength and unity, the rejection of neoliberal orthodoxy, and Chávez leaving a fragmented CAN because of individual members' ties to the US to join Mercosur, a strong South-only economic alliance, reveal the intent of the Venezuela-led axis' strong involvement in the finalized objectives of UNASUR and support for the CDS; to balance the threat of US activism in regional affairs by transforming the union into an autonomous political and security actor and from there elevate the region into a global pole of power.

### **Sub-conclusion on UNASUR and South American Regionalism**

Thus, returning briefly to the literature review and the perceived short-comings of existing theoretical positions on South American regionalism, this approach offers a plausible explanation to the questions of how and why the contrasting regional projects and visions co-exist in UNASUR. Indeed, the standard RSC of South America proposes that irrespective of other observable political differences, if the overarching political issues tying the sub-complexes together gradually transform the RSC into a security community, UNASUR has the potential to transform itself into a future global actor. Moreover, while South American regionalism may not have followed the Kantian recipe and reached any meaningful economic integration outside Mercosur, one cannot so easily dismiss the role of regionalism in the many positive transformations that nonetheless have occurred, namely an overall consolidation of democracy post-Cold War; the visibility and acknowledgement of indigenous peoples in politics, a necessary step in the modernization process of Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador; the political forum of UNASUR as a successful regional conflict manager; the emergence of a solid regional social agenda; And finally, underpinned by the success of the CDS, an emancipation from US dependence and influence in regional conflict management stabilizes regional relations and provide a better foundation for autonomous development in a regional setting. Hence, meaningful regionalism is demonstrably proved to be more than the sum of successful economic and political convergence, to which the criticism of South American regionalism as being nothing more than a series of disappointments appears to miss the target entirely.

### **Conclusion**

Thus, returning to the initial proposal of this research the analysis reveals that the causes and effects of South American regionalism are better understood in terms of interdependent security dynamics and elaborates how the political and economic dimensions of projects are shaped by these dynamics. This approach also provides a nuanced and relevant understanding of the successes, as listed in the above and failures (CAN, Brazil's struggling leadership) of South American regionalism, which highlights a problem with the fixation on economic and political convergence as the dominant criteria from where to understand and measure meaningful regionalism. In support of this conclusion I shall refrain from recycling the analytical findings into an argument that I am

content has already been made and instead return to the introductory observations of NAFTA and the EU. Accordingly, in further support of the conclusion and to illustrate the purpose and universal application of this approach, a security perspective is superficially applied to empirical elements of commonly accepted knowledge about NAFTA and the EU.

Accordingly, the cause of NAFTA follows the rational logic of mutually beneficial economic interaction, a logic that explains Mexico's motivations for participation and a logic from where Trump's diagnosis of NAFTA as an assault on US economic interests finds its perhaps legitimate bearings in a traditional economic cost and benefit analysis. However, when regional security dynamics are applied to the equation Mexico's willingness, as a modern state, to automatically subordinate its economic interests to the interests of the wealthy post-modern core may more accurately be viewed as principally driven by a fear of economic exclusion in a globalizing context, a fear that some twenty years later may be greatly diminished in light of Mexico's current economic prowess. Moreover, Mexico's geographical function as a transit-country for the many Latin American illegal immigrants and drugs-smugglers has long provided the rationale for the US to cultivate a strong economic and diplomatic relationship with Mexico, from where NAFTA may be understood as a strategic geopolitical tool of critical importance to US national security. The latter proposition offers two meaningful considerations that are arguably dependent on a full analysis, but for sake of argument; one, from a US perspective, it may be pertinent to US security interests if Donald Trump considered the various levels of interdependency between Mexico and the US and not just the economic aspects; and two, Mexico may benefit from the significance of their geographical position if used as leverage to improve their bargaining power in potential future NAFTA negotiations. Conversely, the domestic level analysis of the EU security constellation in any given decade would arguably have highlighted the intense sense of British nationalism and strong sense of detachment from the European continent, which may have emphasized an imperative need to better foster a European identity.

As illustrated by the analysis and the above examples alike, it may be possible and even beneficial to think of both cause and effect of regionalism as expressions of security dynamics. Additionally, both the analysis and examples highlight the inherent contradiction in assessing the success or failure of regionalism from an economic or political perspective with no consideration to the wider security dynamics in which the processes of integration are embedded. While the above propositions amount to little else than bold speculations, the point of highlighting them in



conjunction with the analysis serves to underpin the nuances of regionalism that transpire from this universal approach. Subsequently, the findings of this research stress the relevance of incorporating insights of regional security dynamics into regional policies as well as into the larger study on regionalism.

It is fully acknowledged that the conclusion should reflect the research in question and as such refrain from commenting on issues, which have not been part of same research. The unconventional implementation of the above examples of NAFTA and EU is thus acknowledged to be a gamble yet deemed to be in alignment with the introductory chapter and appropriate to highlight the purpose of this research and the universal application of this approach.

## References

- Abugattas, Majluf L. *Swimming in the Spaghetti Bowl: Challenges for Developing Countries under the "New Regionalism"*. No. 27, UNCTAD Blue Series Papers, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2004.
- Achtenberg, Emily. "Bolivia's 9/11: The Pando Massacre and the TIPNIS Conflict." *NACLA*. September 18, 2011. <http://nacla.org/blog/2011/9/18/bolivia%25E2%2580%2599s-911-pando-massacre-and-tipnis-conflict> (accessed May 4, 2017).
- Azicri, Max. "The Castro-Chavéz Alliance." *Latin American Perspectives* 36, no. 1 (2009): 99-110.
- Bach, Daniel C. "Africa in international relations: The frontier as concept and metaphor." *South African Journal of International Affairs* 20, no. 1 (2013): 1-22.
- Baldwin, Richard E. "Multilateralising Regionalism: Spaghetti Bowls as Building Blocs on the Path to Global Free Trade." *World Economy* 29, no. 11 (November 2006): 1451-1518.
- Baylis, John, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens. *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*. 5. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bowman, Kirk S. *Militarization, Democracy, and Development: The Perils of Praetorianism in Latin America*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Briceño-Ruiz, José. "From the South American Free Trade Area to the Union of South American Nations: The Transformations of a Rising Regional Process." *Latin American Policy* (Policy Studies Organization) 1, no. 2 (December 2010): 208-229.
- Briceño-Ruiz, José, and Andrea Ribeiro Hoffmann. "Post-hegemonic regionalism, UNASUR, and the reconfiguration of regional cooperation in South America." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies / Revue canadienne des études latinoaméricain* 40, no.1 (May 2015): 48-62.
- Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods*. 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Buzan, Barry, and Ole Wæver. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Casey, Nicholas. "Colombia and FARC Sign New Peace Treaty, This Time Skipping Voters". *The New York Times*, November 24, 2016.  
[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/24/world/americas/colombia-juan-manuel-santos-peace-deal-farc.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/24/world/americas/colombia-juan-manuel-santos-peace-deal-farc.html?_r=0) (accessed April 1, 2017).
- Chipman, John, and James Lockhart Smith. "South America: Framing Regional Security." *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy* 51, no. 6 (December 2009): 77-104.
- Chodor, Tom, and Anthea Mccarthy-Jones. "Post-Liberal Regionalism in Latin America and the Influence of Hugo Chávez." *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research* 19, no. 2 (December 2013): 211-223.
- Corrales, Javier, and Michael Penfold-Becerra. *Dragon in the tropics : Hugo Chavez and the political economy of revolution in Venezuela*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2011.
- Dauvergne , Peter, and Déborah BL Farias. "The Rise of Brazil as a Global Development Power." *Third World Quartely* 35, no 5 (2012): 903-917.
- Eduardo, Ramon Ruiz. *Mexico: Why a Few are Rich and the People Poor*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- Entrikin, Nicholas J. "Region and Regionalism." In *The SAGE Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, edited by John A. Agnew and David N. Livingstone, 344-356. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2011.
- Farrell, Mary, and Björn Hettne. *Global Politics of Regionalism : Theory and Practice*. London: Pluto Press, 2005.
- Feldstein, Martin. "Argentina's Fall: Lessons from the Latest Financial Crisis." *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 2 (March-April 2002): 8-4.
- Gandásegui Jr, Marco A. "Obama, the Crisis, and Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives* 38, no. 4 (2011): 109-121.

- Gardini, Gian Luca. "Towards modular regionalism: the proliferation of Latin American cooperation ." *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 58, no.1 (January/June 2015): 210-229.
- Gómez-Mera, Laura. *Power and Regionalism in Latin America: The Politics of Mercosur*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013.
- Grenville, J.A.S. *A History of the World: From the 20th to the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Grinspun, Ricardo, and Rúbén Krewlewich. "Consolidating Neo-liberal Reforms: 'Free trade' as Conditioning Framework." *Studies in Political Economy* no. 43 (Spring 1994): 33-61.
- Gudynas, Eduardo. "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow." *Development* 54, no. 4 (2011): 441-447.
- Hudson, Saul. "Latin America Scrambles to Defuse Crisis in the Andes." *The Washington Post*. March 4, 2008. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/03/03/AR2008030301300.html> (accessed April 7, 2017).
- Kawai, Masahiro. "East Asian economic regionalism: progress and challenges." *Journal of Asian Economics* 16, no. 1 (2005): 29-55.
- Kellogg, Paul. "Regional Integration in Latin America: Dawn of an Alternative to Neoliberalism?" *New Political Science* 29, no. 2 (June 2007): 187-209.
- Keohane, Robert. "Ironies of Sovereignty : The European Union and the United States." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40, no. 4 (November 2002): 743-765.
- Legrand, Catherine C. "The Columbian Crisis in Historical Perspective." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 28, no. 55-56 (January 2003): 165-209.
- Mahoney, Jack. *The Challenge of Human Rights: Origin, Development and Significance*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Malamud, Andrés. "Moving Regions: Brazil's Global Emergence and the Redefinition of Latin American Borders." In *The Rise of Post-hegemonic Regionalism: The Case of Latin America*, edited by Pía Riggiozzi and Diana Tussie, 1-16. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012.

Malamud, Andrés, and Gian Luca Gardini. "Has Regionalism Peaked? The Latin American Quagmire and its Lessons." *The International Spectator* 47, no. 1 (March 2012): 116-133.

McHale, John. "Brazil in the 1997-1999 Financial Turmoil." *The National Bureau of Economic Research*. April 14-15, 2000. [http://www.nber.org/crisis/brazil\\_report.html](http://www.nber.org/crisis/brazil_report.html) (accessed April 14, 2017).

"Venezuela Makes it Official: Leaves CAN to Join Mercosur." *MercoPress.com* April 24, 2006. <http://en.mercopress.com/2006/04/24/venezuela-makes-it-official-leaves-can-to-join-mercosur> (accessed April 9, 2017).

Pothuraju, Babjee. "Unasur and Security in South America." *Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis*. October 30, 2012. <http://www.idsa.in/backgrounders/UNASURandSecurityinSouthAmerica> (accessed April 2, 2017).

Riggiozzi, Pía. "Region, Regionness and Regionalism in Latin America: Towards a New Synthesis." *New Political Economy* 17, no. 4 (2012). [http://latn.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/WP\\_130\\_RegionRegionness\\_Riggiozzi.pdf](http://latn.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/WP_130_RegionRegionness_Riggiozzi.pdf)

Riggiozzi, Pía, and Diana Tussie. "The Rise of Post-hegemonic Regionalism in Latin America." In *The Rise of Post-hegemonic Regionalism: The Case of Latin America*, edited by Pía Riggiozzi and Diana Tussie, 1-16. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012.

Riggiozzi, Pía, and Jean Grugel. "Regional Governance and Legitimacy in South America: The Meaning of UNASUR." *International Affairs* 91, no. 4 (2015): 781-797.

Roa, Luigino Bracci. "Bolivia: The Massacre in Porvenir." *Global Research* September 15, 2008. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/bolivia-the-massacre-in-porvenir/10213> (accessed April 11, 2017).

Rochlin, James F. "Who Said the Cold War is Over? The political economy of strategic conflict between Venezuela and Colombia." *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (March 2011): 237-260.

Rosen, Michael, and Jonathan Wolff, . *Political Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

- Sanahuja, Jose Antonio. "Post-liberal Regionalism in South America: The Case of UNASUR" *EUI Working Papers, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Research*, 2012  
[http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/20394/RSCAS\\_2012\\_05.pdf?sequence=1&isAll](http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/20394/RSCAS_2012_05.pdf?sequence=1&isAll)  
owed=y (accessed April 19, 2017).
- Santana, Humberto. "US Navy Resurrects Fourth Fleet to Police Latin America." *World Socialist Web Site*. May 7, 2008. <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2008/05/navy-m07.html> (accessed April 7, 2017).
- "South American Union of Nations Constitutive Treaty". April 1, 2009.  
<http://studentorgs.law.smu.edu/getattachment/International-Law-Review-Association/Resources/LBRA-Archive/15-2/SMB213.pdf.aspx>.
- Stout, David. "Chávez Calls 'Bush' the Devil' in U.N. Speech." *The New York Times*. September 20, 2006. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/20/world/americas/20cnd-chavez.html> (accessed May 2, 2017).
- Söderbaum, Frederik. "What's Wrong with Regional Integration? The Problem of Eurocentrism." *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*, 2013, IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc, 2013.
- Söderbaum, Frederik, and Timothy M. Shaw. *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003.
- Söderbaum, Frederik, Patrick Stålgren, and Luk Van Langenhove. "The EU as a Global Actor and the Dynamics of Interregionalism: A Comparative Analysis." *European Integration*, 27, no 3 (2005): 365-380.
- TeleSUR/ JC -MK. "Cuba and Venezuela Celebrate 12th Anniversary of ALBA Creation." *TeleSUR News > Latin America* December 14, 2016.  
<http://www.telesurtv.net/english/news/Cuba-and-Venezuela-Celebrate-12th-Anniversary-of-ALBA-Creation-20161214-0006.html> (accessed May 2, 2017).
- "Chile, 2017 Index of Economic Freedom." *The Heritage Foundation* 2017.  
<http://www.heritage.org/index/country/chile> (accessed April 5, 2017).

Vergara, Walter, Ana R. Rios, Paul Trapido, and Hector Malarín. "Agriculture and Future Climate in Latin America and the Caribbean: Systemic Impacts and Potential Responses." *Inter-American Development Bank*. Februar 2014.

<http://www.uncclearn.org/sites/default/files/inventory/idb40.pdf> (accessed April 14, 2017).

Villarreal, M. Angeles, and Marisabel Cid. "NAFTA and the Mexican Economy." In *Mexico: Background and Issues*, edited by Richard C. Bradley, 131-151. Hauppauge, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers Inc., 2010.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Translated by A.M Henderson and Talcot Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no.2 (1992): 391-425.

Williams, Michael C. "World, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (December 2003): 511-531.

Williamson, Edwin. *The Penguin History of Latin America*. London: Penguin Group, 2009.

"Brazil Exports by Country and Region 2007." *Wits.Worldbank.Org*. 2008.

<http://wits.worldbank.org/CountryProfile/en/Country/BRA/Year/2007/TradeFlow/Export> (accessed April 14, 2017).

"Brazil Imports by Country and Region 2007." *Wits.Worldbank.org*. 2008.

<http://wits.worldbank.org/CountryProfile/en/Country/BRA/Year/2007/TradeFlow/Import> (accessed April 14, 2017).





