

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTADORA PROCESS:  
THE CONTEXT AND THE MOTIVATION

By

LAURIE GAYLE DICKERSON

††

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS  
July, 1985

Thesis  
1985  
D549a  
cop. 2



AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTADORA PROCESS:  
THE CONTEXT AND THE MOTIVATION

Thesis approved:

*Franz G. von Sauer*

Thesis Adviser

*Edward V. Sore*

*Joseph W. Westfall*

*Norman D. Murken*  
Dean of the Graduate College

## PREFACE

This research is concerned with the Contadora peace process initiated by Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama, the international and domestic contexts from which these four states chose to collectively mediate peace negotiations in Central America. Its primary purpose is to explain how and why these four Latin American countries chose to pursue a foreign policy which continues to find opposition from the Reagan administration. This is in no way a comprehensive explanation of the collectivity. My research has been limited by the publication lag in United Nations documents, the dearth of analytical literature in the study of Latin American foreign policies, and the non-existence of indexes for Latin American newspapers. I have tried to seek out more literature than is available through the OSU Edmond Low Library. To this end, I spent five days in the library of the University of Texas at Austin's Institute of Latin American Studies.

I wish to express gratitude to those who have guided and assisted me in this work. I am particularly thankful to my major advisor, Professor Franz A. von Sauer, for his much-needed suggestions and criticisms with regard to this thesis. His encouragement and concern was noted and very

appreciated.

I also thank the other members of my committee, Professor Harold Sare, and Professor Joseph Westphal, for their interest and help in this work. Professor Sare has been particularly helpful in getting my thoughts organized.

Special thanks goes to Professor Bill Parle for his generous donation of time and energy in assisting with the production of this thesis. His many pep talks appear to have paid off.

I appreciate the friendship and encouragement of fellow-student, Mark Henkes.

I am profoundly grateful to my parents, Don and Janette Dickerson, for their consistent moral and financial support during the course of my graduate studies at OSU.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. WHY THE CONTADORA GROUP? . . . . .	1
Differing Perspectives. . . . .	1
The International System in Transition . . . . .	4
Polycentrism at the Regional Level . . . . .	8
The Emergence of Independent Foreign Policies . . . . .	10
Notes . . . . .	17
II. FOREIGN POLICIES: CASE STUDIES OF THE CONTADORA COUNTRIES. . . . .	21
Panama: A Shift in Foreign Policy? . . . . .	21
Toward an Independent Foreign Policy . . . . .	22
Continued Dependence on the United States . . . . .	27
Summary. . . . .	30
Venezuela: OPEC Wealth and Foreign Policy Activism. . . . .	32
Central American Policy. . . . .	38
Summary. . . . .	41
Colombia: Presidential Foreign Policy Making. . . . .	43
A Regional Foreign Policy. . . . .	46
Summary. . . . .	49
Mexico: Maverick State. . . . .	50
Bilateral Relationship with the U.S. . . . .	50
Precedents for an Independent Foreign Policy . . . . .	52
Oil Revenues Increase Affordable Policy Options . . . . .	58
Chapter Summary . . . . .	62
Notes . . . . .	67
III. THE CONTADORA PROCESS: PROPOSALS AND OBSTACLES . . . . .	75
Formation and Early Meetings. . . . .	76
United States Manipulating Central American Allies? . . . . .	81
The Cancun Summit . . . . .	83
The Document of Objectives. . . . .	85

Chapter	Page
Nicaragua Surprises U.S. with Intent to Sign Contadora Draft Treaty . . . . .	90
Contadora Talks Cancelled . . . . .	95
Dispute Over Political Asylum. . . . .	97
U.S. Strategy to Block Contadora . . . . .	98
Contadora Talks Resumed . . . . .	100
Summary . . . . .	101
Notes . . . . .	104
 IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	 111
Effect of Change in the International System. . . . .	112
Foreign Policy Determinants . . . . .	114
 BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	 119
 APPENDIX. . . . .	 132

## CHAPTER I

### WHY THE CONTADORA GROUP?

#### Differing Perspectives

Opposition to U.S. foreign policy in Central America crystallized January 8-9, 1983, with the formation of the Contadora Group. The foreign ministers of Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, and Mexico met on the Panamanian island of Contadora on that date to discuss how to achieve peace in Central America. The Contadora Group has consistently rejected United States' policy as improperly imposing a Cold War view on the region's problems.<sup>1</sup> The United States, in turn, has not given full support to the Contadora Group's efforts, and has even blocked one Contadora peace treaty.<sup>2</sup>

This research examines the Contadora peace process which ostensibly seeks a negotiated, peaceful settlement of the Central American conflict through the collective action of the four Contadora member nations.

The Carter and Reagan administrations have applied a Cold War analysis to Central America, viewing conflicts there as part of a Soviet-Cuban plan to spread Marxism throughout the region. The Reagan Administration has invoked the clichéd "domino theory," which posits that



Central American governments will fall to communism like so many dominoes, leading finally to a communist Mexico.<sup>3</sup>

Jeanne J. Kirkpatrick, ideologue of President Reagan's Central American policy and former ambassador to the United Nations, attributes the fall of Anastasio Somoza's regime primarily to what she terms Jimmy Carter's "inept" Latin American policy.<sup>4</sup> She takes no account of deep-seated economic, political, and social inequalities which critics of the administration's policy, including the Contadora Group, define as the cause of unrest in the region. One Mexican critic assesses the Reagan administration's position:

...Washington views events in Central America in terms of a global confrontation with the USSR. This point of view, elaborated in a white paper on El Salvador, fears outside communist involvement. The document concludes that the insurrection in that country "has been progressively transformed into a textbook case of indirect armed aggression by Communist powers through Cuba."

The Reagan administration has committed itself to a military strategy in Central America which is supported by few Latin American countries. The U.S. has established a base in Honduras near the border with Nicaragua, and has conducted a number of military exercises there.<sup>6</sup> One military exercise in the Caribbean involved 30,000 troops from all branches in the U.S. armed services.<sup>7</sup> The Central Intelligence Agency has organized and funded an army of Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries, or contras, also in

Honduras. The CIA is also responsible for the mining of Nicaraguan ports, which has drawn fire from Congress and the international community.<sup>8</sup> In El Salvador, the U.S. has provided millions of dollars in economic and military aid to a government whose legitimacy and control of the military is in question. U.S. assistance includes arms, ammunition, logistical support, and advisors who have helped train more than 15,000 Salvadoran soldiers.<sup>9</sup> These policies have faced considerable domestic opposition, from both the Congress, and the public.<sup>10</sup>

The Contadora Group's opposition to U.S. policy in Central America raises a number of questions about inter-American relations. It may be reasoned that the Contadora Group's existence and its policies are due, in part, to reaction to past and present U.S. policy in Latin America. It is of particular importance that the Latin American perception of present U.S. policy is influenced by a resentment of the 150 year history of U.S. interventions in the hemisphere. Recent interventions include the CIA-organized overthrow of Guatemala's democratically elected President Arbenz in 1954, the occupation by U.S. Marines of the Dominican Republic in 1965 to prevent a Communist victory in that country, the CIA-backed coup d'etat which overthrew Chile's elected President Allende, and the 1983 invasion of Grenada. Of the four Contadora countries, only Venezuela has escaped direct armed

intervention by the United States. This history, combined with present U.S. policy, fuels fears of a direct U.S. military intervention in Central America.

Such a long history of United States' interventions in Latin American countries may explain why nations in the region are particularly resentful of U.S. dominance. But why have the four Contadora Group countries chosen the present to challenge U.S. policy in Central America? And through what means are these countries presenting this challenge?

#### The International System in Transition

One explanation is that the international system has undergone changes such that U.S. hegemony in the Western Hemisphere has waned in recent years, thereby creating new opportunities for other states in the hemisphere.<sup>11</sup>

Political theorist Morton Kaplan, and others, have theorized that in the period immediately following World War II, the world fit the model of a loose bipolar system. Kaplan's loose bipolar model posits two major rival nations, or superpowers, leading directly competing blocs, and uncommitted neutral national actors.<sup>12</sup> Ideology aside, the superpowers are assumed to gain long-term allies when the foreign policy-makers of weaker states discern that their own countries' security would be best protected in alliance with one of the bloc leaders, and perhaps when they

find themselves coerced into membership in one of the blocs.<sup>13</sup>

Latin America has been an official member of the Western alliance since the signing of the 1947 Rio Treaty.<sup>14</sup> However, Latin American states' decisions to join the United States to form the Inter-American system after World War II was not due to coercion, nor out of fear of the Soviet bloc. The Latin American nations were reluctant to enter into a treaty of collective security after World War II, but were induced to join by promises of economic "cooperation", or assistance, from Washington, and the opportunity to formalize the United States' denunciation of intervention in Latin American states in the Rio Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of American States.<sup>15</sup>

Some scholars of the international system suggest that Kaplan's loose bipolar model no longer accurately describes the international system.<sup>16</sup> They assert that the loose-bipolar system of the post-World War II era has undergone transformation such that Washington and Moscow do not wield power over their respective allies as they did immediately following World War II.<sup>17</sup> Both the Soviet and Western blocs have experienced internal conflicts and a loss of solidarity since the 1950's.<sup>18</sup> The term "polycentrism" was coined by Soviet writers in the 1950's to describe the breakup of the monolithic communist bloc.<sup>19</sup> The term has also been applied to the decentralization of the Western

bloc after the recovery of Europe and the increasing national diversity in foreign policies in the international system.

Power is more diffuse in the contemporary world than a loose bipolar model allows for. Steven Rosen writes that in the 1950's the American bloc began to crack:

Latin America, increasingly disenchanted with Washington's sporadic paternalism, began to consider itself a member of the Third World, despite its formal<sup>20</sup> military and economic ties with the United States.

Furthermore, Alfred Stepan writes that these formal military and economic ties with the U.S. have been and are disappearing. He writes that the United States is no longer the primary supplier of arms to Latin America, lagging behind Europe and Israel, and challenged by Argentine and Brazilian export arms industries.<sup>21</sup> Bilateral economic relations have also changed. Until the mid-1960's, the United States Agency for International Development provided monies which significantly increased the trade capacities of many Latin American countries. "Middle income" countries, such as Mexico and Venezuela, no longer qualify for USAID programs, while structural economic changes within those countries' economies have improved their standing in the global economy.<sup>22</sup>

Many Latin American states have asserted new and independent foreign policies since the advent of a more polycentric system. The meaning of an independent foreign

policy is that in relation to the United States, particularly on Cold War issues, each of the Latin American countries has "asserted policy positions according to individual country interests and requirements of national security."<sup>23</sup> These nations have "frequently opposed U.S. Cold War policies because their own sovereignties are threatened when the principle of non-intervention is endangered."<sup>24</sup> Many Latin American and other third world nations have sought to decrease their dependence on the U.S. through diversifying trade and investment away from the United States.<sup>25</sup> According to Robert Rothstein, states asserting themselves politically in these ways suggest a multipolar or polycentric distribution of power, in that alliances have become more flexible than allowed under the loose bipolar model.<sup>26</sup>

While the world may be in transition from a loose bipolar model toward a polycentric one, this does not, in the opinion of the writer, indicate a return to a classical balance of power system. The classical balance of power system contains a minimum of five large powers of roughly equal importance which operate in a flexible alliance system in which there is a nation that play the role of "balancer" by throwing its weight to the weaker of two alliances, thereby discouraging the previously dominant alliance from acts of aggression.<sup>27</sup> Wolfram Hanrieder writes that the period of bipolarity experienced by the world after 1945 is

evolving into a more flexible international system, which exhibits both bipolar and polycentric patterns.<sup>28</sup> The world is still dominated by the competition between the superpowers, and there is no agent, national or supranational, that can act as balancer between the United States and the Soviet Union. Moreover, the four Contadora members are still economically dependent on the major leader of the Western bloc: the United States.<sup>29</sup>

#### Polycentrism at the Regional Level

Perhaps the best illustration of transition to a polycentric system of international relations is found in formerly quiescent Latin American nations asserting an independent foreign policy from that of the United States. Twenty-five years ago the United States knew near-solid hemispheric support for its policy toward Castro's regime. Within four years after the Cuban revolution, all Latin America, except Mexico, had followed the United States' lead and had turned its collective back on Cuba. In direct violation of the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS), Cuba was expelled from that body.<sup>30</sup> A variety of sanctions were applied by the OAS to Cuba in 1964 and 1967, which were not lifted until 1975. Cuba's continued socialist revolutionary experiment, in alliance with the Soviet Union, is evidence that United States' dominance of the Western Hemisphere is less than it used to

be.

This contrasts with the challenges from longstanding allies facing the United States' Central American policy today. In 1979, the Carter Administration could not get enough votes in the OAS for its proposal to send a multinational peacekeeping force to Nicaragua; this U.S. plan was designed to support 'moderate' elements in Nicaragua, thereby preventing a victory by the National Sandinista Liberation Front, or FSLN. In 1985, six years after the Nicaraguan revolution, the Reagan Administration alone imposes a trade embargo against the Sandinista regime. Not only do Japan, Western Europe and a number of Latin American countries trade with Nicaragua, but these nations also supply the Sandinistas with economic and military assistance which is unavailable from the U.S.<sup>31</sup>

From the preceding, one may hypothesize that the Contadora process is a reflection of a transition toward a polycentric world. This thesis will test the extent to which the Contadora Group is a manifestation of a movement away from a loose-bipolar system toward a polycentric one. It will examine the Contadora Group as a case study of decreased United States' hegemony in the Western hemisphere.

This thesis will attempt to show whether the decisions of Panamanian, Colombian, Mexican, and Venezuelan foreign policy-makers to participate in the Contadora Group are linked to a transition in the international system.



## The Emergence of Independent Foreign Policies

Another explanation for the emergence of the Contadora Group and the commitment of its four member countries to it, is the role of individual foreign policies designed to protect and pursue the national interests or goals of a given country. The concept of foreign policy refers to the objectives which a nation's policy-makers seek to achieve abroad, the values that shape those goals, and the means through which those objectives are pursued.<sup>32</sup> Foreign policy objectives are determined by a nation's foreign policy-makers in terms of what they perceive to be in the national interest. Their ultimate goal is to promote those interests in the minds of others.<sup>33</sup> Foreign policy-makers develop a hierarchy of interests, according to their perception of them, which may be termed core, medium-range, and long-term interests. "Certain interests must be defended at all costs; others should be safeguarded under particular circumstances; and certain others, although desirable, can almost never be defended."<sup>34</sup> Typically, foreign policy goals asserted by states focus first on self-preservation, and later, on self-enhancement, which may include the goal of acquiring power, and the demonstration of power through a policy of prestige.<sup>35</sup> This research contends that the Contadora countries are motivated by two

levels of goals: that of an altruistic and practical goal of regional peace, and of self-enhancement, or pursuit of prestige and/or power. The core interest is to protect their sovereignty. It is motivated by fear of a U.S. infringement on their sovereignty should a regional war develop. The pursuit of prestige and/or power is a middle-range interest. This research will attempt to determine how successful each member of the Contadora Group is in meeting its foreign policy objectives.

A multitude of external and internal determinants shape the decisions foreign policy-makers make. As discussed earlier, a change in the international system will at least partially determine a country's foreign policy. While the international system is in transition some states may find available to them previously unavailable policies. Insofar as change in the international system affects relationships among nations, it serves as an external determinant of their individual foreign policy processes. Latin American nations dominated by the U.S. have chosen goals from their hierarchy of foreign policy objectives which express more depth and range than seen previously in the hemisphere.

The study of Latin American foreign policies is in its infancy. Before 1970, such study in the United States "usually referred to U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America rather than to foreign policies of Latin American nations individually or collectively toward any other

nation.<sup>36</sup> However, researchers have begun to fill in the gap in Latin American foreign policy studies. A number of studies of the foreign policies of Latin American states' have emerged in recent years. The author utilized a collection of such articles in Latin American Foreign Policies: Global and Regional Dimensions edited by Elizabeth G. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln. Insofar as this thesis includes a look at the U.S. role in Central America, several classic studies of U.S.-Latin American relations have been utilized. They include A Survey of United States -Latin American Relations by J. Lloyd Mecham, and The Latin American Policy of the United States by Samuel F. Bemis, which traces and interprets U.S. policy toward Latin America from independence through World War II. Until recently, studies of Latin American foreign policy have primarily consisted of case studies of the foreign policies of individual nations, with strong emphasis on the analysis of external and internal determinants of foreign policy, the substantive content of individual foreign policies, and the subsequent consequences of a foreign policy. The literature on Latin American foreign policies concerning the process by which policies are made and implemented is very weak.<sup>37</sup>

"To some extent this emphasis accurately reflects the predominance of the chief executive in the foreign policy-making process."<sup>38</sup> To this extent, it would be inappropriate to extrapolate a model based on what has been

written about the U.S. foreign policy-making process, as political institutions behave very differently in most Latin American countries.

Therefore, the author has relied heavily on studies which examine the content of the foreign policies of each of the Contadora members. The most plentiful literature is on Mexico. Several studies of Mexican foreign policies were helpful in researching this thesis. These include several journal articles by Bruce M. Bagley which deal with Mexico as a regional power, two articles by Edward J. Williams and one by John F. McShane which focus on Mexico's Central American policy, and the motivations for that policy, and an article by James F. Engel that analyzes the role of the Mexican Revolution in shaping the country's foreign policy. Studies of Venezuelan foreign policy useful to the author include a paper by Douglas Carlisle entitled "Venezuelan Foreign Policy: Its Organization and Beginning," Robert Bond's book, Contemporary Venezuela and its Role in International Affairs, and an article by Demetrio Boersner which discusses Venezuelan policies toward Central America. The impact of increased oil revenues on Venezuela's foreign policy discussed in an article by David Blank. Few works illuminate Colombian foreign policy; those which were available were several articles by Gerhard Drekonja-Kornat, an article by Ramon Jimeno dealing with Colombian policy in the Caribbean, and several analyses of Colombian-U.S.

relations. Panamanian foreign policy literature is even more scarce, so the author relied on more traditional studies of U.S.-Panamanian relations, and a chapter of a book by Steven C. Ropp which examines the changes in Panamanian politics since 1903. In addition to the literature referred to above, the author has utilized English-language periodicals which review Latin American and Central American news, and Latin American newspapers for indications of shifts in foreign policy.

The author utilized U.S. and Latin American periodicals and newspapers, and United Nations documents for material concerning the Contadora Group's proposals and problems. Some of these sources discuss the U.S. role in the Contadora process; however, no one has analyzed the reasons why the four Contadora members are pursuing this policy. This thesis provides the first analysis of the motivations for the member states of the Contadora Group, and the first attempt to compare the foreign policy motivations of the four particular countries which make up the Contadora Group.

This thesis will examine the question of how and why "small powers" are able to develop a leadership position in a region dominated by a "large power". In more concrete terms, this research shall examine the Contadora Group member countries' foreign policies, and examine their efforts toward a Contadora Peace treaty in Central America

in opposition to U.S. Central American policy. In treating the foreign policies of the Contadora members, this thesis will examine the Contadora process as a manifestation of the trend for Latin American states to assert their national interest, according to what their foreign policy-makers perceive as the national interest, in opposition to United States policy. This thesis will search for the foreign policy goals common to the four nations, and will also attempt to illuminate differences in their foreign policy priorities. Reflecting the dominant role of the Latin American presidency in foreign policy-making, it will include a look for differences in the style of individual presidents within the Contadora Group states. Further, this research will examine how successful the Contadora Group has been in attaining both its stated goals for achieving regional peace, and the inferred goals of enhancing their individual power and prestige.

Chapter Two will consist of case studies of the four Contadora Group member states: Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico, and their foreign policy motivations behind their participation in the Contadora Group. This will entail an examination of the content of individual foreign policies, and the external and internal foreign policy determinants behind the pursuit of the Contadora process.

Chapter Three will look beyond the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of foreign policy choices

within the four Contadora member countries. This chapter will look to the larger interactive process of relations between the Contadora Group, the United States, and other international actors. Proposals and recommendations of the Contadora Group, as well as obstacles to the peace process, will be explored in Chapter Three. This assessment of the Contadora process will include discussion of various obstacles faced by the Contadora Group, including U.S. foreign policy in the region, and vis-a-vis the Contadora Group. This chapter will also assess where Contadora is going, and will evaluate current efforts of the Contadora Group and its chances for obtaining a regional peace treaty.

Chapter Four will consist of a summary of conclusions made in the course of answering the question of how and why have the four Contadora Group member nations been able, as "small powers", to develop a leadership position in the Western hemisphere, a region dominated by the United States.

Moreover, this chapter will evaluate the success of the Contadora Group in achieving the goal of Central American peace in the face of U.S. opposition. This last chapter will summarize the relative success of the four Contadora member countries in achieving their foreign policy goals through participation in the Contadora Group.

## Notes

1. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" UN CHRONICLE, v. 21, March 1984, p. 9; Alan Riding, "Lopez Portillo Urges Talks on Reagan" NEW YORK TIMES, February 22, 1982, p. A8.

2. Alma Guillermoprieto and David Hoffman, "Document Describes how U S 'Blocked' a Contadora Treaty" WASHINGTON POST, November 6, 1984, p 1

3. Richard R. Fagen, "Dateline Nicaragua: The End of the Affair" FOREIGN POLICY, Fall 1979, reprinted in FOREIGN POLICY ON LATIN AMERICA: 1970-1980 (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1983), p. 156; Nestor D. Sanchez, "The Communist Threat" FOREIGN POLICY, v. 52, Fall 1983, pp. 43-51; James Nelson Goodsell, "Central America: Fire in the Front Yard?" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, February 12, 1982, pp. 12-13.

4. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, "U.S. Security and Latin America" in Howard J. Wiarda (ed.), RIFT AND REVOLUTION: THE CENTRAL AMERICAN IMBROGLIO (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1984), pp 343-346.

5. Olga Pellicer, "Mexico's Position" FOREIGN POLICY, no 43, Summer 1981, pp. 89-92.

6. Paul Ellman, "Washington's New Offensive" MACLEANS, v 96, October 17, 1983, pp. 39-40.

7. Robert Robert Fraser (ed.), "Central America-United States-US Policy and Contadora Peace Efforts" KEESING'S CONTEMPORARY ARCHIVES: RECORD OF WORLD EVENTS, vol.XXX, 1984.

8. John M. Goshko, "Mexico Aide Says Mining of Ports Is Counterproductive" WASHINGTON POST, April 18, 1984, p A23.

9. Langhorne A. Motley, "El Salvador: Revoultion or Reform?" DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN, v 84, no. 2084, March 1984, p. 65.

10. Gerald M. Boyd, "Reagan Defends Latin Policy" NEW YORK TIMES, March 3, 1985, p. 6; "Senate criticism threatens



CIA aid to Nicaraguans" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, January 9, 1985, p. 2; Don Shannon, "O'Neill Asks War Powers Probe on U.S. Salvador Role" LOS ANGELES TIMES, March 31, 1984, part I, p. 22; "Reagan Appeals to Public For Support On C A. Policy" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. VI, no. 16, May 2, 1983, p. 122; Esteban Torres and Alan Cranston, "Ignoring Contadora Defeats Our Purposes" LOS ANGELES TIMES, August 26, 1983, p. 28.

11. K. J. Holsti, INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967), pp. 169-170; Abraham F. Lowenthal and Albert Fishlow, LATIN AMERICA'S EMERGENCE: TOWARD A U.S. RESPONSE (New York: The Headline Series, published by the Foreign Policy Association, 1979), p. 21.

12. Morton A Kaplan and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, THE POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1961), pp. 49-51.

13. Holsti, p. 171.

14. Jennie K. Lincoln, "Introduction to Latin American Foreign Policy: Global and Regional Dimensions" in Elizabeth G Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), p. 8.

15. J. Lloyd Meham, A SURVEY OF UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1965.)

16. Cecil V. Crabb, NATIONS IN A MULTIPOLAR WORLD, (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 645; Wolfram F. Hanrieder, "The international system: bipolar or multibloc?" JOURNAL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION, no. 9, September 1965, pp. 299-308; K J. Holsti, INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967; Steven Rosen and Walter Jones, THE LOGIC OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop, 1974.)

17. Douglas Mendel, AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN A POLYCENTRIC WORLD (Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1968), p. 16.

18. Crabb, p. 245; Rosen and Jones, pp. 216-219.

19. Mendel, p. 16.

20. Rosen and Jones, p. 217.

21. Alfred Stepan, "The United States and Latin America: Vital Interests and the Instruments of Power" in Elizabeth G. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), p. 20.
22. *ibid* , pp 20-22.
23. John J. Finan, "Latin America and the Cold War" in Harold Eugene Davis, John J. Finan, and F. Taylor Peck (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY: AN INTRODUCTION (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), p 257.
24. Edward J. Williams, THE POLITICAL THEMES OF INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS (Belmont, California: Duxbury Press, 1971), p. 49.
25. Thomas H. Skidmore and Peter H. Smith, MODERN LATIN AMERICA (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 351.
26. Robert L. Rothstein, "Alignment, Nonalignment, Small Powers: 1945-1965," in Julian R. Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen (eds.), ALLIANCE IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1970), p. 336.
27. Kaplan and Katzenbach, pp. 31-41.
28. Hanrieder, pp. 300, 304.
29. Nicholas Kristof, "That International 'Debt Bomb' Hasn't Stopped Ticking" NEW YORK TIMES, March 31, 1985, p. E5; Alan Riding, "Latin Debt: Postponing the Burden" NEW YORK TIMES, September 23, 1984, p. 8-9.
30. M Margaret Ball, THE OAS IN TRANSITION, (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1969.)
31. Robert E. Bond (ed.), CONTEMPORARY VENEZUELA AND ITS ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (New York: New York University Press, 1977), p. 251; Edward Cody, "W. European Aid to Central Americans" WASHINGTON POST, September 30, 1984, p. A28; James LeMoyné, "European-Latin Parley Considers More Aid" NEW YORK TIMES, September 30, 1984, p. 7; CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. VII, no. 26, July 4, 1981, p. 208.
32. Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and Eugene R. Wittkopf, AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY: PATTERN AND PROCESS (New York: St.

Martin's Press, 1982), p. 3.

33. Hans J. Morgenthau, *POLITICS AMONG NATIONS* (5th ed., New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1978), p. 341.

34. Kenneth W. Thompson and Roy C. Macridis, "The Comparative Study of Foreign Policy" in Roy C. Macridis (ed ), *FOREIGN POLICY IN WORLD POLITICS* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 4.

35. Morgenthau, pp. 42-43.

36. Lincoln, p. 5.

37. *ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

38. *ibid.*, p.6.

## CHAPTER II

### FOREIGN POLICIES: CASE STUDIES OF THE CONTADORA COUNTRIES

It was suggested in Chapter One that a possible explanation for the activity of the Contadora Group is the role of foreign policy in promoting the national interest as defined by foreign policymakers of the four Contadora member states. This chapter will explain the Contadora Group in terms of possible external and internal foreign policy motivations. In an effort to determine the various motivations of Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico for participating in the Contadora process, this chapter will consist of case studies of the foreign policies of the Contadora countries.

This chapter will look for differences and common themes in the content and style of foreign policies, and of perception of the international system and their nations' roles in it.

#### Panama: A Shift in Foreign Policy?

Panama's dependence on the U.S. has been heavy since it achieved its independence from Colombia in 1903. Panama's independence was won with the indispensable

assistance of the United States, but was compromised almost immediately in the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 which gave the U.S. the right of armed intervention in Panama, and the right to any territory essential to the maintenance or security of the Canal.<sup>1</sup> Further, the Panamanian Constitution of 1904 stipulated that defense of the canal and of Panama's continued independence and sovereignty was the obligation of the United States; this document also confirmed the U.S. right of intervention in Panama.<sup>2</sup> Until the 1978 Canal Treaty, Panama's foreign policy consisted mainly of its bilateral relationship with the United States. Many Panamanians believe the U.S. played an imperialistic role in their country. This had an impact on domestic politics, as "a candidate's legitimacy derived largely from foreign policy positions adopted in relation to the 'Colossus of the North'."<sup>3</sup> Evidence that Panamanian dependence on the U.S. has been extremely heavy follows:

A large troop presence was normally maintained in the Canal Zone, and the Panamanian economy was dominated by the Canal Zone and by the banana plantations of United Fruit. Indeed the economic dependence of Panama on the United States was so great during most of the twentieth century that this factor alone could have easily inhibited the pursuit of independent foreign policy initiatives.<sup>4</sup>

### Toward an Independent Foreign Policy

General Omar Torrijos dominated Panamanian politics until his death in a plane crash July 31, 1981. Torrijos

came to power in 1968 through a coup d'etat which removed the newly elected Arnulfo Arias Madrid from office. AS Supreme Commander fo the National Guard, Torrijos created the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD), consisting of popular forces such as the poor, students, and labor groups, which he aligned with the National Guard against the oligarchy.<sup>5</sup> The Panamanian consitution explicitly recognizes the political role of the military, which is known as the Defense Forces, and formerly as the National Guard. The president does not command the military and cannot appoint, nor remove, officers.<sup>6</sup>

Since Torrijos' death, the military has maintained control of Panama's politics. From Torrijos' death until the May 1984 presidential elections, Brig. Gen. Manuel A. Noriega, chief of the Defense Forces, has forced two presidents to resign over differences over foreign policy and PRD politics, and has selected two other presidents. Noriega endorsed the U.S. sponsored regional military alliance against Nicaragua, CONDECA, which is inconsistent with former-President Ricardo de la Espriella's participation in Contadora. De la Espriella resigned January 13, 1984, after Noriega forced the nomination of PRD outsider Nicolas Ardito Barletta as the party's candidate for the May 1984 presidential election.<sup>7</sup> Ardito won the election, and was inaugurated in December of 1984.

From 1968 to 1978, Panama's primary foreign policy

goal was a new Canal treaty with the United States. In order to pressure the U.S. into negotiating the new Panama Canal treaties with the United States, Torrijos built a heterogenous international coalition, which included Havana, Tel Aviv, and others.<sup>8</sup> Torrijos forged an independent and anti-imperialistic reputation for Panama, which earned the country ideological legitimacy with the non-aligned movement. Torrijos "led Panama to a position of regional and even world influence far out of proportion to the size of the country."<sup>9</sup>

With the ratification of a new treaty in 1978, Panama's primary foreign policy goal shifted to protection from a perceived threat of U.S. intervention under the 1978 Neutrality Treaty.<sup>10</sup> The U.S. was granted in the 1978 treaty "a permanent, unilateral right to intervene in Panama on behalf of the Canal's so-called neutrality."<sup>11</sup> Steven Ropp writes that Panama began to develop broad relations with sympathetic Third World nations to get their signatures on the Neutrality Treaty in an effort to demonstrate to the U.S. the neutrality of the canal does not require U.S. "protection." This also enhanced Panama's prestige and autonomy.

Editorials and articles in Panamanian newsmagazines suggest that many Panamanians remain fearful of a unilateral intervention by the United States. This perception is that overt U.S. military activity in any of the Central American

countries would heighten the possibility that the Canal Zone would be the scene of another U.S. military occupation. Such an intrusion would threaten Panama's sovereignty, and would damage the image of independence that Panama's leaders have struggled to build. Charges that Panama is no more than a protectorate of the United States would again ring with some truth to them. That, the majority of Panamanians do not want. A primary motivation for Panama to join the Contadora Group, then, could be fears of U.S. "interests" in the canal.

This prospect has prompted Panama to join a multi-lateral effort to prevent the escalation of conflict in Central America. Regular interaction with the regional powers of Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia, serve to enhance Panama's image. Anything which appears to, or actually does, lessen Panama's dependence on the U.S., without compromising Panama in the eyes of its leaders, is seen to be in Panama's national interest. Panama does not desire to return to such a weak position in its asymmetrical bilateral relationship with the U.S. as it has endured in the past.

With a long history of U.S. domination of Panama, the country is still sensitive to anything which might undermine its relatively new image as an independent member of the non-aligned movement. An example of this sensitivity is the Panamanian protest of the use of AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) aircraft operating out of U.S. Howard Air



Force Base, located in the Canal Zone. The Pentagon confirmed the AWACS were used in reconnaissance missions over Central America to watch out for small planes smuggling weapons out of Nicaragua. Panama's government said this would "undermine Panama's standing among its Latin American neighbors and provide fuel for the Panamanian left."<sup>12</sup>

Panama's foreign policy motivations are not limited to decreasing its dependence on the United States. In the 1930's, Panama broke relations with Franco's Spain.<sup>13</sup> More recently, Panama supported the Sandinistas in their revolt against Somoza. The late Omar Torrijos did not like the Nicaraguan dictator, which probably motivated him in part to support the Sandinistas. Torrijos funnelled arms to the FSLN, and formed a semi-clandestine military unit which was sent to aid the Nicaraguan revolutionaries. When Somoza fell from power in July 1979, over 200 Panamanian volunteers were fighting in Nicaragua, accompanied by an undetermined number of "retired" Panamanian National Guards.<sup>14</sup>

At the OAS conference of June 1979, which took place one month before Somoza's defeat, Panama voted against the U.S. proposal to send a multinational peacekeeping force to Nicaragua. After the Sandinista victory, Panama continued to provide them with assistance. The Panamanian National Guard helped train and equip the new police force of Nicaragua; the old police force, which was the infamous

Somocista National Guard, had fled the country as it was as much a target of the revolution as Somoza himself.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, it is clear that Panama's foreign policy has been motivated by other factors than its bilateral relationship with the United States.

#### Continued Dependence on the United States

Panama remains heavily dependent on foreign investment, primarily on that from the U.S. In 1981, U.S. investment accounted for over half of all foreign investment in Panama. Panama is attempting to diversify its dependence on foreign capital, and has focused on attracting Japanese, Hong Kong, and Taiwanese investment. Panama signed agreements in 1983 which encouraged British, French, and U.S. investment.<sup>16</sup> "Until the economy [of Panama] is less dependent on foreign investment and is more diversified, its future will hinge on a peaceful and stable business environment."<sup>17</sup> War in the region would threaten Panamanian attempts at diversification. It can be assumed that Panama's leaders hope to avoid that.

The United States Agency for International Development (AID) has loaned Panama \$25 million for 1985. This money to be used to improve the living standards of low-income Panamanians. In 1984, AID donated \$30 million to help stabilize Panama's economy.<sup>18</sup> The investment agreement with the United States illustrates Panama's recognition that

it cannot break ties with the U.S. without hurting its own economy (or risking a U.S. intervention in the Canal Zone). The U.S. also promised Panama greater economic benefits from the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and the establishment of U.S. textile mills in Panama.<sup>19</sup>

Concurrent with strengthened economic ties with the United States, it is alleged that President Ardito has shown signs of supporting the Reagan administration's Central American policy. Ardito told the French daily Le Monde that "the peoples and governments of Central America would never tolerate the presence of Soviet Migs in Nicaragua."<sup>20</sup> In late December of 1984, President Ardito and his foreign minister attended a conference in Miami which dealt with U.S. relations with Latin America and was sponsored by the U.S. Congress. Also attending the conference was former director of the CIA, William Colby.<sup>21</sup>

Although Panama protested the 1983 U.S.-Honduran "Big Pine" military maneuvers, Panama has continued to participate in joint military maneuvers with the U.S. in 1983, 1984, and 1985. Panama's newly elected President Ardito agreed to joint military exercises with over 10,000 U.S. soldiers in Panamanian territory far from the Canal Zone, from mid-January to mid-April, 1985. This is eight times the number of U.S. troops involved in joint maneuvers with Honduras.<sup>22</sup> The joint exercises have been protested by Panamanians as a challenge to Panama's sovereignty, in

part, because the maneuvers began on the twenty-first anniversary of 1964 riots in which 28 young Panamanians were killed by U.S. Marines. Those riots were sparked by the actions of U.S. authorities who had prevented a Panamanian high school student from placing a Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.<sup>23</sup> Panama broke off diplomatic relations with the United States following the 1964 riots in the first open protest by Panama's government against the U.S.<sup>24</sup>

The 1985 demonstrations denounced the joint maneuvers as part of the Reagan administration's military strategy in the region.<sup>25</sup> Panama's armed forces have reassured the country "that the maneuvers lack any aggressive intent against other Central American countries."<sup>26</sup> The protesters also questioned the legality of the military exercises. The armed forces have justified them by citing the 1977 Torrijos-Carter Canal Treaty which stipulates U.S. protection and defense of the Canal Zone until 2000. Defense Forces spokesman, Major Edgardo Lopez, said the exercises are not military maneuvers, but are training exercises for the Canal's defense. However, opponents insist that the treaty limits the U.S. presence to the Canal Zone itself, whereas the joint exercises took place in a jungle area far from the canal.<sup>27</sup>

Opponents of the military exercises also pointed out that the maneuvers could endanger Panama's role in the Contadora Group. A revised Contadora draft treaty would

prohibit "international military maneuvers" in any signatory country, and the suspension within 30 days of maneuvers already in progress. Although it is not clear whether Panama would be required to abide by this prohibition, "the new exercises...could undermine Panama's moral authority in the regional peace initiative."<sup>28</sup>

The government has been controlled by the military since 1968. Violence next door is seen by some in the Defense Forces as contagious. Should the U.S. intervene in the Canal Zone, Panamanians might well blame the military and force them to withdraw from politics. It has been observed that "the [Panamanian] military does not want to relinquish its political power."<sup>29</sup>

### Summary

Panama has participated in the Contadora Group, in part, to prevent a war in the region which would threaten Panama's own autonomy, and the Sandinista government which Panama has supported even before it ousted Somoza. Panama has sought to prevent the Central American crisis from becoming a pretense for a U.S. intervention in the Canal Zone. The current of violence in the region also threatens to destabilize Panama's own political and economic systems. It is in the interest of Panama for the unrest in the region to be brought to a peaceful close. These goals are motivated by the core foreign policy interest of

self-preservation.

Panama has also pursued a policy of self-enhancement: by pursuing an independent foreign policy, Panama has enhanced its prestige in the international community. This foreign policy interest is rooted in the efforts of Omar Torrijos to negotiate a new canal treaty with the United States. This theme was continued with Torrijos' support of the Sandinistas in the war against the Somoza regime, and continued assistance to the FSLN after its 1979 victory, and participation in the Contadora Group. Information was not available which would indicate whether Panamanian aid to Nicaragua continues.

However, it appears that President Ardito's commitment to the Contadora process is in doubt. Ardito was hand-picked by the commander of Panama's defense forces, Brig. Gen Noriega, as the presidential candidate of the Torrista PRD party. In 1983 Noriega endorsed instruments of U.S. policy in Central America which was inconsistent with the participation of President de la Espriella in the Contadora Group, who later resigned over differences with Noriega. One can speculate that as Noriega's choice for the presidency, Ardito will fall in line with the General on matters of foreign policy. Ardito has permitted five-month joint military exercises with the United States to take place in Panama, despite protests that they are illegal, are threats to Panama's sovereignty, and are threats to the

Contadora process. Panama has been closely identified with the United States in the past, and is today courting U.S. economic aid. Perhaps the price for such favors is a less independent foreign policy.

#### Venezuela: OPEC Wealth and Foreign Policy Activism

With the exception of three years in the 1940's, Venezuela's foreign policy differed little from Washington's until the 1970's. Before 1958, Venezuela's presidents gained office largely through undemocratic means, and were at least partially dependent on the U.S. to remain in office. In addition, Venezuela was, and is, dependent on the U.S. as the primary market for Venezuelan oil.

The roots of an independent Venezuelan foreign policy appeared under the leadership of Romulo Betancourt, head of the revolutionary junta that ruled Venezuela from 1945 to 1948. This policy emphasized support for democratic regimes, and opposition to military and right-wing dictatorships through non-recognition of governments ruled by dictators. Under Betancourt, Venezuela withdrew diplomatic recognition from right-wing dictatorships in Nicaragua and Santo Domingo, and the Franco regime in Spain. Venezuela also supported the Spanish Republican government-in-exile.<sup>30</sup> This policy later became known as the Betancourt Doctrine during Betancourt's 1958-1964

presidency.<sup>31</sup>

During rule by the Democratic Action party (AD) from 1958 to 1968, defense of democracy in Latin America was Venezuela's foreign policy priority. "By encouraging democracy and discouraging dictatorship abroad, Venezuela hoped to strengthen its own democratic system."<sup>32</sup> During the 1950s, Venezuela had established a policy of opposing international communism through support of U.S. policy. In the 1960s, Venezuela's AD leadership applied the Betancourt Doctrine to Fidel Castro's Cuba, and was thus in line with U.S. foreign policy.<sup>33</sup>

However, anti-U.S. sentiments grew in Venezuela during this same period. Venezuelans were angry with the U.S. for its support of the military dictatorship of Perez Jimenez through the 1950's. Venezuelans also perceived United States' foreign economic policies as responsible for Venezuelan dependence on an unstable world market. This foreshadowed the position of the Southern coalition in the North-South dialogue in which primary points of contention are the unfavorable terms of trade on which members of the "underdeveloped" world rely, and the drastic fluctuations which prices for Southern goods are subject. Beginning in the 1960s, Venezuelan foreign policy sought more equal political and economic relations with the U.S.

When the Christian Democrats (Copei) elected their first president, Rafael Caldera, in 1968, Venezuela's



democratic system had survived a challenge from Cuban-supplied communist guerrillas. The leftist guerrilla movements had all but disappeared by 1968.<sup>34</sup> Through offers of amnesty, Caldera enticed the Left to voluntarily reintegrate itself into Venezuela's social and political system.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, Venezuela no longer seemed vulnerable to the changing political winds of the hemisphere. The world had also changed; it was no longer strictly bipolar as evidenced by the emergence of the nonaligned countries. For these reasons, Caldera discarded the Betancourt Doctrine and appeared to abandon a strong East-West orientation for a North-South one.<sup>36</sup> Reflecting the deemphasis on the Cold War, Venezuela renewed relations with the Soviet Union in 1970, and reestablished diplomatic relations with Cuba in 1974 during the presidency of Carlos Andres Perez.

With the 1973 energy crisis, both Venezuela's prestige and oil revenues grew. Venezuela rode that tide to greater autonomy and influence in its international relations. During the 1970's, Venezuela became a major player in the Caribbean and Central America.

Emboldened by the U.S. energy crisis and conscious of their new power, Venezuelan leaders denounced the old economic relationship with the United States, nationalized U.S. oil and steel holdings, and fashioned a foreign policy different from Washington's. For the first time in the Twentieth Century, the United States was unable to control or channel Venezuelan nationalism.<sup>37</sup>

In 1974, Venezuela's new oil wealth tripled the nation's income over what it had been the previous year. This enabled Venezuela to begin a policy of direct and substantial aid to Central American and Caribbean countries.<sup>38</sup> Venezuela spent 12% of its Gross Domestic Product on foreign aid and was "among the world's most generous dispensers of aid."<sup>39</sup> President Perez saw the region as a potential market for Venezuelan goods. He hoped to integrate Central America and the Caribbean's economic potential with Venezuela's, and said that the region's countries were the "'natural' recipients of Venezuela's marketable exports and of its political influence."<sup>40</sup> Venezuela also took a strong stand of support for Panama's campaign for a new canal treaty.

Such activism in the region brought charges of imperialism against Venezuela. A Dominican Republic economist noted this when he said:

Nineteen-seventy-four probably represents the close of period that began in 1961 of great dependence of our country on the United States, and unfortunately the beginning of another period of economic dependence on Venezuela and other nearby [oil] producers.<sup>41</sup>

Venezuela continues to assert itself in the politics and economics of Central America in order to increase its own prestige as a regional power.<sup>42</sup> However, with the bust in the oil market in the early 1980s, Venezuela's oil receipts and its foreign policy activism declined.<sup>43</sup> In

spite of this, "there is no question that it has permanently extended its influence in the area."<sup>44</sup> Venezuela continues to use its oil to enhance its image through the 1980 San José Protocol, also known as the Mexican-Venezuelan Agreement on Energy Cooperation for Central America and the Caribbean, which is designed to help the strained economies of the region develop and ward off economic breakdown.<sup>45</sup> Under the agreement, Venezuela and Mexico sell crude oil to ten nations in the region, including left- and right-wing governments, at 70% of the world price, and provide soft loans at 4% to cover the balance.<sup>46</sup> In this way both Venezuela and Mexico diversify their buyers a bit more away from the United States. However, Venezuela stopped supplying oil to Nicaragua in 1982 because, Venezuela claimed, the Sandinistas' oil debt to Venezuela had grown too large.<sup>47</sup> Critics accused Venezuela of using oil as a political weapon, because Venezuela singled out Nicaragua when other Central American recipients were also not meeting their payments under the San José Protocol.<sup>48</sup>

Considered loosely in terms of a cost-benefit analysis, Contadora is a profitable venture for Venezuela. It represents a relatively cheap means of asserting independence from the U.S. Verbal declarations and negotiations represent a lower risk than dispensing foreign aid, especially at a time when Venezuela's external debt runs at \$34 billion, making large foreign aid expenditures

too costly for Caracas.<sup>49</sup>

While Venezuela formulated foreign policies that were frowned upon in Washington, the country did not forget its important relationship with the U.S. Venezuela increased its oil exports to the U.S. during the Arab oil embargo, and was instrumental in preventing an OPEC-wide embargo. In the late 1970s Venezuela played the role of moderator between OPEC and the U.S.<sup>50</sup> Venezuela continued to receive large amounts of U.S. economic and military aid through the 1970's. In 1973 alone, Venezuela received \$133 million in credit toward the purchase of U.S. arms.<sup>51</sup>

Venezuela has enhanced its image through its active role in the Third World coalition. Venezuela's Minister of Mines in the early 1960s, Juan Pablo Perez Alfonzo, is the acknowledged father of OPEC.<sup>52</sup> Many other Venezuelan statesmen have been and are leading figures of the nonaligned movement and of the Socialist International. On the heels of ending a longstanding reciprocal trade agreement with the United States, Venezuela joined the Andean Group and the Sistema Economico Latinamericano (SELA), both regional economic organizations. The Andean Group was created in 1969, and consists currently of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela. In the late 1970's, the Andean Group assumed a more political posture in hemispheric affairs. Venezuela and Mexico created SELA, which excludes the United States from

membership, but includes Cuba. It was to be a framework for exclusively Latin economic integration, but its impact has been limited. Venezuela led the movement to reincorporate Cuba into the Latin American system and invited Cuba to join SELA; however, by 1981, relations between Venezuela and Cuba had become very cool. In 1981, Venezuela hosted and chaired the nonaligned Group of 77's conference, which was the precursor of the North-South conference held later that year in Cancun, Mexico.<sup>53</sup> Venezuela also opposed the U.S. during the Malvinas/Falklands crisis of 1982. Venezuela, angered by the U.S. priority on its European ties, was Argentina's most vocal supporter in the hemisphere.

#### Central American Policy

With regard to Central America and the Nicaraguan revolution, President Pérez denounced Somoza, and later, President Luis Herrera Campins lent no support to the U.S. proposed OAS peacekeeping force in Nicaragua.<sup>54</sup> Venezuela initiated the Andean Pact's policy of recognizing the FSLN as a belligerent in Nicaragua in order to help them gain legal status, and global support during the revolution. Caracas sent arms to the FSLN and sent a joint mission with Ecuador to Managua on June 11, 1979, to discuss the Nicaraguan crisis with Somoza.<sup>55</sup> "Topics of these talks included various solutions to the crisis, the political and social basis for the popular revolt, and concessions, if

any, Somoza was willing to offer."<sup>56</sup>

While the Sandinistas were consolidating their victory in Nicaragua in 1979, the Christian Democrats won the presidency in Venezuela, and Napoleon Duarte, a Christian Democrat, became head of the El Salvadoran junta. Duarte's political affiliation, and the fact that he had spent years in exile in Caracas, combined to make El Salvador the focus of Venezuela's Central American policy. The Christian Democrats were more interested in helping their counterpart succeed in El Salvador than in helping a "rival" ideology in Managua.<sup>57</sup> Venezuela has opposed including Salvadoran guerrillas in the government, as it does not wish to see Duarte share power with them. Venezuela, together with Colombia, authored the counterdeclaration to the French-Mexican initiative favoring El Salvador's opposition, and thus appeared to be heading back into the U.S. fold. However, one should stress the Copei regime's commitment to the Christian Democratic member of the El Salvadoran junta. Venezuela denounced the French-Mexican initiative because it ran counter to its own policy, and possibly because its leaders "saw the possibility of increasing their influence through coordination or solidarity with U.S. policies."<sup>58</sup>

Venezuela patched up relations with Mexico and appeared to steer away from the U.S. in 1982. This can be explained by several factors, including the Falklands (or Malvinas) war in which the U.S. supported Great Britain against

Argentina, and Venezuela lent vocal support to Argentina.<sup>59</sup> Another was Duarte's loss of a majority in El Salvador's assembly in the 1982 elections, and alleged lack of real control over the right-wing military cliques and death squads.<sup>60</sup> The Venezuelan Christian Democrats also lost the presidency to the AD candidate Jaime Luisinchi. Initially, AD supported the Salvadoran rebels as a legitimate political force, and endorsed the Sandinista political process. However, AD seemed to change its position. Venezuela called for the demilitarization of Central America; however, Venezuela, under AD, has quietly continued training Salvadoran troops. When Duarte regained office in June 1984, and won control of El Salvador with the victory of the Christian Democrats March 31, 1985, AD expressed solidarity with Duarte, and apparently changed its position toward the Salvadoran rebels.<sup>61</sup> The AD government, led by President Luisinchi, embraced Duarte, although less overtly than did former President, Christian Democrat, Herrera Campins, support Duarte in the junta of 1981. Both Herrera and Luisinchi put a large rhetorical difference between Venezuela and Washington's Central American policy. Herrera assumed a "bipolar world view emphasizing the struggle against Marxism," and his relations with Cuba were not good.<sup>62</sup> Under President Luisinchi, Venezuela is opposed to U.S. military intervention in Nicaragua, and has rallied to the Sandinista's defense on

occasion. On the other hand, Venezuelan officials have said that aid to Nicaragua is contingent on democratization of Nicaragua's political system. Luisinchi has maintained a public posture of support for Contadora, but leaders of the Democratic Action party have been skeptical of its real chances for negotiating peace in Central America.<sup>63</sup>

### Summary

To a smaller degree than Panama, Venezuela has been, and continues to be, economically dependent on the United States. Venezuela supported the U.S. policy toward Cuba, and was particularly hostile to Cuba in the 1960's, but led the movement to reincorporate Cuba into the inter-American system in the 1970's. Venezuela has also assisted the Sandinistas intermittently since 1979. But, with the cut-off of Venezuelan oil under the San Jose Accords to Nicaragua, Venezuela has decreased support for the Sandinistas. Relations with Cuba have cooled. The Venezuelans have been friendlier toward the El Salvador regime of Napoleon Duarte due to his affiliation with the Christian Democratic Party, and denounced a 1981 French-Mexican declaration of support for the Salvadoran rebels. Venezuela publicly denounces U.S. policy in Central America, while Venezuelan troops covertly train Salvadoran armed forces. In this light, Venezuela's commitment to the Contadora Group is ambiguous.



Venezuela pursues her foreign policy goals through the Contadora Group because war in Central America would disrupt Venezuela's economic activities in the region, and would subordinate Venezuela's designs in the region for power to the conflict, particularly if the U.S. were involved. Like Panama, Venezuela fears a U.S. intervention in Nicaragua. Through the Contadora Group, Venezuela hopes to prevent that from happening.

The roots of an independent Venezuelan foreign policy can be traced to the Betancourt Doctrine which was first applied in the 1940's. The Betancourt Doctrine was abandoned in 1968 for a principle of pluralism, and Venezuela appeared to back off from hostility toward Cuba. Venezuela has been very active in the Third World movement, which has lent it great prestige in that group of nations. Major foreign policy initiatives, and substantial foreign aid to countries in the Caribbean, followed Venezuela's sudden oil wealth of the 1970's. The bust in oil prices and Venezuela's overextension have decreased Venezuela's dramatic independent foreign policies. Venezuela pursues a foreign policy which it hopes will appear independent of the U.S., while the substantive content of its real policy resembles that of the U.S. Venezuela continues to favor Duarte in El Salvador, and is opposed to powersharing with Salvadoran opposition groups. Its relations with Cuba are no longer friendly, and its leadership appears to quietly endorse the

Reagan administration's position that Cuba is playing a subversive role in Central America. Venezuela continues to demand that Nicaragua democratize and pluralize its system.

Venezuela's prestige has benefitted from participation in the Contadora Group. This goes toward Venezuela's goal of regional leadership. However, Venezuela has had to keep its covert training of Salvadoran troops under wraps. Venezuela's leaders do not want to Venezuela to appear as a U.S. proxy in Central America. The Contadora Group provides Venezuelan leaders with a means of promoting regional peace, while supporting Duarte in El Salvador.

#### Colombia: Presidential Foreign Policy Making

Since the 1920s, Colombia has had a uniquely loyal relationship with the United States. Both World War II and the Korean War reinforced this, by forging "a very strong political and military relationship between the United States and Colombia."<sup>64</sup> In 1920, Colombia's President Suarez established the guiding principle of Colombian foreign policy: Res Pice Polum, which means "Follow the North Star" (the United States).<sup>65</sup> Colombia was one of three Latin American countries which backed the U.S. fully at the 1942 Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of American States by recommending all American states break ties with Germany, Italy, and Japan."<sup>66</sup> Although twelve Latin

American states had signed a Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement with the United States by 1952, Colombia was the only Latin American country to send troops to Korea.<sup>67</sup> Colombia adhered to the U.S. line toward Cuba in the early 1960s, and introduced the resolutions in the OAS to impose sanctions and break diplomatic relations with that country. Colombia was one of two South American countries that backed the United States in its support for Great Britain in the Malvinas/Falklands War.<sup>68</sup> This special alliance with the United States has guaranteed access to U S markets, but has cost Colombia an autonomous foreign policy. According to Gerhard Drekonja-Kornat, Colombia gave the U.S. unswerving loyalty in hemispheric and international affairs, in exchange for economic and military aid, until late 1982.

Colombia has had little opportunity to fashion new or bold foreign policies because Colombia's presidents have had to focus much of their attention on internal conflict, whether violence between the Liberal and Conservative parties, or from communist guerrillas, or drug barons. Colombia depended on U.S. assistance to combat its internal crises. Between 1961 and 1967, Colombia received approximately \$60 million dollars in military assistance for counterinsurgency operations.<sup>69</sup> In 1980, Colombia negotiated a \$16 million dollar aid package to battle Colombia's narcotics industry.<sup>70</sup> In addition, public pressure has already forced President Betancur to reduce his

role in Contadora and focus even more attention on Colombia's four major guerrilla groups.<sup>71</sup>

Colombian foreign policy making is dominated by the President, leaving the foreign ministry apparatus the more mundane matters of foreign relations and little opportunity to shape policy. Within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs they have dealt primarily with the resolution of boundary disputes with neighboring countries. These have been dealt with in line with the principles of nonintervention and the peaceful settlement of disputes.<sup>72</sup> Colombia's opposition to U.S. foreign policy in Central America began when Betancur took office. His role in formulating Colombian foreign policy is pivotal.

With respect to foreign economic policy, Colombia has asserted itself somewhat independently of the U.S. In 1973, Colombia joined both the Andean Pact and SELA. Membership in these regional groups was aimed at increasing Colombia's share of trade in the region; Colombia needed markets for its nontraditional goods. But these regional markets, and those in Japan, Western Europe, and the United States became saturated with nontraditional Colombian goods, such as nickel and natural gas, by the late 1970s. Colombian elites saw their only alternative market to be the Caribbean Basin. Furthermore, Colombian leaders also desired to become a regional power in the Caribbean.<sup>73</sup> Colombia reestablished diplomatic relations with Cuba in 1981, as most other Latin

American states were also doing so.<sup>74</sup>

### A Regional Foreign Policy

Through its membership in the Andean Pact, Bogota began to experiment with its foreign policy. Then-President Turbay Alaya had extended the principle of cooperation with neighboring countries to include all Andean Pact members at the same time that the Andean Pact nations' foreign ministers agreed to begin coordinating foreign policies. In June 1979 the foreign ministers of the Andean Pact member nations recognized the FSLN as a belligerent in Nicaragua. This announcement served to discredit the Somoza government and speeded up the process of removing him from power.<sup>75</sup> Colombia also joined with other Latin American nations against the U.S. by voting in the OAS not to send a multinational peacekeeping force to Nicaragua in June 1979.

However, for a period, Colombia realigned itself with the U.S. on the question of Nicaragua. The major reasons for this include internal threats from the M-19 guerrilla group which demanded the attention of the Colombian government, and a territorial dispute with the Sandinista government over the island of San Andres.

Bogota correctly assumed that the Sandinistas, cataloged by the Reagan administration as 'totalitarian Marxists,' would fail in their claim for San Andres if Colombia was firmly and unconditionally allied with the United States. To reaffirm its loyalty to the United States, Colombia took a number of unilateral

steps, such as:

- (1) blocking Cuban efforts to gain a seat on the U.N. Security Council in 1980-1981;
- (2) a break in diplomatic relations with Cuba in March 1981;
- (3) partial withdrawal from the group of nonaligned nations;
- (4) protesting the French commitment to Nicaragua and the armed opposition in El Salvador;
- (5) sending observers to elections held in El Salvador in March 1982.<sup>76</sup>

Colombia accused Cuba of training Colombian guerrillas, and denounced the alleged Cuban - Colombian alliance.<sup>77</sup>

Colombia appeared ready to play a role in a military solution to the Central American crisis until 1983 when it joined the Contadora Group. Colombian arms expenditures grew from \$600 million dollars in fiscal 1982, to \$2 billion dollars in fiscal 1983.<sup>78</sup> Former President Turbay opened a new military air base on Colombia's Caribbean coast in 1982, and maintained a strong military presence in the Caribbean, which Colombia's minister of defense said the country must be "equipped and ready either to dissuade or to act" in response to "threatened communist penetration" from Nicaragua.<sup>79</sup>

However, the United States took for granted Colombia's loyalty and excluded Colombia from the Caribbean Basin initiative of 1982. Preferential treatment given to Central American and Caribbean competitors through this initiative hurt Colombia's nontraditional exports at a time when Colombia was counting on that region as a much needed market for such exports. "As a neglected ally, Colombia saw the

urgency of formulating its own Caribbean policy."<sup>80</sup>

Although Colombia eventually won its claim on San Andres island, Colombians were angry with the U.S. for not supporting Colombia's claim for San Andres island with much vigor.

Also, Turbay's term ended in 1982. President Belisario Betancur took office in August 1982, and quickly charted a new foreign policy for Colombia in Central America. He had several reasons for doing so. First, Colombia's prestige had been damaged by U.S. snubs. By asserting itself independently of the United States through the Contadora Group, Colombia hoped to restore some of that prestige. Second, Colombia had found that its unconditional loyalty to the United States had not paid off, particularly in economic terms. By seeking a peaceful resolution of the Central American conflict through the Contadora Group, Colombia hoped to avoid further disruption of its trade in the Caribbean basin.

War in Central America could also serve to destabilize Colombia's internal affairs, and might lend strength to guerrilla movements there. Since Betancur took office, Colombian diplomats have accused U.S. military aid to right wing forces in Central America of standing in the way of peace.<sup>81</sup> It appears that Betancur has rejected the U.S. Cold War analysis of the region which his predecessor so heartily endorsed. Colombia's leadership, it can be

assumed, still wants to prevent further violence in the region from spreading to the volatile domestic front.

### Summary

After a long history of supporting the U.S. foreign policy line, Colombia has asserted its independence through participation in the Contadora Group under the leadership of President Betancur. This suggests that President Belisario Betancur pursued membership in the Contadora Group out of personal ambitions and convictions.<sup>82</sup> While ex-President Turbay Alaya took a militaristic view of Central America, threatening Nicaragua with Reagan-sounding rhetoric, Betancur has rejected the U.S. perception of regional problems in terms of the Cold War, and noted that U.S. policy makers took Colombian support in Central America for granted. The Contadora Group has provided Betancur with an international forum, thus giving him a reputation as a world statesman.

Other foreign policy motivations can be guessed at. One would be a desire to prevent the U.S. from taking military action in Central America and thus protect Venezuelan trade from the disruption that war in the region would bring. Another motive is Colombia's desire for a degree of regional power which activity in the Contadora Group may provide.

Colombia's foreign policy independence is new, and



therefore fragile, however, Betancur aspires to make Colombia a regional power, and recognizes he must be willing to oppose the U.S. on some visible issue if that is to happen.

#### Mexico: Maverick State

##### Bilateral Relationship with the U.S.

Mexican foreign policy has been a function of its relationship with the United States for over one hundred years. Consequently, Mexican foreign policy has been described as passive and defensive, emphasizing principles which could be invoked against an aggressive United States.

Only within the past 20 years or so has the nation repudiated its traditional inward looking, defensive attitude that proclaimed essentially negative dicta on anti-imperialistic policy positions designed to ward-off transgressions from the 'Colossus of the North.' The nation's foreign policy, such as it was, posited the inviolability of principles such as the self-determination of nations, absolute sovereignty, and nonintervention. Overall national policy states explicitly that Mexican interests were best served by concentrating on internal development.

Since World War II, Mexican elites have made internal economic growth their primary national goal. Such an emphasis has increased Mexico's dependence on the U.S. for investment, technology, loans, and food. However, Mexican ambivalence toward the U.S. is rooted in a history of political, military, and economic interventions by the U.S. in Mexico, which began shortly after Mexico's independence

in the early 1800's. Mexicans have never forgiven the loss of half their territory to the U.S. in 1848; independence from U.S. economic penetration was one of the major goals of the Mexican Revolution of 1910-1920. U.S. troops have been sent to Mexico more than a dozen times; they have occupied Veracruz, and have marched across Sonora chasing the Mexican revolutionary Pancho Villa. Mexican author Octavio Paz has written about the longstanding barriers to understanding Mexico. Judging from Mexican presidential speeches, and the general tenor of U.S.-Mexican relations, many Mexicans perceive the treatment they receive from Americans to be lacking in respect. They resent the caricature of themselves as a nation of "wetbacks" held by many North Americans, and the manner in which they are looked down upon by many U.S. citizens. U.S. views of Mexicans continue to be shaped by Hollywood stereotypes of "the lazy Mexican" who naps through the afternoon.

These resentments and other perceptions remain in the collective consciousness of Mexico, and continue to shape Mexican foreign policy today. The desire to be free of U.S. domination has been, and continues to be, constrained by the reality of Mexico's dependence on the United States; positive U.S.-Mexican relations are of paramount concern to Mexico's leadership. Mexico has managed to avoid involvement in the Cold War, but has refused membership in the Nonaligned movement, and OPEC, the latter two probably

out of a fear of angering the United States.

### Precedents for an Independent

#### Foreign Policy

Despite its assymetrical, dependent relationship with the United States, Mexico has asserted itself in its foreign policy toward revolutionary or leftist governments and movements.

In the 1920s, the Mexican government clashed with the United States over the latter's intervention in Nicaragua; in the 1930s, Mexico was one of the most outspoken defenders of Republican Spain and it later allowed the defeated Republicans to set up a government-in-exile in Mexico City.<sup>84</sup>

The primary guiding principles of Mexican foreign policy include nonintervention and the right of self-determination of peoples. This is rooted in Mexico's own fear of foreign intervention during its own revolution, something which the United States threatened.<sup>85</sup> Mexico's position on diplomatic recognition reflects its commitment to nonintervention. The Estrada Doctrine, named for the foreign minister who formulated it in 1930, states that Mexico not withhold recognition of existing governments.<sup>86</sup>

"The Estrada Doctrine, therefore, allows Mexico to avoid the problem of passing judgement on the government of another country and, by that step, interfering in the its internal affairs."<sup>87</sup> The one exception, until 1979, to the Estrada Doctrine was Mexico's refusal to recognize

Franco's Spain. Mexican diplomats justified this position by saying that Franco's government was "the product of German and Italian fascist intervention in the Spanish Civil War of 1936-1939," so Mexico maintained formal relations with the Spanish republican government in exile.<sup>88</sup>

Mexico's calls for nonintervention aside, Mexico passed judgement on the Somoza regime and broke diplomatic relations with Nicaragua in 1979. Steve McShane interprets Mexico's breaking of ties with Somoza as a message to "military dictatorships in the area, particularly El Salvador and Guatemala, and to the United States...that Mexico would support insurrections in cases where it believed that the existing government had lost domestic legitimacy."<sup>89</sup>

Many Latin American scholars claim that Mexico's own revolutionary background prompts it to support revolutionary movements and regimes. Some argue that this is only for domestic consumption, while others maintain that revolutionary ideals continue to shape Mexican foreign policy. The first argument states that Mexico's ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, is under pressure from its left wing, which Mexican presidents must acknowledge by using a progressive foreign policy to contain opposition to conservative and authoritarian domestic ones.<sup>90</sup> This analysis is accepted "by both the Left and the Right, at home and abroad" that domestic politics

predicate Mexican support of revolution abroad.<sup>91</sup> However, Steve McShane argues that President López Portillo's breaking of ties with Somoza in 1979 was not primarily aimed at placating the domestic left. McShane writes that while this action was very popular with the Mexican public, López Portillo already enjoyed a high public approval rating credited to his stance taken with President Jimmy Carter four months earlier, successful negotiations with Fidel Castro just days earlier, and growing oil and natural gas reserves.<sup>92</sup> The second argument is presented by Edward Williams, among others, who contends that ideological considerations continue to play a role in shaping Mexican foreign policy. Whichever explanation is closest to the truth, historically, Mexico has been sympathetic to revolutionary movements and regimes, and its Central American policy in the 1980's is consistent with this tradition.<sup>93</sup>

Historically, Mexico has adhered to the principle of nonintervention with relation to the appearance of communism in the hemisphere. Mexico was the only Latin American country which by 1963 had not bowed to U.S. pressure to break diplomatic relations with Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba. Mexico's relations with Cuba have continued without interruption up to the present, with López Portillo referring to Cuba as Mexico's "dearest neighbor" in 1981.<sup>94</sup>

Mexico invoked the principles of nonintervention and self-determination against the 1965 U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, and against the U.S. invasion of Grenada in 1983. Such invasions threaten Mexico insofar as they are seen as precedents for future interventions in Mexico. This, in part, motivated Mexico's "no" to the U.S. proposal in the OAS to send a peacekeeping force to Nicaragua in 1979. Unlike the United States, Mexico was supportive of the Allende government in Chile, and protested loudly the coup d'etat which ousted and killed him in 1973. Mexico accepted many political exiles from Chile following that coup.<sup>95</sup>

Mexico envisages an ideological pluralism in the hemisphere, which is rejected by the U.S. due to its Cold War analysis of the world.

The Reagan administration has consistently argued that Mexico is the final domino in the chain of dominoes set off by Cuban-Soviet subversion in Nicaragua. The Mexicans, in turn reject this cold war definition of the Central American crisis and emphasize instead the economic inequality, social injustice and political repression that have sparked broad-based opposition movements in countries like Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala.<sup>96</sup>

Due to their own revolutionary experience, Mexicans do not assume that social upheaval necessarily leads to catastrophe. "For their part, most Mexicans tend to see the conflicts in Central America as logical and perhaps inevitable responses to historic conditions of repression

and inequity."<sup>97</sup> In fact, many Mexicans perceive the U.S. to pose a greater threat to them of military intervention than the Soviet Union. This is because of Mexico's proximity to the United States, the numerous U.S. interventions in Mexico in the last one hundred years, and the recognition that the Soviets would not be likely to attack Mexico as such an intrusion into the United States' sphere would risk a direct confrontation with the U.S.

The basic foreign policy principle of pluralism is still invoked to justify Mexico's foreign policy. Mexico regards tolerance of different kinds of regimes as necessary because increased polarization in Central America threatens the region's political and economic stability. The Mexican-Venezuelan Energy Program provides oil to the area's countries regardless of their policy orientation. In accord with the Estrada Doctrine, Mexico conducts diplomatic relations with all the region's states. In this way, Mexico rides the fence; by continuing to have relations with right wing dictatorships, Mexico can attempt to influence them, and also avoids angering the United States. Mexico calls on the United States to tolerate different types of regimes in the region, again invoking the principles of self-determination and pluralism.

The Mexican leadership has a more sophisticated understanding of the roots of turmoil in Central America than perhaps do their northern counterparts. Since 1980,

news of paramilitary forces' activities in El Salvador and statements made by former members of the junta visiting Mexico to the effect that the military still controls Salvadoran politics have persuaded an already largely sympathetic Mexico that problems in El Salvador are largely due to the repressive style of the oligarchy.<sup>98</sup> This places some pressure on the Mexican government to support the revolutionary movements in Central America, and suggests the Mexican government is articulating public opinion in its Central America policies. Mexico stresses the inequalities within a system which make it vulnerable to revolution, whereas the United States generally sees only Soviet-Cuban instigated instability.

By befriending the revolutionary forces in Central America, many contend that Mexico is best able to influence the direction those regimes will take.<sup>99</sup> The U.S. policy is seen by Mexican officials as counterproductive as it is aimed at isolating revolutionaries, thereby driving "those struggling for social justice into communist hands."<sup>100</sup> President de la Madrid has expressed the belief that Nicaragua can retain its revolutionary characteristics and yet diversify its relations away from the Eastern bloc.<sup>101</sup>

The Contadora Group has been able to attract aid to Nicaragua from Western Europe and Japan, thereby diversifying Nicaragua's relations away from the Soviet bloc. As an article in the Economist pointed out, Mexico's



domestically conservative leaders have "no sympathy whatsoever with the Soviet Union's ambitions for influence in the region."<sup>102</sup> Mexico has its own regional ambitions and has no desire to compete directly with the USSR. Moreover, Mexico's conservative political system could be destabilized by war or revolution on its southern border. Mexican elites are aware of this, and seem anxious to avoid such a scenario.

On a more pragmatic level, Olga Pellicer says Mexicans fear that if Central America becomes a pawn in the Cold War, Mexico may be next.<sup>103</sup> Mexico supports the Contadora efforts to remove U.S. military forces from Central America in large part because:

Mexicans are particularly sensitive to the reestablishment of any United States troops on both their northern and southern borders, a type of encirclement seen from the Mexican perspective that would make a United States seizure of southern Mexican oil fields more feasible.<sup>104</sup>

#### Oil Revenues Increase Affordable

#### Policy Options

In the mid-1970s, Mexico discovered vast new oil reserves. Increased oil production, exports, and revenues fueled an economic boom in Mexico. The increase in oil revenues also financed an active foreign policy which increasingly clashed with Washington. However, Mexico's foreign policy has continued to be limited by economic and technological dependence on the United States.<sup>105</sup> Mexican

leaders are aware of this, and have sought "external markets and alliances which, it is hoped will bring about a diversification of dependence."<sup>106</sup>

Mexico initiated its present Central American policy in 1979 when President López Portillo severed ties with Anastasio Somoza's government in Nicaragua and recognized the FSLN as a belligerent. Mexico continued to help the Sandinistas once they assumed control of Nicaragua. From 1979 to 1981, Mexico provided 16% of the total foreign aid received by Nicaragua. In 1981, Mexico and France issued a joint declaration that recognized the El Salvadoran opposition, the Democratic Revolutionary Front, or FDR, which has a guerrilla arm, as a representative political group.<sup>107</sup> In 1982, President Lopez Portillo proposed a Central American peace plan which did not get off the ground.<sup>108</sup> These, and other moves, demonstrate Mexico's desire to be a regional leader in Central America and the Caribbean.

Like the other Contadora members, Mexico wishes to enhance its regional leadership position, and sees a United States' intervention as preventing that goal from realization. A U.S. intervention in Central America would severely limit any regional leadership ambitions which Mexico might have.

Mexican prestige has been enhanced by participation in the Mexican-Venezuelan Program of Energy Cooperation

discussed earlier in the section on Venezuela. This program is partially motivated by a desire help Central American states avoid further economic instability because of high oil prices.<sup>109</sup> Such instability would threaten Mexico in that Central America's economic problems mean economic refugees from the region pouring into and through Mexico in search of jobs. Economic problems in Central America would also impact on Mexico because of economic ties with the region's countries.

The Mexican-Venezuelan arrangement also broadens the market for Mexican crude oil. Authors cautiously suggest that Mexico seeks economic advantage in Central America. One Mexican analyst sees opportunity for an expansion of Mexican economic activity in Central America as "small oligarchies and fuedal lords" lose their stranglehold in Central America.<sup>110</sup> Nicaragua has not paid Mexico for its oil purchases since late 1980, but Mexico continued delivery to Nicaragua until January of 1985, when officials renegotiated terms of the oil shipments. Nicaragua's ambassador to Mexico, Edmundo Jarquín Calderón, "estimated Nicaragua's total debt to Mexico, accumulated over the past six yeras at, \$500 million dollars."<sup>111</sup> Further violence in the region also threatens to upset the economies of the area. Again, Mexico opposes U.S. polices in Central America because they are bad for Mexico.

Mexico continues its support of the Sandinistas through

a variety of economic aid. In 1984, Mexico donated \$23 million dollars to Nicaragua for the hydroelectric project at Asturias, and gave \$15 million dollars in credit to purchase fishing boats.<sup>112</sup>

Through participation in the Contadora Group, Mexico hopes to moderate the U.S. position and prevent further violence in Central America. Mexico sees the Reagan administration's military approach as responsible for prolonging violence in the region. This violence, in turn, is the cause of the flight of the civilian populations from their homes in search of safety in the north. "Some estimates put the total number of El Salvadoran refugees in Mexico as high as 350,000 and the number of Guatemalans at around 100,000."<sup>113</sup> A 1981 estimate, made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Mexico City, placed the number of Salvadoran refugees in Mexico at 70,000.<sup>114</sup> Prolonged warfare, whether conventional or guerrilla in type, is not in the interest of Mexico. Mexico does not have the facilities to handle a large refugee population, and illegal Central American immigrants have never been welcome in an economy which cannot provide enough jobs for its own citizens. These, too, are reasons Mexico would pursue a solution through the Contadora Group.

Important strategic considerations also shape Mexico's policy in Central America. Two key oil fields are located in the southern states of Chiapas and Tabasco, which border

on Guatemala. In 1981, the Mexican Army increased the number of troops in the southern province of Comitán from 3,000 to 8,000. As the Mexican military totals a little more than 100,000 men, an increase of 5,000 men at one post is very significant.<sup>115</sup>

The southern states are Mexico's poorest, least developed, and continue to have large haciendas which are authoritarian, exploitative structures. The oil boom of the 1970's brought with it social dislocation, which, in turn, led to political protest. The influx of Central American refugees provides an additional destabilizing force in southern Mexico.<sup>116</sup> Should war break out on Mexico's southern border, not only could it threaten to destabilize Mexico, but the Mexican leadership would be forced to divert monies from domestic programs to the military. This would grant more power to Mexico's military, something which has been successfully avoided since the early 1940s, and which would be seen as threatening to the ruling party.

#### Chapter Summary

All the Contadora members fear a U.S. intervention in Central America. For various reasons, they perceive that such an intervention would not be in their best interests. Their professed goal is to prevent a regional war by negotiating a regional peace agreement. This policy is in opposition to U.S. foreign policy in the region; already

this hints at a reality of a more independent foreign policy line in these four countries, for they have rejected the U.S. policy for one of their own making. The Contadora Group members do not automatically accept the U.S. policy line.

Historically, these four nations have reason to fear a U.S. intervention. All of them, with the exception of Venezuela, have been subject to numerous U.S. military interventions. Each has experienced tremendous political and economic domination by the U.S. Each continues to experience this domination and dependence in varying degrees. Panama has brought its commitment to Contadora into question with its participation in joint military maneuvers with the U.S. Venezuela appears to be pursuing a dual policy in Central America. Its leaders have pursued the Contadora process and criticized the Reagan administration's military policy in the region, while covertly training Salvadoran troops. The Salvadoran policy of the U.S. and Venezuela are very similar. Moreover, Venezuela and Panama both have violated sections of their own draft treaty. Venezuela has foreign military advisors in El Salvador, and Panama has hosted military exercises with the U.S. Venezuela's action brings its commitment to the peace process into serious doubt. It is not clear whether Panama would be bound by the restriction if the treaty ever becomes adopted, but many question President

Ardito's motives. He has already lined up closer to Washington with his attendance at a U.S. workshop on U.S. policy toward Latin America.

Mexico has the longest history of an independent foreign policy of the four Contadora members. Historically, Mexico has frequently stood alone in support of revolutionary governments which the U.S. opposed. Some credit this to Mexico's own revolutionary tradition. It is possible that Mexico's foreign policy in Central America, and thus for participating in the Contadora Group, is motivated by opposition to dictatorship, and a commitment to assisting revolution outside its borders. Mexico may truly share ideological sympathy with what it sees as indigenous revolution in Central America, or its support of these movements may be designed to placate a constituency which would otherwise be very critical of conservative domestic policies. The country's foreign policy has lived up to the revolutionary ideal, whether the motivation is either of these, or a mixture of the two.

Increased trade with Central American states is the goal of all four Contadora members. All of them are attempting to diversify their trade and investment away from the U.S. so that they will be less dependent on the U.S. One small way of doing this is to capture more of the market in the region. The Contadora states fear war in the region, because their trade with Central American markets would

suffer.

Diplomats in each country have accused U.S. military aid to right wing forces in Central America of standing in the way of peace. A Cold War view of Central America has been denounced by all four, but Venezuela's sincerity is in question due to a continuing Venezuelan training program of Salvadoran troops. Leadership in Mexico has explained the belief that by working with the revolutionaries, they stand to better influence them.

Security also acts as a foreign policy determinant. Panama fears a U.S. intervention in the Canal Zone would follow a U.S. military escapade in Central America. Colombia, Mexico, and Panama each fears the instability that a regional war could bring to their political systems. Colombia fears the Central American revolutionaries might inspire or assist Colombian guerrillas. Mexico's southern states are particularly vulnerable, with their traditional socio-political systems which are already under strain from the oil boom and the influx of thousands of Central American refugees. Mexico does not want the refugees, and would be an unwilling host to many more should the violence in Central America escalate. Some scholars argue that Mexico's somewhat authoritarian system might be endangered by revolutionary fervor. Panama's military-dominated system could be vulnerable to revolutionary cries for democracy. Venezuela survived attacks by Cuban-supported leftist



guerrillas during the 1960's, and few seriously doubt its vulnerability to revolution. However, it is useful to remember that Venezuela's relations with Cuba turned sour when Castro began actively supporting revolutionary movements again. Venezuelan leaders have not forgotten Castro's attempt to overthrow their system of government in the 1960's.

Each country pursues a policy of prestige through participation in the Contadora Group. Of the four, only Panama is not pursuing regional leadership. Panama has sought an independent image for itself in the international community since the late 1960's. Participation in the Contadora Group contributes to an impression that all four of the Contadora members is not restricted in its foreign policy by its ties to the U.S.

In each of the Contadora countries, presidents, or in the case of Panama, the military chief command, have virtual control of their countries' foreign policy formulations. Both Colombian and Venezuelan Central American policies have made 180-degree turns since new presidents came into office in 1983.

## NOTES

1. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 28, 1983, p 55487.
2. G.E. Mellander, THE UNITED STATES IN PANAMANIAN POLITICS: THE INTRIGUING FORMATIVE YEARS (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971.)
3. Lawrence O. Ealy, THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA IN WORLD AFFAIRS, 1903-1950 (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.)
4. Steve C. Ropp, PANAMANIAN POLITICS: FROM GUARDED NATION TO NATIONAL GUARD (New York: Praeger; Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1982.)
5. "Panama Elections: Analysis" MESOAMERICA, v. 3, no. 4, April 1984, p. 10; Tom Barry, Beth Wood, and Deb Preusch, DOLLARS AND DICTATORS: A GUIDE TO CENTRAL AMERICA (Albuquerque, New Mexico: The Resource Center, 1982), p. 148-149.
6. Westrand Quieser Morales, "Republic of Panama" pp. 786-799, in George E. Delury, (ed.), WORLD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF POLITICAL SYSTEMS AND PARTIES v.11, (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 1983), p. 798.
7. Dan Williams, "Panama Military Unlike to Sidestep Politics, Despite Promises" LOS ANGELES TIMES, February 20, 1984, part I, p. 5; MESOAMERICA, April 1984, p. 10.
8. "General's death has consequences for whole of Central America," LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT (August 7, 1981), p. 1.
9. "Panama: Economic Stability Shaky Without Torrijos," CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT: THE WEEKLY REVIEW OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS v. VIII, no. 32, (August 15, 1981), p. 249.
10. Ropp.
11. Richard A. Falk, "Panama Treaty Trap" in FOREIGN POLICY ON LATIN AMERICA, 1970-1980 (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982), pp. 121-127.

12. "Panama Miffed Over Spy Planes," THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA v. VI, no. 20, (May 30, 1983), p. 158.
13. Robert J. Alexander, ROMULO BETANCOURT AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF VENEZUELA (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1982)
14. Richard Millet, "Central American Paralysis" FOREIGN POLICY no. 39, Summer 1980, pp. 163-172, reprinted in FOREIGN POLICY ON LATIN AMERICA; Ropp, pp. 126-127.
15. Alfred Stepan, "The United States and Latin America: Vital Interests of Power" in Elizabeth K. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), p. 30.
16. "Panama: Economic Stability Shaky Without Torrijos," p. 250.
17. *ibid.*
18. "Panama," MESOAMERICA v. IV, no. 2, (February 1985), p. 11.
19. "Now, US military exercises in Panama" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XII, no. 1, January 11, 1985, p. 2.
20. *ibid.*
21. *ibid.*
22. *ibid.*, p. 1; and "Joint US-Panama Military Maneuvers Commence" MESOAMERICA v. IV, no. 2, (February, 1985), p. 10.
23. "Panama actions, p. 10.
24. "Joint US-Panama Military Maneuvers Commence" p. 10.
25. "Las Maniobras Militares" ["The Military Maneuvers"] DIALOGO SOCIAL, no. 175, February 1985, pp. 10-14.
26. "Joint US-Panama Military Maneuvers Commence" MESOAMERICA v. IV, no. 2, (February, 1985), p. 10.
27. "Now, US military exercises in Panama" p 2.

28. *ibid.*
29. "Vanishing Act" *TIME* v. 123, February 27, 1984, p. 63.
30. Alexander, p. 283-284.
31. Demetrio Boersner, "Venezuelan Policies Toward Central America" pp. 245-260, in Wolf Grabendorff, Heinrich-W. Krumwiede, and Jorg Todt (eds.), *POLITICAL CHANGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984), p. 161.
32. *ibid*, p. 248.
33. *ibid.*
34. William E. Ratliff (ed.), 1971 *YEARBOOK ON LATIN AMERICAN COMMUNIST AFFAIRS* (Washington, D.C.: Hoover Institution Publications, 1971), pp. 221-222.
35. Stephen Ellner, "Venzucommunism" *COMMONWEAL*, February 15, 1980, p. 70.
36. Stephen G. Rabe, *THE ROAD TO OPEC: UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH VENEZUELA, 1919-1976* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1982)
37. Boersner, p. 248.
38. Rabe, p. 168.
39. Robert E. Bond (ed.), *CONTEMPORARY VENEZUELA AND ITS ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS* (New York: New York University Press, 1977), pp. 178-181.
40. James John Guy, "Venezuela: Foreign Policy and Oil" *THE WORLD TODAY*, December 1979, pp. 508; Rabe, p. 190.
41. Guy, p. 510.
42. Rabe, p. 190.
43. Wolf Grabendorff, Heinrich-W. Krumwiede, and Jorg Todt (eds.), *POLITICAL CHANGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984), p. 161
44. John D. Martz, "The Crisis of Venezuelan Democracy" *CURRENT HISTORY*, v. 83, February 1984, pp. 77.

45. Bond, p. 251.
46. Bagley, "Mexico in Central America: The Limits of Regional Power" pp. 261-284, in Wolf Grabendorff, Heinrich-W. Krumwiede, and Jorg Todt (eds.), POLITICAL CHANGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984), p. 266; John F. McShane, "Emerging Regional Power: Mexico's Role in the Caribbean Basin" pp. 191-209, in Elizabeth G. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), p. 205.
47. "Venezuela: The Political Scene" VENEZUELA, SURINAM, NETHERLANDS ANTILLES, no. 1, 1985, Economic Intelligence Unit, p. 7.
48. Robert Matthews, "1982-84: Plus Ca Change" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 39.
49. McShane, p. 205.
50. Alan Riding, "Latin Debt: Postponing the Burden" THE NEW YORK TIMES, September 23, 1984, p. 9.
51. Howard I. Blustein, J. David Edwards, Kathryn T. Johnston, David S. McMorris, and James D. Rudolph, AREA HANDBOOK FOR VENEZUELA, 3rd edition, (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 216.
52. David E. Blank, "Venezuela: Politics of Oil" pp. 73-101, in Robert Wesson (ed.), U.S. INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA IN THE 1980s (New York: Praeger; Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1982), p. 92.
53. *ibid.*, p. 90.
54. *ibid.*
55. Guy, p. 511; Stepan, p. 30.
56. Millet, p. 46.
57. Dennis R. Gordon and Margaret M. Munro, "The External Dimension of Civil Insurrection: International Organizations and the Nicaraguan Revolution" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN STUDIES AND WORLD AFFAIRS, v. 25, no.1, February 1983, p. 67.
58. Grabendorff, p. 164.

59. Margaret Daly-Hayes, LATIN AMERICA AND THE U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST: A BASIS FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984.)
60. Grabendorff, p. 161.
61. "The Duarte Administration receives renewed support" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, October 1984, p. 302; "Duarte's Victory Opens Door for New Peace Drive" LATIN AMERICAN INDEX, April 15, 1985, p. 26.
62. Robert Matthews, p. 39; Volman, p. 1.
63. *ibid.*, p. 42.
64. *ibid.*, p. 164; Eusebio Mujal-Leon, "European Socialism and the Crisis in Central America" pp. 253-302, in Howard J. Wiarda (ed.), RIFT AND REVOLUTION: THE CENTRAL AMERICAN IMBROGLIO (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1984.)
65. Ramon Jimeno and Steven Volk, "Not Such Strange Bedfellows" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, May/June 1983, p. 5.
66. *ibid.*, p. 10.
67. *ibid.*, p. 11.
68. Jimeno, "Not Such Strange Bedfellows" p. 12.
69. *ibid.*
70. Richard B. Craig, "Colombian Narcotics and United States-Colombian Relations" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN STUDIES AND WORLD AFFAIRS, v. 23, no. 3, August 1981, pp. 258-259.
71. Gerhard Drekonja-Kornat, "Colombia: Learning the Foreign Policy Process" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN STUDIES AND WORLD AFFAIRS, v. 25, no. 1, February 1983, pp. 233-234.
72. Jackson Diehl, "Peace Efforts Spur Criticism in Colombia" WASHINGTON POST, May 27, 1984, p. A24.
73. Drekonja-Kornat, p. 230.
74. "Colombia-Another Threat in the Caribbean?" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVI, no. 5, September/October 1982, p. 13.

75. *ibid.*, pp. 241-243; Grabendorff, p. 161.
76. Drekonja-Kornat, p. 238.
77. "Colombia-Another Threat in the Caribbean?"  
p. 14.
78. *ibid.*, p. 18.
79. *ibid.*, p. 13.
80. Drekonja-Kornat, p. 239.
81. *ibid.*, p. 240.
82. William Orme, "Peace May Not Be at Hand" *MACLEANS*,  
v. 96, December 276, 1983, p. 19.
83. Bruce Bagley, "Mexican Foreign Policy: The Decline  
of a Regional Power" *CURRENT HISTORY*, December 1983, pp.  
408.
84. Edward J. Williams, "Mexico's Central American  
Policy: National Security Considerations" pp. 303-328 in  
Howard J. Wiarda (ed.), *RIFT AND REVOLUTION: THE CENTRAL  
AMERICAN IMBROGLIO* (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise  
Institute, 1984), p. 304.
85. James F. Engel, "The Revolution and Mexican  
Foreign Policy" *JOURNAL OF INTER-AMERICAN STUDIES*, v. 11,  
no. 4, October 1964, p. 524.
86. Edith B. Couturier, "Mexico" pp. 117-135 in Harold  
Eugene Davis and Larman C. Wilson, *LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN  
POLICIES* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University  
Press, 1975), p. 127.
87. Engel, p. 529.
88. Couturier, p. 127.
89. Bagley, "Mexican Foreign Policy: The Decline of a  
Regional Power" p. 408.
90. "A Bet on Mexico" *THE ECONOMIST*, July 10, 1982,  
pp. 12-13.
91. Williams, "Mexico's Central American Policy" p.  
33; Engel, pp. 528-532.

92. McShane, p. 200.
93. Williams, "Mexico's Central American Policy" p. 33; Engel, pp. 518-532.
94. "Mixed Reviews on White Paper" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. IV, no. 9, March 2, 1981, pp. 65-66.
95. Williams, "Mexico's Central American Policy" p. 26.
96. George Philip, "Mexico and its Neighbors" THE WORLD TODAY, September 1981, pp. 356-362.
97. Peter H. Smith, MEXICO: NEIGHBOR IN TRANSITION, Headline Series, no. 267 (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1984), p. 67.
98. Bagley, "Mexico in the 1980s: A New Regional Power" CURRENT HISTORY, November 1981, pp. 356.
99. "Mexico Declares Hands-Off Policy" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. V, no. 8, February 22, 1982, p. 62; Pellicer, p. 91.
100. Bagley, "Mexican Foreign Policy: The Decline of a Regional Power" p. 409.
101. Volman, p. 1.
102. Bruce Bagley, "Mexico in the 1980s: A New Regional Power", p.355.
103. Pellicer, p. 89.
104. Volman, p. 1.
105. James Reston, "Mexico Asks U.S. to Change Policies" NEW YORK TIMES, February 13, 1984, p. A3.
106. Bagley, "Mexico in the 1980s: A New Regional Power", p.355.
107. Bagley, "Mexican Foreign Policy: The Decline of a Regional Power", p. 409.
108. Errol D. Jones and David LaFrance, "Mexico's Foreign Affairs Under President Echeverria: The Special Case of Chile" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, v. 30, no. 1, Summer 1976.



109. Alan Riding, "Mexico, Braced by Oil, Steps Out in Foreign Affairs" NEW YORK TIMES April 24, 1980, p. A2.

110. Soccoro Díaz, FUERZAS E INTERESES DE LAS POTENCIAS MEDIANAS REGIONALES: EL CASO DE MEXICO [FORCES AND INTERESTS OF THE MIDDLE REGIONAL POWERS: THE CASE OF MEXICO], Discussion Paper, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Bonn, West Germany, March 11, 1981, p. 8, cited in Edward J. Williams, "Mexico's Central American Policy" BULLETIN OF LATIN AMERICAN RESEARCH, p. 28.

111. Madeline Eisner (ed.), "Anti-Drug War Enters Diplomatic Arena; Mexico Suspends Oil Shipments to Two Customers" MEXICO UPDATE, v. III, no. 11, March 15, 1985, p.10; "Mexico Promises Oil Deliveries" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA, v. 6, no. 40, October 17, 1983, p. 317.

112. "Nicaragua: Masiva Solidaridad de Países, Instituciones y Personas" ["Nicaragua: Massive Support from Nations, Institutions and Individuals"] INFORPRESS CENTROAMERICANA, no. 630, February 28, 1985, p. 7.

113. Grabendorff, p. 162.

114. "News Briefs: Mexico" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, v. IX, no. 9, May 31, 1981, p. 38.

115. Williams, "Mexico's Central American Policy" p. 35.

116. *ibid.*, p. 34.

## CHAPTER III

### THE CONTADORA PROCESS: PROPOSALS AND OBSTACLES

The common and diverse foreign policy motivations of the Contadora member countries were analyzed in the preceding chapter. One hopes to shed light on the emergence and role of the Group by studying what motivates these four countries to participate in the Contadora process. In this chapter the focus will be on the Contadora process, and interactions between the Group, the Central American countries, the United States, and other international actors. Proposals and recommendations of the Contadora Group will be discussed. The various obstacles to the Contadora process will also be discussed, with particular attention paid to the United States.

This chapter will include a short assessment of the Contadora Group's chances for obtaining a regional peace treaty. Through a discussion of the Contadora Group's efforts, and the role the United States plays in thwarting those efforts, an effort at evaluating the hypothesis that U.S. power has waned in the western hemisphere and that the international system has moved toward polycentrism.

### Formation and Early Meetings

The collective efforts of the Contadora member states began January 5, 1983, when the foreign ministers of Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico, met to discuss ways of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Central American conflict. This chapter examines the Contadora process and U.S. attempts to thwart and manipulate that process. The Contadora Group has initiated and mediated negotiations between the Central American states, has drawn up several draft peace proposals, and has invoked global public opinion in the face of U.S. intransigence. The Reagan Administration first openly opposed the Contadora effort, but soon began giving it verbal support. One assessment of the Reagan Administration's strategy is "to play along, changing its demands when resolution seemed near and stepping up the war when peace threatens to break out."<sup>1</sup>

After its first meeting January 8-9, 1983, the Contadora Group released a statement which became known as the Contadora Declaration, or Accord, and indicated that the Contadora Group did not itself plan to present finished peace proposals, but hoped to mediate negotiations between Nicaragua and four U.S. allies in Central America: Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Guatemala.<sup>2</sup> The Accord reflected a rejection of the U.S. view of the Central American crisis in terms of the Cold War in favor of a

perspective which views origins of revolutionary movements in terms of the economic, social, and political inequalities found in each country.<sup>3</sup> The document identified El Salvador's civil war, and the fighting between Nicaragua and anti-Sandinistas, or contras, which have been alleged to be operating out of Honduras and Costa Rica, as the region's major troubles. The Accord stressed the need to end foreign military aid and intervention in Central America, and to withdraw foreign military advisors.<sup>4</sup>

The Contadora ministers met again in Panama City on April 11 to review the January Declaration, before shuttling to the capitals of Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador April 12-13. There, they spoke with heads of state and foreign ministers, and arranged for the first joint meeting of the Contadora Group with the foreign ministers of the Central American countries subsequently held in Panama City April 20-21, 1983. The primary goal of this joint meeting, and others in the months of May and June, "was to create a climate of confidence for initiating substantive negotiations on each of the issues in dispute."<sup>5</sup>

This first joint meeting, according to the Mexican delegation, was designed to reduce regional tensions and establish "the basis for a stable and durable peace in the area."<sup>6</sup> The most pressing concern was to prevent the border conflict between Nicaragua and Honduras from

escalating into a major military confrontation. The border conflict centers on the existence of contra bases in Honduras, from which, Nicaragua says, the rebels stage attacks into northern Nicaragua. The Nicaraguan government demands the bases be dismantled, while Honduras denies their existence.<sup>7</sup>

However, "the talks were reportedly hindered by the refusal of the Nicaraguan and Honduran foreign ministers to negotiate directly with each other."<sup>8</sup> However, they were not above exchanging insults:

When Honduran foreign minister Edgardo Paz Barnica charged that Nicaragua was 'occupied' by 15-17,000 foreign advisers, his Nicaraguan counterpart, Miguel D'Escoto, suggested that perhaps he should take up residence in a 'psychiatric clinic.' Costa Rica foreign minister Fernando Volio returned the compliment in kind: 'Never believe Marxists who say they are looking for peace,' he cautioned.

The representatives of the nine nations could not reach agreement on the content of a joint declaration, so three separate statements were issued: one by the Contadora Group, one by Nicaragua, and one by the other four Central American foreign ministers.<sup>10</sup> The ministers were unable to settle the issue of whether the peace talks would be on a regional or bilateral basis. Nicaragua favored bilateral talks, but the other four Central American governments wanted regional talks. The Contadora ministers themselves could not "agree on whether a regional agreement would be effective or whether bilateral accords are needed."<sup>11</sup>

Nonetheless, as a bulletin released by the Contadora Group stated, "for the first time in the course of the present crisis, the Central American Ministers for Foreign Affairs had joined in a common effort to establish a dialogue."<sup>12</sup> The foreign ministers had been able to agree with the January Contadora Accord that the responsibility for peace in the region is their own, not outsiders'.<sup>13</sup> The representatives extended the meeting through the 22nd, and drew up an agenda for negotiations to begin in May, which consisted of: the regional arms race, the illegal arms trade, the presence of foreign military advisors, destabilization efforts by various countries, verbal threats and aggression, acts of war and border tensions, and the violation of human rights.<sup>14</sup>

The Contadora Group ministers moved their fourth meeting forward from May 27 to May 11 due to an increase in U.S.-Nicaraguan tensions. The main topic of concern was a Costa Rican request of the Organization of American States to establish a peacekeeping force along its border with Nicaragua. The border area had become the scene of heavy fighting in April, 1983, when contras reportedly began launching strikes against Nicaragua from within Costa Rica. Nicaragua allegedly violated Costa Rican airspace by sending aircraft on reconnaissance missions to search out the rebel camps. The Contadora ministers bewailed the escalation of the conflict in a statement released on May 15th. The

Contadora ministers agreed to send an 11-person civilian observer commission to inspect the border situation and submit recommendations. The statement said "the observers will include two representatives from each of their four countries."<sup>15</sup> Venezuela alone had supported sending an armed peacekeeping force.<sup>16</sup>

The United Nations Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 530 on May 19, 1983, to back the efforts of the Contadora Group to bring a negotiated settlement to the Central American conflict. Nicaragua and seven other Third World countries sponsored the resolution. The Security Council:

2. Commends the efforts of the Contadora Group and urges the pursuit of those efforts;
3. Appeals urgently to the interested States to co-operate fully with the Contadora Group, through a frank and constructive dialogue, so as to resolve their differences;
4. Urges the Contadora Group to spare no effort to find solutions to the problems of the region and to keep the Security Council informed of the results of these efforts.

The U.S. agreed to vote for the resolution only after Nicaragua agreed to drop three proposals from the original draft.<sup>18</sup>

The next Contadora Group meeting, held in Panama City, May 28-30, included the Central American Foreign Ministers. The nine foreign ministers confirmed the Costa Rica-Nicaragua border observer commission's mandate. It was deemed to act as an advisory body on all border problems in

the region.<sup>19</sup> The nine ministers also agreed to form a technical group consisting of representatives of the nine participating nations. This body's job was to advise the Contadora ministers of the most effective procedures in reaching a peaceful solution to the conflict. The technical group's recommendations were due the fourteenth of July at the next meeting of the Contadora Group.<sup>20</sup>

On June 19, 1983, the European Economic Community leaders endorsed the efforts of the Contadora Group at a three-day summit meeting in Stuttgart, West Germany.<sup>21</sup> Cuba had begun to publicly support the Contadora effort by the next meeting of the Contadora Group ministers and the Central American foreign ministers. Fidel Castro stated July 28th that Cuba would abide by any agreements made by "all the parties involved" for all foreign advisors to be withdrawn from the area, and/or for the cessation of arms trade with Central American nations.<sup>22</sup>

#### United States Manipulating Central American Allies?

Also on July 19, 1983, Nicaragua presented a plan to the Contadora Group which dealt with the region's military problems, and dealt squarely with the concerns previously stated by the U.S. and its allies. The Nicaraguans' proposal included an end to weapons deliveries to El Salvador, an end to all military support for subversives



attacking one of the region's governments, and respect for the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of a country.<sup>23</sup> This pledge was largely what the "Declaration of San José" of 1982 had been after. This document, signed by Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador, Colombia, the U.S., and others, had called for:

[An] end to support, supply, training or command of terrorist or subversive elements operating against other states in the region; an end to arms trafficking in the region; a ban on importing offensive heavy weapons; and a regional limit on armaments to legitimate defense needs of the countries in the region.<sup>24</sup>

However, the Central Americans (minus Nicaragua) shifted their bargaining position at the urging of the United States.<sup>25</sup> Military non-aggression and non-interventionism were no longer sufficient. The new proposals of Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, and El Salvador called for the establishment of participatory democratic institutions in all Central America. Sections of the proposals which dealt with those matters were, in fact, very vague.<sup>26</sup> This was one of the first times of many in which the US has undermined the Contadora process by encouraging its allies and clients in Central America (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica) to make counter-proposals to those previously agreed upon at joint meetings of the Contadora and Central American foreign ministers.<sup>27</sup>

### The Cancun Summit

The Contadora Ministers met July 14, 1983, in Panama City to draft the agenda for the planned summit meeting of the presidents of the Contadora countries, which took place in Cancun, Mexico, July 26-17, 1983.<sup>28</sup> Mexico had called the presidential summit, and the other presidents agreed to attend because of the heightened conflict in Central America, evidenced by an escalation of violence and border incidents, and the fear that the "Honduran-Nicarguan border clashes could degenerate into a regional war."<sup>29</sup> The presidents produced what has been termed the Cancun Declaration, a "bland and noncontroversial peace formula" which called on the Central American nations to use the following guidelines in working out an agreement:

- 1) An end to all present 'situations of belligerence.'
- 2) A freeze on offensive weapons at their present levels.
- 3) Control and reduction of weapons inventories, with adequate inspection.
- 4) A ban on 'the existence of military installations of other countries in their territory.'
- 5) Advance notice of troop movements near borders.
- 6) Joint border patrols by neighboring countries or supervision of frontiers by international observers.
- 7) Multilateral security commissions to prevent or settle border incidents.
- 8) Internal controls on arms smuggling across borders.
- 9) Promotion of a relaxation of tension through an end to statements and actions that harm the climate of mutual confidence.
- 10) Coordination of direct communication

systems to end armed clashes and generate an atmosphere of mutual confidence.<sup>30</sup>

The Cancun Declaration also stressed the need for economic development, regional integration, and political democracy in solving the underlying social, economic and political problems causing instability in the region.<sup>31</sup>

Like other Contadora statements, the Cancun declaration did not include ideological differences of East and West, nor their supposed competition for hegemony in Central America as possible causes of the region's problems. They continued to assert that the issues are Central American and should be settled by Central Americans, not outside powers such as the U.S. However, the Contadora presidents appealed to President Ronald Reagan and Premier Fidel Castro, and to the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the OAS to support their peace-making efforts.<sup>32</sup>

The Contadora ministers postponed a joint meeting with the Central American foreign ministers set for August 26-29, 1983, until September 7, 1983. At this meeting, the ministers proposed establishing three task forces to study political, security, and economic and social issues "to accelerate the analysis and discussion of the subjects on the agenda, as well as to oversee the implementation of determined solutions."<sup>33</sup>

### The Document of Objectives

Also at the September meeting, the group approved, in principle, a package called the "Document of Objectives" which was designed as a guide for efforts to achieve a peace treaty for the region. The twenty-one principles of agreement include an end to conflicts in the area, an end to the regional arms race, an end to the illegal arms trade, and negotiations on reductions in numbers of weapons and troops. The document also includes a prohibition on foreign military installations in the region, a removal of foreign military advisors, an end to support of subversive or terrorist groups, particularly allowing the use of one's territory by such groups. The document also calls for economic development assistance to the Central America countries, and, a general restructuring of the international economic system.<sup>34</sup>

The 21-point document was ratified by all the Central American countries by September 27, 1983.<sup>35</sup> However, their actions were not yet limited in practice as the document was only a draft treaty.<sup>36</sup>

When prospects for success in the Contadora negotiations were optimistic, the United States revealed a lack of commitment to resolving the Central American conflict through peaceful means. Only three days after the tentative acceptance of the Document of Objectives in September, U.S.

Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeanne Kirkpatrick, reasserted her commitment to a military victory over "international communism" in Central America.<sup>37</sup> During the Contadora Group meeting of September 7-10, 1983, the CIA escalated its war against Nicaragua:

It was revealed that sabotage actions carried out against Nicaragua's oil facilities last September and October by frogmen, speedboats and airplanes were actually carried out by CIA operatives independent of the contras .... Air attacks in February against a military base and radio facility were also carried out by the CIA, although again the contras claimed credit. The timing of these attacks to coincide with Nicaragua's announcement of an election date suggests an effort to disrupt Nicaragua's electoral process. The contras also claimed credit for another unilateral CIA operation, the laying of some 600 acoustical [sic] mines in Nicaragua's harbors.<sup>38</sup>

In October, at a joint meeting of Contadora and Central American foreign ministers, Honduras requested the establishment of a working group to "study measures to strengthen the defensive and security capabilities of the countries, which would act under the guidance of the Interamerican Defense Council."<sup>39</sup>

During October 22-23, 1983, the Contadora Ministers met with their own ambassadors to the United Nations, as well as their ambassadors to the various Central American countries in Panama City. The meeting was dominated by devising a way to implement the Document of Objectives.

In mid-November, Nicaragua sent some 1,200 Cuban advisors (of a total of 8,000) home. This appeared to

observers to be a result of Nicaragua's desire to make a good-faith move by abiding by the 21-point "Document of Objectives" drawn up by the Contadora Group and the Central American foreign ministers. The U.S. rejected this action as insincere, and said the numbers were insignificant.<sup>40</sup>

The UN General Assembly passed a strongly worded resolution proposed by the Contadora Group members in support of the Contadora Group November 10, 1983, which "condemns" acts of aggression in the region.<sup>41</sup> The General Assembly passed another resolution in October 1984, which urged the five Central American countries to expedite talks with the Contadora Group and sign the Act as soon as possible.<sup>42</sup>

The Contadora Ministers continued to fine-tune the Document of Objectives until the formal signing by the Central American foreign ministers in Panama City, at the fifth joint meeting of Central American foreign ministers and the Contadora Group January 8, 1984, of the "Norms for the Execution of the Assumed Compromises in the Document of Objectives."<sup>43</sup> They also established three working commissions which are to "prepare studies, legal drafts and recommendations...and make proposals for verifying and supervising implementation of the measures agreed on."<sup>44</sup> The Contadora Group convened the three working commissions on January 31, 1984.

Again the U.S. stepped up the pace of its military

policy in Central America. The CIA began the mining of Nicaragua's harbors in January, and in early February conducted air strikes on targets in Nicaragua.<sup>45</sup> U.S. Deputy Secretary of State, Steven Bosworth, explained the Reagan Administration's view of escalation of its military power as consistent with the Contadora process: "We have the obligation to provide military and economic assistance to U.S. allies in Central America in order that they don't feel subordinated to Nicaragua."<sup>46</sup>

Under pressure from Congress, President Reagan had established the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America in July 1983, dubbed the Kissinger Commission for its chairperson, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The Kissinger Commission presented its report on the same day as Contadora announced its January 8 agreement.<sup>47</sup> The Kissinger Commission's report superficially praised the Contadora Group, while also making "it quite clear that Contadora will be ignored if the group's evolving policies do not coincide with Washington's interests."<sup>48</sup> The Kissinger Report provided "an overall rationale for deepening US involvement" in Central America and endorsed the Reagan administration's policy there.<sup>49</sup>

The Contadora Group met February 27-28, 1984, and underscored its resolve to find a stable and lasting peace in Central America. It also noted the need to "scrupulously" carry out the measures put forward in the

Document of Objectives.<sup>50</sup> Nicaragua and Costa Rica signed a border agreement to allow joint inspection of their common border at a joint meeting May 15, 1984. The measure, drawn up by the Contadora Group, created a commission which is responsible for inspection of the border area and is to be free to cross the border at will.<sup>51</sup>

The Contadora Group presented a draft peace agreement to the five Central American presidents June 9-10, 1984. The agreement, formally called "The Contadora Act for Peace and Cooperation in Central America," includes a draft protocol that the Soviet Union, the United States, and other "outside countries" would be invited to sign to show evidence of support for the agreement.<sup>52</sup> This treaty, or Acta put into concrete terms the twenty-one points of the Document of Objectives, and was to be signed by the five Central American governments.<sup>53</sup>

The draft treaty calls for mutual reductions in arms, troops, and foreign advisors among Central American nations, and includes a prohibition against the establishment of foreign military bases. It would also bar countries from providing support to irregular forces trying to overthrow other governments.<sup>54</sup>

This was designed to stop U.S. support of the Honduran-based contras, and any Nicaraguan or Cuban aid that may be going to Salvadoran rebels. The U.S. would be expected to close its bases and military school in Honduras and remove its military advisors from the region; Nicaragua, in turn, would reduce the number of foreign advisors within



its borders, and would agree not to permit any foreign military base on its territory.<sup>55</sup>

The five Central American governments did not meet the July 15, 1984, deadline to sign the Contadora Group's "Act for Peace and Cooperation."<sup>56</sup> Guatemala did indicate in July that it would sign the Act "after clarifying some procedural points."<sup>57</sup> Before the meeting in late September, both Honduras and El Salvador announced "unofficially," that they were prepared to sign the Act, but Nicaragua continued to express strong reservations about signing it. At that joint meeting in September, the five Central American foreign ministers discussed their objections to the Act, and many of them were worked into a revised version of the Act.<sup>58</sup>

#### Nicaragua Surprises U.S. with Intent to Sign Contadora Draft Treaty

After the meeting, the Sandinistas alone agreed to sign the draft treaty as is. The other Central American governments had expressed support for the plan, but soon lost their enthusiasm under pressure from the U.S.<sup>59</sup> Managua's formal pledge to sign the treaty caught the United States by surprise. The U.S. previously "had given blanket endorsement to the peace process but never expected Nicaragua to sign such a treaty."<sup>60</sup> The U.S. withdrew support it had previously given the Act, and tried to

discredit the Sandinista government. The Reagan administration said the Nicaraguan decision was designed to cover up fraudulent elections.<sup>61</sup> In this way, the administration built a case for supporting the contras, based on the claim that the Sandinista government is non-democratic and totalitarian.<sup>62</sup>

Upon second look, the United States cited problems with the plan and urged its allies to alter specific provisions. The U.S. balked at the treaty for a number of reasons, including its requirements that the U.S. close its bases and withdraw support from the contras. The treaty would effectively end the anti-Sandinista war by forbidding countries, such as Honduras and Costa Rica, to allow their territories be used as sanctuaries. A generalized arms reduction, withdrawal of foreign military advisors and troops, the closing of U.S. bases, and reduction of the region's armed forces, as proposed in the Contadora treaty, would leave the U.S. with few viable alternative measures by which to exercise power in Central America.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, the treaty would leave the Sandinista regime in power, something Reagan administration hardliners have decided they cannot live with.<sup>64</sup> The Reagan administration cited the inadequate verification measures of treaty provisions, and demanded more specific timetables for foreign advisor and troop withdrawals, and tighter regulation of democratic elections.<sup>65</sup>

The European and Central American foreign ministers met September 28-19, 1984, at the San José, Costa Rica, summit. The United States was excluded, but Secretary of State, George Shultz, was very much present in the form of a cable sent to the Europeans. It heavy-handedly asked the Europeans not to increase political or economic aid to the Sandinistas, and that the source of problems in Central America are the Soviets. The European ministers were "incensed" and rebuffed Shultz as an uninvited intruder.<sup>66</sup> The Europeans included all members of the European Economic Community plus Spain and Portugal. They do not regard the Central American conflict as an opportunity for Soviet expansionism. Instead, they fear that the U.S. will attempt armed intervention in the region and will then pull NATO into the hostilities.<sup>67</sup> The Europeans included Nicaragua in the regional economic aid package.<sup>68</sup>

Although not a party to the Contadora process, the Reagan Administration made its feelings about the proposed treaty known:

At the UN's 39th General Assembly, US Secretary of State George Shultz met jointly with the region's foreign ministers, excluding Nicaragua. Then on October 12, 1984, at the inauguration ceremonies for Panama's new president, Nicolas Ardito Barletta, Shultz met individually with Panamanian, Colombian, Costa Rican, and Guatemalan officials, and later visited El Salvador and Mexico for talks with officials in those two countries. The Contadora negotiations were the central point in the meetings,<sup>69</sup> but the specific topics discussed are unknown.

Mr. Shultz was not the only U.S. diplomat lobbying Central American governments not to accept the Contadora proposal after the Nicaraguans announced their pledge to sign it. U.S. special envoy to Central America, Harry Schlaudeman, toured the four other governments in the region a few days after Managua's declaration. He "exerted discreet but strong diplomatic pressure...to take less-than-positive positions toward the treaty."<sup>70</sup>

According to a secret background paper prepared for a National Security Council meeting which was obtained by The Washington Post, the U.S. blocked adoption of the Contadora treaty by exerting intense pressure on El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica and by persuading them to withdraw their support from the treaty.<sup>71</sup> As Central America's dominant trade partner and primary source of economic and military assistance, and often the controlling influence in the world's major financial institutions, the U.S. was able to get Honduras, Costa Rica, and El Salvador to bend to its pressure.<sup>72</sup>

Following consultations with U.S. officials, Honduran Foreign Minister Edgardo Paz Barnica called for all five Central American foreign ministers to meet October 19, 1984, in Tegucigalpa to review the Contadora proposal. Nicaragua boycotted the meeting, charging that the meeting was prompted by U.S. efforts to derail the Contadora process, and that revisions should only be discussed jointly with the

Contadora Group.<sup>73</sup> Guatemala attended the meeting, but did not propose any changes in the draft treaty, nor did it endorse the new version. Guatemala's ambassador to the U.S., Frederico Fashen, said that his country took this position because Nicaragua was not involved when the changes were made.<sup>74</sup> These three countries submitted a counterdraft to the Contadora proposal which reflected U.S. security interests.<sup>75</sup> This plan eliminated sections banning all international military exercises from the area. The Washington Post said that the National Security Council secret briefing paper said:

We have effectively blocked Contadora Group efforts to impose a second draft of a revised Contadora Act. Following intensive U.S. consultations with El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, the Central American [sic] submitted a counterdraft to the Contadora states on October 20, 1984...[that] shifts concern within Contadora to adocument broadly consistent with U.S. interests....We will continue to exert strong pressure on Guatemala to support the basic core four [counterdraft] position.<sup>76</sup>

In a major departure from the Contadora proposal, the counterdraft permits the holding of international military maneuvers in Central American nations. It also omitted a protocol which asked for signatory countries outside the region to pledge support for the Contadora treaty.<sup>77</sup>

Mexican Foreign Minister, Bernardo Sepúlveda Amor, said the Contadora Group would reject any changes which could "serve as a pretext to reopen the negotiations in what would be an interminable process."<sup>78</sup>

Nicaragua refused to negotiate based on the counterdraft, while Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras have refused to do so if their new plan is not included in the negotiations.<sup>79</sup> The Contadora negotiations were stalemated and did not resume for another six months.

In November, the OAS passed a resolution supporting a Contadora Group report, but Honduras, El Salvador, and Costa Rica supported the resolution with the understanding that the final version of the Contadora peace treaty would include those changes they had recommended at Tegucigalpa.<sup>80</sup>

#### Contadora Talks Cancelled

The Contadora Process lay fallow until March 21-22, 1985, nearly six months after the aborted draft peace plan of October 1984. The months of inactivity placed the Contadora Group's effectiveness in grave doubt. In the opinion of many observers, the Contadora Group faces the same warlike conditions in the region that existed two years when it was formed two years.<sup>81</sup> Between October 1984 and January 1985, the Contadora ministers held separate closed meetings with the foreign ministers of the Central American countries in an effort to revive the negotiating process.<sup>82</sup> The Contadora Group met January 8-9, 1985, to plot strategy to get all five Central American foreign ministers to the negotiating table again.<sup>83</sup> They planned

to persuade the Central American foreign ministers to set aside the "surprise" alternative peace plan presented by El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Honduras on October 19, 1984, and, instead, return to the Contadora-sponsored "Act of Peace and Cooperation in Central America."<sup>84</sup> They also made some revisions in the Act which the foreign minister of Venezuela, Isidro Morales Paul, said "aim at bringing all the parties closer together."<sup>85</sup> But perhaps the most significant thing to emerge from this meeting was the group's first explicit reference to the United States, and whose support the Contadora ministers are alleged to have acknowledged as necessary to the achievement of a workable regional peace treaty.<sup>86</sup> Each of the parties to the Contadora Group recognize that an effective Central American peace agreement will require U.S. support. They set the date for the next joint meeting for February 14, 1985, in Panama.

It appeared that all parties would attend the scheduled February meeting:

A few weeks before the date of the meeting that would have approved the rough draft of the Acta of Cooperation for Peace, with the proposed modifications, the political sectors in favor of the negotiations felt optimistic because Nicaragua and Costa Rica were beginning to overcome their diplomatic conflict within the frame of Contadora.<sup>87</sup>

However, a dispute between Costa Rica and Nicaragua about an alleged violation of political asylum by Nicaraguan police,

prompted Costa Rica, Honduras, and El Salvador to boycott the February 1985 meeting, thereby forcing its cancellation.

#### Dispute Over Political Asylum

The object of this dispute was a 37-year old Nicaraguan draft evader, Jose Manuel Urbina Lara. Urbina had taken refuge in the Costa Rican embassy in December, 1984, and had been arrested by Nicaraguan security agents. Costa Rica charged that Nicaraguan authorities had stormed the embassy to arrest Urbina, a violation of the right of political asylum and of diplomatic protocol. The Sandinistas maintained that Urbina was not arrested until after he had voluntarily left the embassy. Urbina was tried for desertion in a Nicaraguan military court and sentenced to a five-year prison term.<sup>88</sup> The Costa Rican government announced January 10, 1985, that it would boycott all Contadora meetings until Urbina was freed or allowed to emigrate to Costa Rica.<sup>89</sup> On January 17, in what it called an "act of solidarity" with the Costa Rican government, Honduras announced that it, too, planned to boycott the scheduled February 14 meeting unless Nicaragua released Urbina in accord with the Costa Rican demand. The next day El Salvador announced its support of the boycott, and denounced the Sandinista government as totalitarian.<sup>90</sup>



### U.S. Strategy to Block Contadora

Reagan administration officials said the U.S. supported the boycott, and a State Department aide said that the U.S. was "sympathetic to Costa Ricans' complaints". Nicaragua charged that the United States had manipulated the three countries to participate in the boycott in an effort to block the Contadora initiative.<sup>91</sup> Two factors lend weight to Managua's allegations. First, in January, United States National Security Council Advisor, Robert McFarlane very quietly toured Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama, and second, the U.S. abruptly suspended bilateral talks with Nicaragua upon McFarlane's return to Washington.<sup>92</sup>

The Administration asserted that Nicaragua was not showing a "serious" interest in the talks as reason for their suspension. This appears to be no more than rhetoric, because President Reagan scorned peace overtures made in March by Nicaragua's President Daniel Ortega. Reagan said Ortega's offers to halt all foreign arms purchases and send home 100 more Cuban military advisors were without substance.

The Reagan administration...tied a resumption of the talks to progress in the Contadora negotiations. However, observers are drawn to the conclusion that the suspension of talks, combined with the boycott by U.S. allies in the region, is precisely intended to block Contadora.<sup>93</sup>

When the U.S. announced its decision to walk out of the negotiations the World Court at The Hague had indicated it supported Nicaragua's complaint that the U.S. is in violation of international law by engaging in covert efforts to overthrow the government of Nicaragua during peacetime.<sup>94</sup>

Since July 1984, U.S. special envoy to Central America, Harry Schlaudeman, and Nicaragua's vice-minister of foreign relations, Victor Tinoco, met nine times in Manzanillo, Mexico. The bilateral talks were designed to parallel the Contadora negotiations. Washington's walk-out on the Manzanillo talks was seen in Venezuela as a withdrawal of U.S. support for the Contadora peace mediation.<sup>95</sup>

A cabinet-rank advisor to Venezuela's President Jaime Lusinchi blamed Contadora's problems on enmity between the United States and Nicaragua said:

Contadora is at a dead point. Unless we obtain a clear definition of support from the Reagan Administration for a realistic agreement in the region, our good offices are not going to prosper.

A Mexican diplomat credited the problem to "deepening political antagonism between Costa Rica and Nicaragua that has left both sides unwilling to make concessions."<sup>97</sup> The Contadora Group had mediated an unsuccessful series of secret meetings in Panama during the first half of February to resolve the tension between the two countries.<sup>98</sup>

Former Colombian Foreign Minister and architect of the

original draft peace treaty, Rodrigo Lloredo Caicido put it simply: "Contadora was trying to swim against the tide."<sup>99</sup>

It is reported that a pronounced split has emerged in the Contadora Group due to the stalemate:

Mexico strongly supports Nicaragua's position and seeks U.S. concessions. Venezuela, Colombia and Panama have more sympathy for the concerns of the United States and its allies in the region.<sup>100</sup>

#### Contadora Talks Resumed

Nicaragua released Jose Urbina Lara on March 6, 1985, thereby meeting Costa Rica's condition to cease a boycott of Contadora meetings.<sup>101</sup> The Contadora Group announced March 16, 1985, in a joint communique with the the five Central American foreign ministers, that joint negotiations would resume April 11-12, 1985, in Panama. The joint communique said that:

...there were now 'propitious conditions' for a resumption and stressed that the Central American countries had pledged their 'political will to give genuine momentum' to the peace effort.<sup>102</sup>

The foreign ministers met in May, but little was accomplished. Members of the Contadora Group are not optimistic about prospects for a Contadora treaty without U.S. support.<sup>103</sup> Privately, each of the Contadora Group's participating foreign ministers have said that they believe that without the commitment of the United States, all efforts for a negotiated peace in Central America are in

vain.

### Summary

Through bilateral and collective negotiations with the five Central American states, the Contadora Group has produced a draft peace treaty for the region. The Group's efforts have the support of the international community, with endorsements from the European Economic Community, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations. The U.S. has stated support for the Contadora process, but its actions reveal its real opposition to the success of the Contadora Group's mediating efforts.

The Contadora Group has brought the opposing Central American countries to the negotiating table. Tensions between Nicaragua and Honduras have lessened so that the foreign ministers of the two countries can now speak directly to one another. This was not the case when joint meetings began in 1983. Structures have been established to ease border tensions between Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

However, when the Contadora Group appeared on the verge of major compromises, U.S. allies changed their positions such that negotiations always suffered a set back. Original demands of the U.S. and its allies in the region centered around calls for Nicaragua to stop its "export" of revolution to its neighbors. When Nicaragua showed signs of accepting this demand, the U.S. and its

Central American allies demanded changes in the internal politics of Nicaragua. These included a call for pluralism, representative democracy, and a return to a free press. A National Security Council document provides evidence that the U.S. deliberately sabotaged the acceptance of the draft Contadora treaty in the autumn of 1984. U.S. diplomats pressured Costa Rica, Honduras, and El Salvador into dropping their support for the draft treaty, and presenting their own counterdraft. This brought the negotiations to a standstill until January 1985, when the same three countries used a diplomatic incident between Costa Rica and Nicaragua as reason to boycott Contadora meetings.

The diplomatic impasse was solved, and the Central American foreign ministers again met with the Contadora Group in May, but there is little hope of reaching agreement on a regional peace treaty. The U.S. still retains enough of the power in the hemisphere that without its support, and its active opposition, such efforts for regional policies on the part of even middle powers like Mexico will not succeed.

Nonetheless, as noted in Chapter Two, the Contadora Group has perhaps contributed to conditions that have prevented a regional war from breaking out yet. The Contadora members have also been successful in their pursuit of increased prestige, for they have attracted the support of the international community of nations.

Therefore, the hypothesis that U.S. power has waned in

the western hemisphere and that the international system has moved toward polycentrism, is both supported and not supported. U.S. power has waned insofar as the Contadora Group formed at all to challenge U.S. policy in Central America. Twenty-five years ago, this kind of policy option was not available to Latin American foreign policymakers. The international system is therefore more flexible than it was then, when it seemed to better fit Kaplan's model of loose bipolarity. The Western bloc is decentralized, or polycentric, to the point that Latin American states within the U.S. sphere of influence, can formulate policies which are pursued in the individual Latin American country's national interest.

Yet, the system still retains features of bipolarity, as discussed in the first chapter. Regional foreign policy initiatives on the part of Latin American states which fly in the face of U.S. policy cannot succeed, based on this case study of the Contadora Group.

## NOTES

1. "Contadora: War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 47.
2. Robert Fraser (ed.), "Establishment of Contadora Group" KEESING'S CONTEMPORARY ARCHIVES: RECORD OF WORLD EVENTS, v. XXIX, November 1983, p. 32492.
3. "Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, Panama Call for Dialogue" EL SALVADOR BULLETIN, v. 2, no. 4, February 1983, p. 1.
4. "Chasing the Wild Goose" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA: A REPORT ON BUSINESS AND POLITICS, v. VI, no. 14, April 18, 1983, p. 106; and FACTS ON FILE, v. 43, no. 2216, May 6, 1983, p. 320.
5. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" UN CHRONICLE, v. 21, March 1984, p. 10.
6. "Reunion de cancilleres" ["Meeting of Chancellors"] TIEMPO, May 2, 1983, p. 45.
7. "Nine Nations Meet in Panama" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICAN AND PANAMA, v. 6, no. 15, p. 118.
8. FACTS ON FILE, v. 43, no. 2216, May 6, 1983, p. 320.
9. "Contadora: War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 47.
10. Dial Torgerson, "New Round of Talks on Central America to Open" LOS ANGELES TIMES, May 28, 1983, part I, p. 14.
11. *ibid.*
12. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" p. 10
13. FACTS ON FILE, v.43, no. 2221, May 6, 1983, p. 320.

14. Fraser, November 1983, p. 32492; and "Reunion de cancilleres" ["Meeting of Chancellors"] p. 45.
15. "Latin Group OKs Observers at Costa Rica Border" LOS ANGELES TIMES, May 14, 1983, part I, p. 19.
16. Fraser, November 1983, p. 32492.
17. "Resolution 530" RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, 1983, Security Council, Official Records: 38th Year, (New York: United Nations, 1984), p. 10.
18. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" UN CHRONICLE, v. 21, March 1984, p. 10.
19. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" p. 10.
20. "Quinta Reunion del Grupo Contadora" [Fifth Meeting of the Contadora Group] TIEMPO, June 6, 1983, p.1.
21. FACTS ON FILE, v.43, no. 2223, June 24, 1983, p. 466.
22. Fraser, November 1983, p. 32493.
23. "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 47.
24. LOS ANGELES TIMES, October 8, 1982, cited in "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 45.
25. Phillip Berryman, THE KISSINGER COMMISSION REPORT: A CRITIQUE, cited in "The Region" MESOAMERICA, v. 3, no. 3, March 1984, p.12.
26. CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, July 29, 1983, cited in "Contadora: War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 47.
27. Phillip Berryman, THE KISSINGER COMMISSION REPORT: A CRITIQUE, cited in "The Region" MESOAMERICA, v. 3, no. 3, March 1984, p.12.
28. Fraser, November 1983, p. 32492.
29. "Contadora Chiefs Meet In Summit" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA, v. 6, no 27, July 18, 1983, p. 212.
30. "Contadora Issues Plan, But Tensions Still Rise" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA, v. 6, no. 28, July 25, 1983, p. 217.



31. *ibid.*
32. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" p. 10.
33. Fraser, November 1983, p. 32493.
34. "The 21 Points of Contadora," THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA, v. VI, no. 48, December 12, 1983, pp. 380, 382.
35. "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 48.
36. Juan M. Vásquez, "4-Nation Latin Group Begins 2-Day Meeting" LOS ANGELES TIMES, October 22, 1983, part I, p. 22.
37. Anne Marie Mergier, "Mientras hablan de paz en Contadora, los Estados Unidos impulsan la agresión" [While Contadora talks of peace, the United States pushes aggression] PROCESO, September 19, 1983, in "Contadora: War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 48.
38. "United States Continues Pressure Tactics" CENTRAL AMERICA BULLETIN, v. III, no. 8, June 1984, p. 6; see also "'Contras' Increase Attacks Against Nicaragua" EL SALVADOR BULLETIN, v. 2, no. 7, pp. 1,8; "Fact Sheet: US Militarism in Central America" MESOAMERICA, v. 4, no. 1, January 1985, pp. 11-12; Violence, Rhetoric Escalate in Central America" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, v. XI, no. 16, September 15, 1983, p. 61; "Chamorro Portrays CIA Role" LATIN AMERICAN MONITOR, v. 1, no. 10, December 1984, p. 115.
39. "Contadora Advances, but Nicaragua is Bombed" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT v. X, no. 36, September 16, 1983, p. 282.
40. "More Sandinista peace initiatives," CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. X, no. 47, December 22, 1983, p. 1.
41. "38/10. The situation in Central America: threats to internaional peace and security and peace initiatives" RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DURING ITS THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION, 20 SEPTEMBER-20 DECEMBER 1983 AND 26 JUNE 1984, General Assembly official records, 38th session, Supplement no. 47, (United Nations, 1984), pp. 21-22.
42. "Contadora" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, March 15, 1985, p. 20.

43. Conosurpress, "Un año del Grupo de Contadora" ["A Year of the Contadora Group"] DIALOGOSOCIAL, v. XVII, no. 164, p. 37.
44. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" p. 10.
45. "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 48.
46. *ibid.*
47. *ibid.*
48. *ibid.*, p. 49.
49. "The Region: Peace in Central America" p. 12.
50. "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" p. 11.
51. "A Contadora Victory" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 20, May 20, 1984, pp. 167-168.
52. William R. Long, "Contadora Group Drafts Peace Accord" LOS ANGELES TIMES, part I, p.8.
53. William D. Rogers, "The United States and Latin America" FOREIGN AFFAIRS, pp. 560-580.
54. Philip Taubman, "Latin Peace Plan: Why the U.S. Balks" THE NEW YORK TIMES, October 3, 1984, p. 3.
55. Will Ellsworth-Jones, "Reagan Caught Napping by Sandinista Manoeuvre" THE SUNDAY TIMES, September 30, 1984, p. 21; John Latigua, "Draft Pact Would Limit Arms in Central America" THE WASHINGTON POST, September 25, 1984, p. A8.
56. "Contadora's peace act still looking for buyers" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 28, July 20, 1984, p. 222.
57. *ibid.*
58. "Contadora: The Politics of Peace" p. 5.
59. "Shultz twisting arms on Contadora" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 41, October 19, 1984, p. 323.
60. Joanne Omang, "Four of Five Latin Countries Agree on Draft Peace Treaty" WASHINGTON POST, November 9, 1984, p. 3.

61. "US Nervous Over Contadora Deadline" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 40, October 12, 1984, p. 315; "U.S. Official Discounts the Pledge by Nicaraguans" NEW YORK TIMES, September 23, 1984, p. 8.
62. "U.S. Diplomatic Offensive Continues" CENTRAL AMERICAN BULLETIN, v. III, no. 12, October 1984, p. 4.
63. "US Nervous over Contadora Deadline" p. 315.
64. "Violence, Rhetoric Escalate Central America" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, v. XI, no. 16, September 15, 1983, p. 61; and LOS ANGELES TIMES, September 13, 1983, in "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 47.
65. Stephen Kinzer, "Managua Takes a Trick With the Contadora Card" NEW YORK TIMES, September 30, 1984, p. E2; Taubman, p. 3; "US Seen as Responsible for the Slowdown in Contadora Peace Talks" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, October 26, 1984, p. 14; "U.S. Allies Modify Contadora Plan" FACTS ON FILE, v. 44, no. 2297, November 23, 1984, p. 863.
66. "Now, Europe and Contadora versus the US" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 39, October 5, 1984, pp. 305-306.
67. *ibid*, p. 306.
68. Edward Cody, "W. Europeans to Aid Central Americans" WASHINGTON POST, September 30, 1984, p. A28.
69. "Schultz twisting arms on Contadora" pp. 323-324.
70. "Contadora: The Politics of Peace" MESOAMERICA, v. 4, no. 4, April 1985, p. 5.
71. Alma Guillermoprieto and David Hoffman, "Document Describes How U.S. 'Blocked' a Contadora Treaty" WASHINGTON POST, November 6, 1984, pp. 1, 27.
72. "Contadora: Politics of Peace" p. 5.
73. "Shultz twisting arms on Contadora" p. 324; "U.S. Allies Modify Contadora Plan" FACTS ON FILE, v. 44, no. 2297, November 23, 1984, p. 863.
74. "U.S. Allies Modify Contadora Plan" FACTS ON FILE, v. 44, no. 2297, November 23, 1984, p. 863.
75. Guillermoprieto, p.1; "U.S. Allies Revise Peace

Plan" LATIN AMERICAN MONITOR, v. I, no. 10, December 1984, p. 115.

76. Guillermoprieto, p. 6.

77. "U.S Allies Modify Contadora Plan" p. 863.

78. "U.S. Allies Revise Peace Plan" LATIN AMERICAN MONITOR, v. I, no. 10, November 1984, p. 115.

79. Juan M. Vásquez, "Latin Peace Pact Revised" LOS ANGELES TIMES, p. 6; "Contadora runs into trouble" QUARTERLY ECONOMIC REVIEW OF NICARAGUA, COSTA RICA, PANAMA, The Economist Intelligence Unit, no. 1, 1985.

80. "A languishing OAS to look for new formulas" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 47, November 30, 1984, pp. 369-370.

81. "Contadora se reunirá en Panama" ["Contadora Meets in Panama"] EL NACIONAL, January 6, 1985, p. 1.

82. Juan M. Vásquez, "Latin Peace Pact Revised, Call for New Talks Issued" LOS ANGELES TIMES, January 10, 1985, p. 1.

83. Juan M. Vásquez, "New Latin Peace Initiative Coming" LOS ANGELES TIMES, January 7, 1985, p. 16.

84. *ibid.*

85. Vásquez, "Latin Peace Pact Revised, Call for New Talks Issued" January 10, 1985, p. 6.

86. *ibid.*

87. "Guerra o paz para Centro America?" ["War or Peace for Central America?"] INFORPRESS CENTROAMERICANA, no. 629, February 21, 1985, p. 7.

88. Juan M. Vásquez, "Talks Canceled as Latin Peace Effort Falters" LOS ANGELES TIMES, February 14, 1985, pp. 1, 28.

89. "Contadora Meet Postponed" LATIN AMERICAN INDEX, v. XIII, no. 3, February 15, 1985, p. 9.

90. "Contadora in Dire Straits" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XII, no. 3, January 1985, p. 17.

91. Vásquez, "Talks Canceled as Latin Peace Effort

Falters" p. 28.

92. "Contadora in Dire Straits" p. 17.

93. "Peace Talks Collapse" LATIN AMERICA MONITOR, v. 2, no.1, January/February 1985, p.1.

94. "Contadora: The Politics of Peace" p. 6; "Peace Talks Collapse" p. 1.

95. Juan de Onís, "Central America Peace Drive Reported in Peril" LOS ANGELES TIMES, January 30, 1985, p. 6.

96. Juan de Onís, "Central America Peace Drive Reported in Peril" LOS ANGELES TIMES, January 30, 1985, part I, p. 6.

97. Juan M. Vásquez, Feb. 14, 1985, p. 28.

98. *ibid.*

99. "Contadora is Only Limping Along" LATIN AMERICA REGIONAL REPORTS-MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA, April 1985, p. 104.

100. Juan de Onís, "Central America Peace Drive Reported in Peril" p. 6.

101. "Contadora" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, March 15, 1985, p.20.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has examined the Contadora Group as a possible manifestation of a transition from a loose bipolar to a polycentric international system. The foreign policies of the Contadora states have been examined in an effort to determine possible motivations for the pursuit of these foreign policies. These motivations were then assessed for their role in determining participation in the international system because, as discussed in Chapter One, the international environment sets limits on the types of policies which are available to policymakers in any given country, thereby acting as an external foreign policy determinant.

In analyzing the role of the Contadora Group, Chapter Three discussed the Contadora peace process. This illustrated the efforts of the Contadora foreign ministers to mediate peace negotiations in Central America, and the difficulties they have encountered. This chapter will summarize the basic conclusions of the thesis. The fundamental questions addressed are: Does this case study support the contention that U.S. power is declining in the western hemisphere?, and to what extent are the foreign

policies of the Contadora Group member countries independent of U.S. influence?

Effect of Change in the  
International System

As discussed in Chapter One, the world is still dominated by superpower rivalry, however, the international system operates such that there is greater flexibility in international relations than exists in a loose bipolar model, such as existed immediately following World War II. While the international system is in transition some states may find available to them policies which were previously unavailable. Latin American states have more latitude in the range of foreign policy options than they did even twenty years ago. With the waning of U.S. power in Latin America, nations still dominated by the U.S. have chosen goals from their hierarchy of foreign policy objectives which express more depth and range than seen previously in the hemisphere.

In reference to the issue of polycentrism, the Contadora Group has exercised a degree of power not available to members of a bloc in a loose bipolar system. The simple fact of publicly calling U.S. policy into question demonstrates that the U.S. cannot dictate foreign policy throughout the hemisphere. The Contadora Group has achieved a measure of success. Thus far, an open regional

war has not broken out, but this must be weighed against the continuing CIA-coordinated contra war. The Contadora Group has not been able to secure a relaxation of U.S. military activity in the region. Contadora peace initiatives have been blocked numerous times by the U.S., as discussed in Chapter Three. The United States still retains hegemony in the hemisphere such that a workable Central American peace treaty is not possible without the United States' backing.

In terms of achieving national foreign policy interests, the Contadora process serves two functions. It has enhanced the prestige of Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico in the global community. The Contadora Group has mustered world public opinion against the Reagan administrations' Central American policies; the European Economic Community and the United Nations General Assembly has openly criticized U.S. support for the anti-Sandinista rebels, and both these international forums, and others, have endorsed the Contadora process. The United States has, and is, pursuing a globally unpopular policy in Central America.

The real foreign policy capabilities of the four Contadora nations have also improved of themselves. For example, in the 1970's, oil revenues afforded Venezuela and Mexico foreign policy choices, such as development loans and grants to Central American and Caribbean states, which were traditionally in the realm of the "developed" nations.



## Foreign Policy Determinants

In an effort to secure a more autonomous and prestigious image in the world community, the Contadora members have asserted themselves independently of the U.S. foreign policy line. Each of the four has a varying history of such activity, and each has limited its words and actions in an effort not to ingratiate itself to the United States; reality of continued dependence on the U.S. demands each country not go too far.

The motivation for an autonomous foreign policy has combined with a perspective on social injustice and revolution different from the United States', except, perhaps, in the case of Panama or Venezuela. This seems to be particularly dependent on the views of the incumbent president in all the Contadora countries, except in Mexico where a consistent world view seems to prevail. Panama's military and economic ties to the U.S. have been strengthened during the presidency of Ardito Barletta. Venezuela fears Cuban revolutionary activity, and Venezuelan leaders have expressed suspicion of the Sandinistas and Cubans. Venezuela continues to covertly train Salvadoran troops despite its public calls for peace. Colombia's President Betancur followed Turbay Alaya in office, and rejected Turbay's Cold War analysis of Central America.

None of the Contadora four desires a confrontation of

the two superpowers in Central America. Through positive contact with the revolutionaries in Central America, both Mexico's President de la Madrid and Venezuela's President Herrera Campins have explained their belief that they may best influence the outcome of these conflicts. Mexico also allegedly face pressure from the left wing of the ruling party to support revolution abroad or face a challenge to conservative domestic policy. Some ascribe Mexico's policy in Central America to this factor alone, but this explanation seems to simplistic. The ideals of the Mexican Revolution have become part of the social and political consciousness of Mexicans. A combination of the two seems most plausible.

Each of the Contadora members' presidents has stated a desire to see an improvement in the standard of living for the Central American masses, and to see their inclusion in the political processes of their respective countries. These goals, if only partially met, would prevent a large measure of instability which Contadora leaders fear could spread to their countries (see Chapter Two).

The Contadora Group member states share a combination of foreign policy motivations. Perhaps the most common is the desire to avoid a war in Central America which would, in all likelihood, involve the United States. The collective memory of the Contadora countries winces at past U.S. military interventions in the hemisphere. All four

Contadora members do not wish to see a resurgence of military activity within their sphere of influence. Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia share aspirations to regional leadership which have surfaced since a cessation of direct U.S. interventions in Central America. A U.S. intervention in Central America would be perceived as a precedent for possible U.S. interventions in Mexico and Panama to secure oilfields and the neutrality of the Canal Zone, respectively. These nations have opposed U.S. policy in Central America because their own sovereignties, or status within the international system, are threatened when the U.S. violates the principle of non-intervention. These scenarios would not heighten Mexico's nor Panama's prestige.

In fact, none of the Contadora Group nations would find its image enhanced by a U.S. military intervention in Central America, as U.S. hegemony would inevitably outshine them.

A war in Central America would impact negatively on the pursuit of the national objectives of self-enhancement, whether prestige or increased power is the foreign policy goal. War would disrupt trade in the region which Mexico and Venezuela have sought as a market for oil exports, and which Colombia has pursued as a market for its nontraditional exports. Not only would a Central American war threaten to destabilize Contadora countries' trade in the region, but, perhaps most importantly, could also threaten the stability of the Contadora countries' political

systems. Panama's military government fears a challenge from below, which could conceivably occur should the U.S. intervene in the Canal Zone. Colombia's own domestic problems with communist guerrillas might grow if the region is 'contaminated' by another U.S. intervention. Mexico fears an influx of even more Central American refugees, and the prospect of beefing up its military with a treasury which is already short on funds during a time of economic austerity.

Participation in the Contadora Group has enhanced the prestige of each of its members in the eyes of both the U.S. and the rest of the world. This has been satisfying in itself, particularly to Mexico, which has zealously sought to command more respect from the United States. Colombia's leadership, also ignored by the United States in the recent past, also regained some of its lost pride. All four countries have sought to improve their position vis-a-vis the United States. Even if the Contadora Group does not produce a viable peace treaty for Central America, its members' ultimate goals of peace, enhanced power and prestige will have been achieved. However, such a treaty has little chance without U.S. support, as demonstrated in the autumn of 1984.

Further study of the regional foreign policies of Latin American states would be very helpful in both the fields of international relations and comparative politics. Regional

policies of Latin American states of "middle- range" power could illustrate how far an ally of the U.S. may assert itself independently of the U.S., and where, and when, those Latin American states are willing and able to do so. This, in turn, could help flesh out the literature on the general nature of the current, yet evolving, international system, which, apparently, lies somewhere between bipolarity and multipolarity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Robert J. ROMULO BETANCOURT AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF VENEZUELA (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1982.)
- Ball, M. Margaret. THE OAS IN TRANSITION (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1969.)
- Bagley, Bruce. "Mexican Foreign Policy: The Decline of a Regional Power" CURRENT HISTORY, December 1983, pp. 408.
- Bagley, Bruce. "Mexico in Central America: The Limits of Regional Power" pp. 261-284, in Wolf Grabendorff, Heinrich-W. Krumwiede, and Jorg Todt (eds.), POLITICAL CHANGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984.)
- Bagley, Bruce. "Mexico in the 1980s: A New Regional Power" CURRENT HISTORY, November 1981, pp. 356.
- Barry, Tom, Beth Wood, and Deb Preusch, DOLLARS AND DICTATORS: A GUIDE TO CENTRAL AMERICA (Albuquerque, New Mexico: The Resource Center, 1982.)
- Berryman, Phillip. THE KISSENGER COMMISSION REPORT: A CRITIQUE, cited in "The Region" MESOAMERICA, v. 3, no. 3, March 1984.
- "A Bet on Mexico" THE ECONOMIST, July 10, 1982, pp. 12-13.
- Blank, David E. "Venezuela: Politics of Oil" pp. 73-101, in Robert Wesson (ed.), U.S. INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA IN THE 1980's (New York: Praeger; Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1982), p. 92.
- Blustein, Howard I., J. David Edwards, Kathryn T. Thompson, David S. McMorris, and James D. Rudolph. AREA HANDBOOK FOR VENEZUELA, 3rd ed. (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.)
- Boersner, Demetrio. "Venezuelan Policies Toward Central America" in Wolf Grabendorff, Heinrich-W. Krumwiede, and Jorg Todt (eds.), POLITICAL CHANGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS

(Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984),  
pp. 245-260.

- Bond, Robert E. (ed.), CONTEMPORARY VENEZUELA AND ITS  
ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (New York: New York  
University Press, 1977.)
- Boyd, Gerald M. "Reagan Defends Latin Policy" NEW YORK  
TIMES, March 3, 1985, p. 6.
- CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. VII, no. 26, July 4, 1981,  
p. 208.
- CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, July 29, 1983, cited in "Contadora:  
War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS,  
v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 47.
- "Chamorro Portrays CIA Role" LATIN AMERICAN MONITOR, v. 1,  
no. 10, December 1984, p. 115.
- "Chasing the Wild Goose" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND  
PANAMA: A REPORT ON BUSINESS AND POLITICS, v. VI,  
no. 14, April 18, 1983, p. 106.
- Cody, Edward. "W. Europeans to Aid Central Americans"  
WASHINGTON POST, September 30, 1984, p. A28.
- CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 28, 1983, p 55487.
- Conosurpress. "Un año del Grupo de Contadora," ["A  
Year of the Contadora Group,"] DIALOGOSOCIAL,  
v. XVII, no. 164, p. 37.
- "Contadora" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, March 15, 1985, p. 20.
- "Contadora Advances, but Nicaragua is bombed," CENTRAL  
AMERICA REPORT: THE WEEKLY REVIEW OF ECONOMICS AND  
POLITICS, v. X, no. 36, September 16, 1983, p. 282.
- "Contadora Chiefs Meet In Summit", THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL  
AMERICA, v. 6, no 27, July 18, 1983, p. 212.
- "Contadora in Dire Straits" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XII,  
no. 3, January 1985, p. 17.
- "Contadora is Only Limping Along" LATIN AMERICA REGIONAL  
REPORTS - MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA, April 1985,  
p. 104.
- "Contadora Meet Postponed" LATIN AMERICAN INDEX, v. XIII,  
no. 3, February 15, 1985, p. 9.

- "Contadora's peace act still looking for buyers"  
CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 28, July 20, 1984,  
p. 222.
- "Contadora: Peace Process in Central America" UN CHRONICLE,  
v. 21, March 1984, p. 9.
- "Contadora: The Politics of Peace" MESOAMERICA, v. 4,  
no. 4, April 1985, p. 10.
- "Contadora se reunirá en Panama" ["Contadora Meets in  
Panama"] EL NACIONAL, January 6, 1985, p. 1.
- "Contadora runs into trouble" QUARTERLY ECONOMIC REVIEW OF  
NICARAGUA, COSTA RICA, PANAMA, The Economist Intelli-  
gence Unit, no. 1, 1985.
- "A Contadora Victory," CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI,  
no. 20, May 20, 1984, pp. 167-168.
- "Contadora: War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON THE  
AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, p. 47.
- "'Contras' Increase Attacks Against Nicaragua" EL SALVADOR  
BULLETIN, v. 2, no. 7, pp. 1,8.
- Couturier, Edith B. "Mexico" in Harold Eugene Davis  
and Larman C. Wilson, LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN  
POLICIES (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins  
University Press, 1975), pp. 117-135.
- Crabb, Cecil V. NATIONS IN A MULTIPOLAR WORLD, (New York:  
Harper and Row, 1968.)
- Craig, Richard B. "Colombian Narcotics and United States-  
Colombian Relations" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN  
STUDIES AND WORLD AFFAIRS, v. 23, no. 3, August 1981,  
pp. 243-270.
- Daly-Hayes, Margaret. LATIN AMERICA AND THE U.S. NATIONAL  
INTEREST: A BASIS FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY (Boulder,  
Colorado: Westview Press, 1984.)
- Díaz, Soccoro. FUERZAS E INTERESES DE LAS POTENCIAS  
MEDIANAS REGIONALES: EL CASO DE MEXICO [FORCES AND  
INTERESTS OF THE MIDDLE REGIONAL POWERS], Discussion  
Paper, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Bonn, West Germany,  
March 11, 1981, p. 8, cited in Edward J. Williams,  
"Mexico's Central American Policy" BULLETIN OF  
LATIN AMERICAN RESEARCH, pp. 21-41.



- Diehl, Jackson. "Peace Efforts Spur Criticism in Colombia" WASHINGTON POST, May 27, 1984, p. A24.
- Drekonja-Kornat, Gerhard. "Colombia: Learning the Foreign Policy Process" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN STUDIES AND WORLD AFFAIRS, v. 25, no. 1, February 1983, pp. 233-234.
- "The Duarte Administration receives renewed support" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, October 1984, p. 302.
- Ealy, Lawrence O. THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA IN WORLD AFFAIRS, 1903-1950 (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.)
- Eisner, Madeline (ed.), "Anti-Drug War Enters Diplomatic Arena; Mexico Suspends Oil Shipments to Two Customers" MEXICO UPDATE, v. III, no. 11, March 15, 1985, p. 10.
- Ellman, Paul. "Washington's New Offensive" MACLEANS, v. 96, October 17, 1983, pp. 39-40.
- Engel, James F. "The Revolution and Mexican Foreign Policy" JOURNAL OF INTER-AMERICAN STUDIES, v. 11, no. 4, October 1969, pp. 518-532.
- "Fact Sheet: US Militarism in Central America" MESOAMERICA, v. 4, no. 1, January 1985, pp. 11-12.
- FACTS ON FILE, v.43, no. 2221, May 6, 1983, p. 320.
- FACTS ON FILE, v.43, no. 2223, June 24, 1983, p. 466.
- Fagen, Richard R. "Dateline Nicaragua: The End of the Affair" FOREIGN POLICY, Fall 1979, reprinted in FOREIGN POLICY ON LATIN AMERICA: 1970-1980 (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1983), p. 156.
- Falk, Richard A. "Panama Treaty Trap" in FOREIGN POLICY ON LATIN AMERICA, 1970-1980 (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982), pp. 121-127.
- Finan, John J. "Latin America and the Cold War" in Harold Eugene Davis, John J. Finan, and F. Taylor Peck (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY: AN INTRODUCTION (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.)

- Fraser, Robert (ed.), "Central America-United States-US Policy and Contadora Peace Efforts" KEESING'S CONTEMPORARY ARCHIVES: RECORD OF WORLD EVENTS, vol.XXX, 1984.
- Fraser, Robert (ed.), "Establishment of Contadora Group" KEESING'S CONTEMPORARY ARCHIVES: RECORD OF WORLD EVENTS, v. XXIX, November 1983.
- "General's death has consequences for whole of Central America," LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT (August 7, 1981), p. 1.
- Goodsell, James Nelson. "Central America: Fire in the Front Yard?" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, February 12, 1982, pp. 12-13.
- Gordon, Dennis R. and Margaret M. Munro. "The External Dimension of Civil Insurrection: International Organizations and the Nicaraguan Revolution" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN STUDIES AND WORLD AFFAIRS, v. 25, no.1, February 1983, p. 67.
- Goshko, John M. "Mexico Aide Says Mining of Ports Is Counterproductive" WASHINGTON POST, April 18, 1984, p. A23.
- Grabendorff, Wolf, Heinrich-W. Krumwiede, and Jorg Todt (eds.), POLITICAL CHANGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984.)
- "Guerra o paz para Centro America?" ["War or Peace for Central America?"] INFORPRESS CENTROAMERICANA, no. 629, February 21, 1985, p. 7.
- Guillermoprieto, Alma and David Hoffman. "Document Describes How U.S. 'Blocked' a Contadora Treaty" THE WASHINGTON POST, November 6, 1984, pp. 1, 27.
- Guy, James John. "Venezuela: Foreign Policy and Oil" THE WORLD TODAY, December 1979, pp. 508.
- Hanrieder, Wolfram F. "The international system: bipolar or multibloc?" JOURNAL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION, no. 9, September 1965, pp. 299-308.
- Holsti, K. J. INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967; Steven Rosen and Walter Jones, THE LOGIC OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (Cambridge, Massachusetts:

- Winthrop, 1974.)
- Jimeno, Ramon, and Steven Volk. "Not Such Strange Bedfellows" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, May/June 1983, pp. 2-12.
- "Joint US-Panama Military Maneuvers Commence" MESOAMERICA, v. 4, no.2, p. 10.
- Jones, Errol D. and David LaFrance. "Mexico's Foreign Affairs Under President Echeverria: The Special Case of Chile" JOURNAL OF INTERAMERICAN ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, v. 30, no. 1, Summer 1976.
- Kaplan, Morton A. and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. THE POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1961.)
- Kegley, Charles W., Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY: PATTERN AND PROCESS (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.)
- Kinzer, Stephen. "Managua Takes a Trick With the Contadora Card," NEW YORK TIMES, September 30, 1984, p. E2.
- Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. "U.S. Security and Latin America" in Howard J. Wiarda (ed.), RIFT AND REVOLUTION: THE CENTRAL AMERICAN IMBROGLIO (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1984), pp. 343-346.
- Kristof, Nicholas. "That International 'Debt Bomb' Hasn't Stopped Ticking" NEW YORK TIMES, March 31, 1985, p. E5.
- "A Languishing OAS to look for new formulas" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 47, November 30, 1984, pp. 369-370.
- Latigua, John. "Draft Pact Would Limit Arms in Central America" WASHINGTON POST, September 25, 1984, p. A8.
- "Latin Group OKs Observers at Costa Rica Border" LOS ANGELES TIMES, May 14, 1983, part I, p. 19.
- LeMoynes, James. "European-Latin Parley Considers More Aid" NEW YORK TIMES, September 30, 1984, p. 7.
- Lincoln, Jennie K. "Introduction to Latin American

- Foreign Policy: Global and Regional Dimensions" in Elizabeth G. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), pp. 3-18.
- Long, William R. "Contadora Group Drafts Peace Accord" LOS ANGELES TIMES, part I, p.8.
- LOS ANGELES TIMES, September 13, 1983, in "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 47.
- LOS ANGELES TIMES, October 8, 1982, cited in "Contadora: War by Other Means" p. 45.
- Lowenthal, Abraham F. and Albert Fishlow. LATIN AMERICA'S EMERGENCE: TOWARD A U.S. RESPONSE (New York: The Headline Series, published by the Foreign Policy Association, 1979.)
- "Las Maniobras Militares" [Military Maneuvers"] DIALOGO SOCIAL, no. 175, February 1985, pp. 10-14.
- Martz, John D. "The Crisis of Venezuelan Democracy" CURRENT HISTORY, v. 83, February 1984.
- Matthews, Robert. "1982-1984: Plus Ca Change" NACLA REPORT ON THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984, pp. 36-43.
- McShane, John F. "Emerging Regional Power: Mexico's Role in the Caribbean Basin" in Elizabeth G. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), pp. 191-209.
- Mecham, J. Lloyd. A SURVEY OF UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1965.)
- Mellander, G. E. THE UNITED STATES IN PANAMAIAN POLITICS: THE INTRIGUING FORMATIVE YEARS (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971.)
- Mendel, Douglas. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN A POLYCENTRIC WORLD (Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1968), p. 16.
- Mergier, Anne Marie. "Mientras hablan de paz en Contadora, los Estados Unidos impulsan la agresion" [While Contadora talks of peace, the United States pushes

- agresion"] PROCESO, September 19, 1983, in  
 "Contadora: War by Other Means" NACLA REPORT ON  
 THE AMERICAS, v. XVIII, no. 4, July/August 1984,  
 p. 48.
- "Mexico Declares Hands-Off Policy" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL  
 AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. V, no. 8, February 22, 1982,  
 p. 62.
- "Mexico Promises Oil Deliveries" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL  
 AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. 6, no. 40, October 17, 1983,  
 p. 317.
- "Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, Panama Call for Dialogue"  
 EL SALVADOR BULLETIN, v. 2, no. 4, February 1983,  
 p. 1.
- Millet, Richard. "Central American Paralysis" FOREIGN  
 POLICY no. 39, Summer 1980, reprinted in Steve  
 C. Ropp, PANAMANIAN POLITICS: FROM GUARDED NATION TO  
 NATIONAL GUARD (New York: Praeger; Stanford,  
 California: Hoover Institution Press, 1982),  
 pp. 163-172.
- "Mixed Reviews on White Paper" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL  
 AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. IV, no. 9, March 2, 1981,  
 p. 1.
- Morales, Westrand Quieser. "Republic of Panama" in George  
 E. Delury (ed.), WORLD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF POLITICAL  
 SYSTEMS AND PARTIES, v. 11 (New York: Facts on  
 File, Inc., 1983), pp. 786-789.
- "More Sandinista peace initiatives," CENTRAL AMERICA  
 REPORT, v. X, no. 47, December 22, 1983, p. 1.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. POLITICS AMONG NATIONS, 5th ed.  
 (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1978.)
- Motley, Langhorne A. "El Salvador: Revolution or  
 Reform?" DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN, v. 84,  
 no. 2084, March 1984, p. 65.
- Mujal-Leon, Eusebio. "European Socialism and the  
 Crisis in Central America" in Howard J. Wiarda (ed.),  
 RIFT AND REVOLUTION: THE CENTRAL AMERICAN IMBROGLIO  
 (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute  
 for Public Policy Research, 1984), pp. 253-302.
- "News Briefs: Mexico" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, v. IX, no. 9,  
 May 31, 1981, p. 38.

- "Nicaragua: Masiva Solidaridad de Paises, Insituciones y Personas" ["Nicaragua: Massive Support from Nations, Institutions and Individuals"] INFOR-PRESS CENTROAMERICANA, no. 630, February 28, 1985, p. 7.
- "Nine Nations Meet in Panama" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. 6, no. 15, p. 118.
- "Now, Europe and Contadora versus the US" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 39, October 5, 1984, pp. 305-306.
- "Now US military exercises in Panama," CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XII, no. 1, (January 11, 1985), p. 1.
- Omang, Joanne. "Four of Five Latin Countries Agree on Draft Peace Treaty" THE WASHINGTON POST, November 9, 1984, p. 3.
- de Onís, Juan. "Central America Peace Drive Reported in Peril" p. 6.
- Orme, William. "Peace May Not Be at Hand" MACLEANS, v. 96, December 276, 1983, p. 19.
- "Panama" MESOAMERICA v. IV, no. 2, February 1985, p. 11.
- "Panama: Economic Stability Shaky Without Torrijos" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT: THE WEEKLY REVIEW OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS v. VIII, no. 32, (August 15, 1981), p. 249.
- "Panama Miffed Over Spy Planes" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA v. VI, no. 20, (May 30, 1983), p. 158.
- "Peace Talks Collapse" LATIN AMERICA MONITOR, v. 2, no 1 January/February 1985, p.1.
- Pellicer. Olga. "Mexico's Position" FOREIGN POLICY, no. 43, Summer 1981, pp. 89-92.
- Philip George. "Mexico and its Neighbors" THE WORLD TODAY September 1981, pp. 356-362.
- "The 21 Points of Contadora," THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA, v. VI, no. 48. December 12, 1983 pp. 380, 382.
- Poitras, James. "Mexico's Foreign Policy in an Age of Interdependence" in Elizabeth G. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES:

- GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), pp. 103-113.
- "Quinta Reunión del Grupo Contadora" [Fifth Meeting of the Contadora Group] TIEMPO, June 6, 1983, p.1.
- Rabe, Stephen G. THE ROAD TO OPEC: UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH VENEZUELA, 1919-1976 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1982.)
- Ratliff, William E. (ed.), 1971 YEARBOOK ON LATIN AMERICAN COMMUNIST AFFAIRS (Washington, D.C.: Hoover Institution Publications, 1971.)
- "Reagan Appeals to Public For Support On C.A. Policy" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA, v. VI, no. 16, May 2, 1983, p. 122.
- "Resolution 530" RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, 1983, Security Council, Official Records: 38th Year, (New York: United Nations, 1984), p. 10.
- Reston, James. "Mexico Asks U.S. to Change Policies" NEW YORK TIMES, February 13, 1984, p. A3.
- "Reunion de cancilleres" ["Meeting of Chancellors"] TIEMPO, May 2, 1983, p. 45.
- Riding, Alan. "Contadora Group Says Peace Talks Will Resume" NEW YORK TIMES, March 17, 1985, p. 6.
- Riding, Alan. "Latin Debt: Postponing the Burden" NEW YORK TIMES, September 23, 1984, p. 9.
- Riding, Alan. "Lopez Portillo Urges Talks on Reagan" NEW YORK TIMES, February 22, 1982, p. A8.
- Riding, Alan. "Mexico, Braced by Oil, Steps Out in Foreign Affairs" NEW YORK TIMES April 24, 1980, p. A2.
- Rogers, William D. "The United States and Latin America" FOREIGN AFFAIRS, pp. 560-580.
- Ropp, Steve C. PANAMANIAN POLITICS: FROM GUARDED NATION TO NATIONAL GUARD (New York: Praeger; Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1982.)
- Rosen, Steven, and Walter Jones. THE LOGIC OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (Cambridge, Massachusetts:

Winthrop, 1974.)

- Rothstein, Robert L. "Alignment, Nonalignment, Small Powers: 1945-1965," in Julian R. Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen (eds.), ALLIANCE IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1970), pp. 335-358.
- Sánchez, Nestor D. "The Communist Threat" FOREIGN POLICY, v. 52, Fall 1983, pp. 43-51.
- "Senate criticism threatens CIA aid to Nicaraguans" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, January 9, 1985, p. 2.
- Shannon, Don. "O'Neill Asks War Powers Probe on U.S. Salvador Role" LOS ANGELES TIMES, March 31, 1984, part I, p. 22.
- "Shultz twisting arms on Contadora" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 41, October 19, 1984, p. 323.
- Skidmore, Thomas H. and Peter H. Smith. MODERN LATIN AMERICA (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 351.
- Stepan, Alfred. "The United States and Latin America: Vital Interests of Power" in Elizabeth K. Ferris and Jennie K. Lincoln (eds.), LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981), pp. 19-38.
- Taubman, Philip. "Latin Peace Plan: Why the U.S. Balks" NEW YORK TIMES, October 3, 1984, p. 3.
- Thompson, Kenneth W. and Roy C. Macridis. "The Comparative Study of Foreign Policy" in Roy C. Macridis (ed.), FOREIGN POLICY IN WORLD POLITICS (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.)
- Torgerson, Dial. "New Round of Talks on Central America to Open", LOS ANGELES TIMES, May 28, 1983, part I, p. 14.
- Torres, Esteban and Alan Cranston. "Ignoring Contadora Defeats Our Purposes" LOS ANGELES TIMES, August 26, 1983, p. 28.
- "The UN discusses Central America and Contadora" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 44, November 9, 1984, p. 351.
- "United States Continues Pressure Tactics" CENTRAL



- AMERICA BULLETIN, v. III, no. 8, June 1984, p. 6.
- "U.S. Allies Modify Contadora Plan" FACTS ON FILE, v. 44, no. 2297, November 23, 1984, p. 863.
- "U.S. Allies Revise Peace Plan" LATIN AMERICAN MONITOR, v. I, no. 10, November 1984, p. 115.
- "U.S. Diplomatic Offensive Continues" CENTRAL AMERICAN BULLETIN, v. III, no. 12, October 1984, p. 4.
- "US Nervous Over Contadora Deadline" CENTRAL AMERICA REPORT, v. XI, no. 40, October 12, 1984, p. 315.
- "U.S. Official Discounts the Pledge by Nicaraguans" NEW YORK TIMES, September 23, 1984, p. 8.
- "US Seen as Responsible for the Slowdown in Contadora Peace Talks" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, October 26, 1984, p. 14.
- "Vanishing Act" TIME v. 123, February 27, 1984, p. 63.
- Vásquez, Juan M. "Latin Peace Pact Revised" LOS ANGELES TIMES, p. 6.
- Vásquez, Juan M. "New Latin Peace Initiative Coming" LOS ANGELES TIMES, January 7, 1985, p. 16.
- Vásquez, Juan M. "Talks Canceled as Latin Peace Effort Falters" LOS ANGELES TIMES, February 14, 1985, p. 1-28.
- Vásquez, Juan M. "4-Nation Latin Group Begins 2-Day Meeting," LOS ANGELES TIMES, October 22, 1983, part I, p. 22.
- "Violence, Rhetoric Escalate Central America" LATIN AMERICA INDEX, v. XI, no. 16, September 15, 1983, p. 61.
- Williams, Dan. "Panama Military Unlikely to Sidestep Politics, Despite Promises" LOS ANGELES TIMES, February 20, 1984, part I, p. 5.
- Williams, Edward J. "Mexico's Central American Policy: National Security Considerations" in Howard J. Wiarda (ed.), RIFT AND REVOLUTION: THE CENTRAL AMERICAN IMBROGLIO (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1984), pp. 303-328

Williams, Edward J. THE POLITICAL THEMES OF INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS (Belmont, California: Duxbury Press, 1971.)

"38/10. The situation in Central America: threats to internaional peace and security and peace initiatives" RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DURING ITS THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION, 20 SEPTEMBER-20 DECEMBER 1983 AND 26 JUNE 1984, General Assembly official records, 38th session, Supplement no. 47, (United Nations, 1984), pp. 21-22.

## APPENDIX

### THE DOCUMENT OF OBJECTIVES

- 1) Promote a detente and terminate situations of conflict in the area, avoiding any action that undermines political confidence or tends to block the objective of achieving peace, security and stability in the region.
- 2) Assure the strict observance of international law.
- 3) Respect and guarantee human, political, social, economic, religious, and cultural rights.
- 4) Adopt measures leading to the establishment or improvement of democratic, representative, and pluralistic systems guaranteeing popular participation in decision-making and assuring free access of diverse currents of opinion at the polls, which should be honest and periodic, based on the complete observance of civil rights.
- 5) Promote action of national reconciliation in cases where there are deep divisions in society through the democratic political process.
- 6) Create political conditions aimed at guaranteeing the international security, integrity, and sovereignty of the states in the region.
- 7) Halt the arms race in all of its manifestations and initiate negotiations on the control and reduction of the

present weapons inventory as well as the number of soldiers.

8) Prohibit the installation of foreign military bases or any other outside military influence.

9) Reach accords to reduce and eventually eliminate the presence of foreign military advisors and other outside elements participating in military or security activities.

10) Establish internal control mechanisms to halt arms traffic from the territory of one country to another.

11) Eliminate all arms traffic, whether intraregional or from outside Central America, destined for persons, organizations, or groups attempting to destabilize the governments of the region.

12) Prevent use of national territory by persons, groups, or organizations trying to destabilize the governments of Central America.

13) Abstain from fomenting or supporting acts of terrorism, subversion or sabotage in the countries of the area.

14) Build mechanisms and coordinate direct communications systems in order to prevent, or resolve, incidents between the various states of the region.

15) Continue humanitarian aid to help Central American refugees displaced from their countries of origin and creating conditions leading to the voluntary repatriation of those refugees in cooperation with the United Nations High

Commission for Refugees or other relevant international organizations.

16) Foment programs of economic and social development in order to improve living standards and assure a fair distribution of the wealth.

17) Revitalize and normalize the mechanisms of economic integration to achieve sustained development for the common good of all the nations of the area.

18) Request external monetary resources that will permit the reactivation of intraregional trade, overcome the balance of payments problem, produce funds for working capital, support programs to broaden and restructure the productive systems, and foment medium and long range investment programs.

19) Request greater access to international markets in order to expand trade between the Central American states and the outside world, particularly the industrial countries, through a revision in commercial practices, the elimination of tariff barriers, and the assurance of 'fair, remunerative prices.'

20) Obtain technical cooperation for the planning and execution of a wide spread of investment and commercial promotion.

21) The foreign ministers of Central America, together with those of the Contadora Group, will meet to begin negotiations on formal agreements guaranteeing the points

stated above.

Source: "The 21 Points of Contadora" THIS WEEK IN CENTRAL AMERICA, v. VI, no. 48, December 12, 1983, pp. 380, 382.

VITA 2

Laurie Gayle Dickerson  
Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

Thesis: AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTADORA PROCESS: THE  
CONTEXT AND THE MOTIVATION

Major Field: Political Science

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Amarillo, Texas, November 4,  
1960, the daughter of Donald and Janette  
Dickerson.

Education: Graduated from Tascosa High School,  
Amarillo, Texas, May, 1979; attended Amarillo  
College, Amarillo, Texas, summers of 1979 and  
1980, and the Fall of 1980; received Bachelor  
of Science Degree with General Studies Honors  
and Departmental Honors at Oklahoma State  
University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, May, 1983;  
completed requirements for Master of Arts  
Degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,  
Oklahoma, July, 1985.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Depart-  
ment of Political Science, Oklahoma State Univ-  
ersity, Stillwater, Oklahoma, August, 1983, to  
December, 1984; Research Assistant, Department of  
Political Science, Oklahoma State University,  
Stillwater, Oklahoma, January, 1985, to present.  
Also worked as news director of KACV-FM, Amarillo,  
Texas, August, 1980, through December, 1980.