

**Conference of Latin American and
Caribbean Research Institutes**

São Paulo (Brazil), 2-3 December 1991

UNIDIR
United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
Geneva

Conference of Latin American and Caribbean Research Institutes

Proceedings of the São Paulo Conference
(2-3 December 1991)

Edited by
Péricles Gasparini Alves

UNITED NATIONS
New York, 1993

NOTE

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

*
* *

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Secretariat.

UNIDIR/93/11

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION

Sales No. GV.E.93.0.8

ISBN 92-9045-078-9
ISSN 1014-4013

UNIDIR

United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

UNIDIR is an autonomous institution within the framework of the United Nations. It was established in 1980 by the General Assembly for the purpose of undertaking independent research on disarmament and related problems, particularly international security issues.

The work of the Institute aims at:

1. Providing the international community with more diversified and complete data on problems relating to international security, the armaments race, and disarmament in all fields, particularly in the nuclear field, so as to facilitate progress, through negotiations, towards greater security for all States and toward the economic and social development of all peoples;
2. Promoting informed participation by all States in disarmament efforts;
3. Assisting ongoing negotiations in disarmament and continuing efforts to ensure greater international security at a progressively lower level of armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, by means of objective and factual studies and analyses;
4. Carrying out more in-depth, forward-looking, and long-term research on disarmament, so as to provide a general insight into the problems involved, and stimulating new initiatives for new negotiations.

The contents of UNIDIR publications are the responsibility of the authors and not of UNIDIR. Although UNIDIR takes no position on the views and conclusions expressed by the authors of its research reports, it does assume responsibility for determining whether they merit publication.

UNIDIR

Palais des Nations
CH-1211 Geneva 10
Tel. (41.22) 917.42.93/917.42.56
Fax (41.22) 917.01.23

Table of Contents

Page

Preface	vii
List of Acronyms	ix
Opening Address - <i>Sérgio de Queiroz Duarte</i>	xi
Introduction - <i>Péricles Gasparini Alves</i>	1
Part I: Security in Latin America and the Caribbean: Developments and Prospects	9
Chapter 1 The Security of the Western Hemisphere in the Post-Cold War Period - <i>Augusto Varas</i>	11
Chapter 2 Threat Perceptions and Security: Requirements for the 1990's - <i>Georges Lamazière</i>	29
Chapter 3 Responses	39
First Response: Central America: Crisis, Pacification, Demilitarization and Development Processes - <i>Francisco Barahona Riera and Elizabeth Escalante Herrera</i>	39
Second Response: Security in Latin America and the Caribbean: Developments and Prospects - <i>P. K. Menon</i>	64
Part II: Latin America and Caribbean Security and Disarmament Issues in the Global Context	75
Chapter 4 Security and Disarmament in Latin America and the Caribbean: Nuclear Issues - <i>Julio C. Carasales</i>	77
Chapter 5 Geopolitics, Naval Security and Demilitarization in Latin America: New Dimensions for the 1990s - <i>Raúl Benítez Manaut</i>	87
Chapter 6 Responses	103
First Response: Latin American and Caribbean Security Issues in the Global Context - <i>Bernardo Quagliotti de Bellis</i>	103
Second Response: Comments on the Papers of Raúl Benítez Manaut and Julio C. Carasales - <i>Jorge Rodriguez Beruff</i>	104

))

Part III:	Security and Disarmament Issues in Latin America and the Caribbean Region	107
Chapter 7	Conventional Armament and Disarmament in South America: Policies and Perspectives - <i>Eduardo Ferrero Costa</i>	109
Chapter 8	Development, Armament and Confliction in Latin America and the Caribbean - <i>Alberto Müller Rojas</i>	125
Chapter 9	Non-Military Aspects of Security: Latin America and the Caribbean - <i>Clovis Brigagão</i>	137
Chapter 10	Responses	145
	First Response: Security, Demilitarization and Development in Central America with Special Reference to El Salvador - <i>Luis Argueta Antillón</i>	145
	Second Response: Collective Security in Latin America as Reflected in the Agendas of the Summit Meetings of the Rio Group - <i>Alfredo Bruno Bologna</i>	149
	Third Response: Latin America and the United States after the Cold War: Preliminary Strategic Notes - <i>John Saxe-Fernández</i>	159
	Concluding Observations - <i>Renato Dagnino</i>	183
Annex:	Enhancing Information Exchange Between Latin American and Caribbean Research Institutes - <i>Péricles Gasparini Alves</i>	189
	List of Participants	197

Preface

The organization of the *Regional Conference of Research Institutes on Questions of Security and Disarmament for Latin America and the Caribbean* marks the continuation of a UNIDIR programme in line with its mandate of strengthening contacts between institutes in a particular region and extending its own contacts with experts whose concerns are akin to its own, in order to arrive at a better understanding of the major substantive issues relating to international security. Similar conferences have also been organized for Africa (Algiers, 1990), Asia and the Pacific (Beijing, 1992) and the Near and Middle East (Cairo, 1993) and others will be held in the future. These meetings provide an opportunity to assess the extent to which and in what way universal problems are modified, adapted or even eliminated in the context of regional situations and requirements.

One of the merits about the São Paulo Conference, rightly emphasized by Péricles Gasparini Alves in the introduction, is that it calls into question certain clichés concerning this vast continent which are aired only too frequently. From outside, Latin America is often perceived, if not as a fully homogenous whole, as a group of countries welded together by a common civilization and past, the ancient product of a Mediterranean and an Atlantic Europe projecting its spirit of adventure and colonization to the western maritime horizons. The overall picture is of a Latin America attached to its cultural roots and intellectually closer to Europe than is North America, which underwent powerful development at an earlier date.

From a closer perspective, it is the diversity of Latin America that is more striking. Partly, of course, this is due to the distinction between the rather fragmented Spanish-speaking world and united Portuguese-speaking Brazil. Deeper down, however, a number of Latin Americas can be distinguished, so that a subregional approach is certainly in order: a northern and central area which is increasingly attracted to North America; a Caribbean area formed of islands where each has its specific political, cultural and economic features; an Andean area still deeply marked by its pre-Columbian origins; and the Southern Cone, which is perhaps the area most inclined to safeguard and reinforce its own originality and its own path to development. In short, seen from outside, the Latin American continent is a region, while, seen from inside, it is a universe.

In still broader terms, Latin America has always been marked by two contradictory factors: a kind of dispersal between its various component States on the one hand, and traditional aspirations to convergence on the other. In this connection, it is surely significant to make the traditional reference to the existence of a "Latin America international law", which is said to be the expression both of the purely inter-State character of international relations in the region, and of an awareness of a specificity, giving it an extraordinary character. A treaty such as the Treaty of Tlateloco, *inter alia*, is held to be a very characteristic symbol in this respect.

A characteristic symbol and at the same time, perhaps, a distorting mirror for the regional approach to security problems. The very valuable contributions at this Conference show that perceptions of security, like the objective facts on which they are based, go far beyond military matters. They extend to a variety of political, economic and social aspects and encompass such well-known phenomena as the special internal role often assumed by the process of transition to more democratic forms of government. At the same time, the internal dimensions of security and its continental or subregional dimensions are particularly closely linked.

A number of the contributions prompt reflection on the very concept of security and the desirability of expanding it. It would be pointless to draw uniform conclusions from them or to diminish their diversity, which reflects the vigour and originality of thinking by Latin America experts, but a reading of these contributions cannot be recommended too highly.

UNIDIR would like to convey its appreciation to the Brazilian authorities and to the Instituto de Estudos Avançados da Universidade de São Paulo, which hosted the Conference and greatly facilitated

))

its preparation. UNIDIR also wishes to express its gratitude to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and to the Ford Foundation, whose generous contributions made this Conference possible. This research paper was prepared under the direction of Péricles Gasparini Alves, UNIDIR research associate.

The contents of UNIDIR publications are the responsibility of the authors and not of UNIDIR. Although UNIDIR takes no position on the views and conclusions expressed by the authors of its research papers, it does assume responsibility for determining whether they merit publication.

Professor Serge Sur
Deputy Director

List of Acronyms

ALALC	Latin American Free Trade Association
ARDE	Democratic Revolutionary Alliance
CARICOM	Caribbean Commonwealth Governments
CD	Conference on Disarmament
CEPEI	Centro Peruano de Estudios Internacionales
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIESUL	Lima University's Centre for Economic and Social Studies
COCOM	Committee on Multilateral Export Controls
CODESA	Costa Rican Development Corporation SA
CSN	National Security Council
DARARIs	UNIDIR Database on Research Institutes
DIT	Department of Technical Investigations
EEC	European Economic Community
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
EEMI	International Military Education and Training
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EGP	Guerrilla Army of the Poor
EPS	Sandinist People's Army
ESF	Economic Support Funds
FAES	Salvadorian Armed Forces
FDR	Revolutionary Democratic Front
FLACSO	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales
FMLN	Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPN	Gross National Product
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IDESES	Salvadorian Institute for Economic and Social Development
IISS	International Institute for Strategic Studies
IMET	International Military Education and Training
ITRA	Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance
MAP	Military Assistance Programme
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Area
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
OAS	Organization of American States
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
OPANAL	Organismo para la Proscripción de las Armas Nucleares en la Americana Latina (Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America)
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
ORPA	Organization of the People Under Arms
PAM	Military Assistance Programme
R&D	Research and Development

))

SAE	Secretariat for Strategic Affairs
SCCC	Joint Accounting and Control System
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
SLC	Sea Lines of Communication
START	Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (Treaty)
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNIDIR	United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
URNG	Guerrillas of the National Revolutionary United Front
VME	United States Military Sales Abroad

Opening Address

Sérgio de Queiroz Duarte

It gives me great pleasure to address the Conference of Latin American and Caribbean Research Institutes working in the field of disarmament and international security, and welcome you all to Brazil. I would also like to thank, through its director, Professor Jacques Marcovitch, the Instituto de Estudos Avançados of the University of São Paulo for its wonderful hospitality. I want also to extend a very warm welcome to Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, an old friend from Geneva and New York. UNIDIR has again done a great job, from conception to execution, in bringing together so many people devoted to disarmament. It is very important to provide opportunities for regional opinions on global disarmament issues to be expressed in an organized manner so as to be duly taken into account in other parts of the world.

As you know, my colleague and friend Ambassador Marcos Castrioto de Azambuja, Secretary-General for Foreign Policy, who was supposed to address this conference and chair its first session, could not attend the meeting due to unforeseen circumstances and asked me to replace him. I was very glad to oblige, on account of my many years experience as Deputy Representative of Brazil for Disarmament Affairs and Representative of my country in several fora on this matter. I see around me many familiar faces from my tenure in Geneva and New York. This demonstrates how close-knit, active and persistent in its dedication the disarmament community is.

Coming back, after some time, to a gathering of this sort, I am led to make comparisons in the field of disarmament and international security between the situation in the 1980's and the present times. As we are all well aware, for a long time, the Conference on Disarmament and its predecessor bodies had to cope with the stalemate produced by the global East-West confrontation. This was indeed true of every multilateral forum dealing with those questions. Disarmament could not progress, we were told, because there was no trust between the two blocs and because security for the whole world was supposed to depend on the possession and build-up of military arsenals by a few nations. In addition, we were told that global disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, was too arcane a subject for the majority of the international community to understand and to have a word to say about it. The possessors of nuclear weapons seemed convinced that only they had enough at stake, and that this gave them the exclusive rights to discuss, debate and negotiate matters relating to nuclear disarmament.

We all may dimly recall that in 1978 the First Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament adopted a Final Document intended to become a reference for negotiations on disarmament at the multilateral level. This text faithfully reflected the realities of the time in which it was conceived. It established a clear hierarchy of priorities for negotiations and tried to take into account the perceptions and concerns of all nations, large and small, armed and unarmed.

Only fourteen years have elapsed since then, and the world has changed in an manner that no one would have dared to imagine. The Cold War is over; the logic of opposing military alliances is discredited; the Security Council of the United Nations has a real chance to fulfil its role under the Charter; and last but not least, the solutions to regional conflicts can now be understood in its proper perspective, that is, the legitimate interest of its local protagonists, and not as the projection of extra-regional rivalry.

In the wake of those new developments, some very relevant disarmament treaties have been signed at the global level, even between former adversaries. I would recall here the INF Treaty, the START Treaty, and some other lesser instruments and bilateral arrangements. I might also mention, on the regional level, the CFE Treaty, and on the multilateral level, the CW Convention, which is hopefully nearing conclusion in Geneva.

One cannot, however, feel but a little disappointed with the small amount of progress so far made in the area of disarmament. Rivalry at the global level, and ongoing regional conflicts used to provide

))

justification for the development, production, stockpiling and purchase of ever-increasing arsenals. It would seem logical that the new climate in international relations should have engendered much wider and deeper cuts in the world's arsenals.

One explanation could obviously be that those armaments seemed more threatening because of the deep rivalry and unparalleled confrontation between the two military blocs, and pointed to the real possibility of a nuclear showdown. Now that there does not seem to be any reason nor climate to fear the worst, the world seems to have forgotten the existence of those still huge and deadly inventories. In very recent years, issues relating to disarmament appear to have been replaced in world public opinion by new themes, like the environment or human rights. Important as such issues are, there is no justification for the apparent numbness regarding more serious efforts on nuclear disarmament. It is almost as if the majority of mankind has become reconciled with the prospect of living in insecurity as long as a few nations can buttress their security with the exclusive possession and continuing development of the most awesome weapons of mass destruction.

Weapons tend to have a logic of their own and their possession and constant improvement can lead to the temptation of resorting to their use, even as we know, as a way of legitimizing the large sums invested or to be invested in their procurement. They also pose a serious environmental hazard - this is certainly the case with nuclear and chemical armament. Finally, it would be a grave case of a double-standard if developing nations continue to hear exhortations to forsake technical development on the grounds that it leads to armaments, while those countries who are already overarmed, maintain and update their arsenals, thanks to technological progress. Consistency, as well as good faith, continue to suggest that global disarmament should have as high a priority as current efforts to curb proliferation of nuclear weapons.

What then should be the priorities in our field? We sit here today in a regional forum, but this should not necessarily limit the focus of our discussion to regional issues. I submit that in the improved international climate of today, the main task of the United Nations and the international community of disarmament continues to be to address the global issues. We must seek the achievement of general convergence of views on global disarmament issues - nuclear, chemical, biological, naval, peaceful uses of outer space, technological cooperation for peaceful purposes, adequate and universal verification of commitments. Given progress in these areas, regional problems will stand a better chance of being taken care of by the parties directly and legitimately concerned.

When universal regimes like the ones we have been discussing in Geneva - comprehensive test ban, prohibition of chemical weapons, etc. - and the ones we should be discussing - nuclear disarmament among the first - come to being and are monitored through universal agencies with responsibility for verification, the possibility for a double-standard, discrimination and cheating will be greatly reduced.

Countries situated in "hot spots" would thus have a much lower incentive for acquiring destabilizing weapon systems. The world community would have much more authority to press for restraint and responsible behaviour. The implementation of such global régimes would be exceedingly helpful towards increasing international peace and security. The real and concrete source of regional conflicts, which are political, could be addressed either multilaterally through the United Nations or regionally and bilaterally.

The First SSOD was the last instance of a widely shared consensus on disarmament and security matters at the international level. Since the end of the 70's, however, international consensus on such matters has rapidly dwindled. Today we again seem to have a window of opportunity to move forward from past disappointments and failures. I think it is important to recognise that if consensus at the multilateral United Nations level cannot be achieved, certain ideas and perceptions will be forced upon world consciousness by opinion makers who normally do not reflect realities and concerns from our part of the world. It is thus crucial to rescue the true role of the UN in the field of disarmament and security, for it still is the only forum in which the whole international community has a democratic opportunity to express itself.

Introduction

The present winds of change sweeping old established concepts and norms related to international security matters in the late 1980s and early 1990s are by no means limited to relations between the major military powers and countries on the European continent. Latin American and Caribbean security issues have also been subject to considerable change - although to a much lesser degree. However, research on these changes, either in the global or regional level, are often two different endeavours, almost as if one is not related to the other, or as if one could not affect the other. These are artificial boundaries which are not, one may argue, specific to the Latin American and Caribbean case.

In this connection, this publication is the fruit of a conference of Research Institutes in Latin America and the Caribbean region organized by UNIDIR in December 1991, at São Paulo, Brazil, at which these artificial boundaries were avoided. In an attempt to shed some light on regional security matters, the articles below address past, present, and prospective trends in international security and research in Latin America and the Caribbean. Divided into four parts, the present book contains a blend of thought-provoking papers which deal not only with regional security issues, but also appraise security matters both in the global and sub-regional contexts.

As in the case of other regions of the world, experts in the field of international security in Latin America and the Caribbean question the nature and the extent of the impact which the end of the Cold War has had in the region's security affairs. Other more conceptual questions in security debates relate to the relationship between two notions of security in the region, namely: *internal security* and *external security*. Particular attention has been paid to the question of which one of these notions is more applicable to the region under discussion. Integral to security debates is of course the issue of *armaments* and, given the changing nature of the present international environment, it is not surprising to notice a revival of the debate where *armaments* has a *negative* connotation, or the debate on what level of armaments is enough for the defence of countries in the region. These discussions have gained much momentum, especially in light of a perceived need on the part of Latin American and Caribbean experts to avoid addressing security issues on an over simplistic manner. Hence, in the forefront of discussions are renewed interests in non-military aspects of security, and in the background of debates are pressing demands for improving the standard of living in the region. Put together, all these different variables attest not only to the complexity of regional security affairs, but also to the compelling role research institutes can and should play in developing and maintaining a coherent debate on security matters from the regional and a more global point of view.

Consequently, attention has also been directed towards an appraisal of the trends in international security research undertaken by research institutes and other entities in Latin America and the Caribbean, especially in comparison to other regions of the world. Notably, a brief analyses on the major subjects of research and ways and means to improve communication and other forms of disseminating information on research work, conferences, and any other subject of common interest among research institutes has been undertaken.

Security in Latin America and the Caribbean: Developments and Prospects

In many cases, an appraisal of developments and prospects of security depends to a large extent on the meaning one gives to the very word *security*. The discussion on Latin American and Caribbean security is no exception. The restrictive meaning of the traditional interpretation of the word *security* (*military security*) is not seen by many experts as applicable to the region, since it does not take into consideration

))

the full range of conceptual and practical problems related to peace issues as a whole. In this regard, there is a general feeling among experts that the meaning of security should be widened and not exclusively based on military issues. More specifically, this would mean that *security* should encompass non-military issues which present different types of threats to democracy in particular and to the order of a state in general.

Examples to be cited are social problems which are not of a direct military nature, such as drug trafficking, as well as issues of economic security (e.g., overpopulation, and poverty) and maritime, territorial, and environmental aspects of security. In the final analysis, the need to establish common definitions of the word *security* in the 1990s is not new but largely reflects a collective desire to develop a new and more coherent world order. However, the real challenge lying ahead is that of delineating the practical limits of this new definition, without which security debates risk to be intrinsically vague, unmanageable, and - undoubtedly, clearly counter-productive.

However, beyond this redefinition issue is a need to find ways of coping with a non-traditional and broader concept of security. This includes addressing fundamental questions such as that of obtaining adequate means for dealing, for example, with the problem of drug trafficking. Should this problem be dealt with internally by means of a national police force, or should it be handled collectively by an international - regional or global - military-like operation? There is no lack of experience in either approach, but an efficient solution to the problem in question, based upon either a national or collective initiative, leaves much to be desired. Moreover, one may further question if ecological problems related to security should also be handled within the framework of military issues. In other words, would a redefinition of security call for a military solution to problems which are not military in nature? Or, *in extremis*, would it also call for a revision of the role that regional and other organizations should play in the region's security agenda? Whatever the answers to these questions, it seems that much can be learned from the changes in security issues related to regional or sub-regional crises such as in Central America. Therefore, in order to fully appreciate this issue, the debate in this book contains a survey of the military situation in this sub-region and the prospects for the fulfilment of its peace process. However, regional security is rarely independent from other extra-regional events and the discussion below also addresses trends in foreign military aid into Latin America and the Caribbean region. This discussion is quite important in determining the regions' security agenda for the 1990s.

This brings to the fore the issue of *threat perceptions* and their variations - which include threat perceptions (a) inside the region, (b) from outside the region, and (c) from the region to the outside. The primary question to be considered is perhaps that of how to cope with potential regional conflicts, or better yet, how to conceive crisis-preventive procedures or mechanisms which would provide the proper ground for the development of mutual confidence among states in the region. One assertion largely shared among experts is that new concepts of security and mechanisms which have neither their place nor a proper meaning in regional security affairs should not be imported to Latin America and the Caribbean. Reference here is often made to mechanisms aimed at prevailing regional disarmament and security arrangements designed within the framework of former East/West relations. This being said, new forms of arrangements should be thought of for Latin America and the Caribbean, although the conception of new security structures in light of existing experiences should not to be excluded.

However, it is also important to note that Latin America and the Caribbean should not be regarded only as a region of potential security problems. A number of regional agreements such as the 1990 Declaration of Foz do Iguacú, the 1991 Guadalajara Agreement, the 1991 Vienna Agreement, the 1992 Mendoza Declaration, and others have been reached which have the merit of being special examples in their case, thus ensuring Latin American and Caribbean contributions to both regional and global security. In spite of this, there remains much room for similar contributions in this decade on the part of states in the region. One of the specific areas in which meaningful advances should be expected is that of *non-military aspects of security*.

))

Latin America and Caribbean Security and Disarmament Issues in the Global Context

Issues related to security and disarmament in Latin America and the Caribbean which have global implications are not numerous, yet they are quite significant. The most prominent of these issues is of course the debate on weapons of mass destruction, which covers nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons research and development. Nuclear weapons have traditionally found a special place in security discussions in the region yet without the intention of underestimating the importance of the debates on other weapons of mass destruction. After the innovation of the Nuclear Weapons Free-Zone Treaty in the late 1960s (the Treaty of Tlatelolco) the series of declarations and agreements reached by Argentina and Brazil since the mid-1980s has culminated in the regulation of nuclear materials and the abstention from the possession of any nuclear weapons. These agreements have also been strengthened by intrusive verification mechanisms. (Although in a somewhat different manner, the same outcome has also been reserved for the possession of chemical and biological weapons.)

Such initiatives have been argued to provide grounds for mutual confidence among potential rivals. This appears evident and one cannot but appreciate such initiatives. However, it is worth noting that, if the possibility of nuclear weapons state proliferation in Latin America and the Caribbean has been greatly decreased by means of national and bilateral initiatives, all the implications deriving from such measures are still not fully understood. The question may be raised as to whether such initiatives would not create a precedent with respect to other arms agreements, or if it would instigate countries in other regions to reach similar *selective* agreements. In other words, would the above initiatives be the predecessors of a new practice whereby countries would avoid adhesion to major arms agreements. Here one must see *not only* how beneficial this kind of practice may be for regional security, but also what implications they have for the credibility of more universal legal instruments. In this case, how soon should adhesion to multilateral agreements follow national or bilateral initiatives? In order to illustrate this point, a careful observer might follow closely developments related to the Non-Proliferation Treaty until 1995, but the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention will also provide a change to attest to any implications that regional practices might have on global security issues.

Other security and disarmament issues of global implication cover, for example, what is perceived by many states in the region as existing loopholes in the present legal regime on nuclear weapons, such as in the case of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, notably with respect to issues related to the transit of nuclear weapons through the Treaty zone. In the first place, there is the question of a legal gap concerning the introduction of nuclear weapons to this zone. Secondly, the question under debate is that of how to conceive ways and means of verifying allegations of the introduction of nuclear weapons into the region. In both cases, the interests of non-possessor states in the region face major obstacles and some experts consider this to be a *no solution issue*.

The above scepticism is perhaps not only due to the standpoint of nuclear weapons states on the transit of nuclear weapons in the region, but also because the issue gets caught in the debate on the development of nuclear powered submarines in the region. Does the development of such submarines provide grounds for potential misuse of enriched uranium, or does such development present a greater danger because of the access to a presupposed power projecting capability? These are questions which not only address developments in regional naval forces, but also their doctrinal role in the region's geopolitics. In the early 1990s, this role seems to be neither clear nor easily discernable - both in respect to regional forces and their rationale within Latin American and Caribbean security and to any potential competition with extra-regional powers that it might imply.

))

weapons disarmament is an issue of priority in international security debates on Latin American and Caribbean security. As a matter of fact, major weapons disarmament based on state-to-state security matters is generally seen as secondary in priority to issues of national security requirements. Needless to say, the debate on regional disarmament should provide a clearly defined rationale which explains the need to undertake disarmament efforts.

Consequently, the "less guns equals more security" debate has motivated more interest in disarmament of small guns in certain countries in Central America and neighbouring South American countries. So has the issue of defining the role of the state and its armed forces. For most countries in the region, the role of the military has often extended to cope with issues of internal order, and redefinition of its future role is appearing as a more urgent undertaking. The most significant challenge is perhaps that of ensuring its active role in the defence of a country, while at the same time delineating its stance in coping with internal threats.

Research and Teaching in Latin America and the Caribbean: Questions of Security and Disarmament

The fourth and last part of the Conference consisted of a round-table discussion which addressed the trends related to research institutes in the region, including the status of international security and disarmament research. A number of remarks made then are worth mentioning here, particularly with respect to the role of research, its status, and ways to reinforce and encourage research work.

In terms of figures, it is perhaps useful to analyze two surveys conducted by UNIDIR in 1982 and 1990 on research institutes working in the area of international security and disarmament worldwide. Assuming that these figures are accurate, it can be observed that the number of research institutes in the region and elsewhere has largely increased in the last decade or so. However, it should also be noted that part of this increase may reflect the growth in the number of countries surveyed in these two periods - 46 in 1982 and 121 in 1990,¹ as well as a greater interest on the part of these research institutes to gain a more international visibility. The 1982 survey revealed the existence of 23 research institutes in Latin America and the Caribbean, which represented a little over 9 per cent of the world's regional distribution (see Graph A). Almost ten years later - in 1990, the percentage of research institutes in Latin America and the Caribbean reported to UNIDIR increased to over 13 per cent, accounting for 97 institutes in total - this reflects an increase of 74 institutes (see Graph B). When compared to other regions, Latin America and the Caribbean ranks fourth in the world, behind Western Europe, North America, and Asia. However, a sharp discrepancy is noted with respect to the distribution of research institutes within Latin America itself. At date of writing, 60 per cent of the 100 institutes were located in only four countries (Argentina-19, Brazil-15, Chile-11, Mexico-15).

¹ See *UNIDIR Repertory of Disarmament Research: 1990*, Chantal de Jonge Oudraat and Péricles Gasparini Alves. UNIDIR, UN Publication, New York, 1990, 420 pp.

))

assertion is right or wrong is not so important, yet what seems to matter is that this situation has certainly influenced those who advocate the need to rethink the role and approach that institutes in the region attribute to research. One important issue in this debate is that of ascertaining the real need to rediscover the traditional geopolitical considerations and priorities of research. In essence, this discussion responds to a desire to better understand the fundamental reasons and concerns of research work in the region. Is research an essential means of information and clarification of social phenomena, or is its appreciation tributary to other less objective factors? Nevertheless, answering the above question is not enough to reach the essence of the problem and attention should also be given to ascertaining how priorities and balance on the various topics of research should be established. In particular, priorities and balance are needed when considering topics directly and indirectly related to security such as trade issues, migration, ecology, democracy, technology transfer, access to capital, and - last but not least - human rights.

In light of the above problems related to research in the region, perhaps the first question to ask is that of how to reinforce and encourage research in the Latin America and the Caribbean. Naturally, this concerns not only increasing contacts between the diplomatic and the academic communities, but also ensuring that research work undertaken in the region finds an open window to outside the region. Efforts should also be made to combine existing regional mechanisms or to develop new ones in view of improving the exchange of data among institutes, although inter-institute communication seems to work relatively well in comparison to other regions, such as in Africa. However, as in any other region of the world, a major obstacle to overcome will be that of defining the limits of the possible, since financial support will largely determine the scope and, to some extent, the efficiency of any such endeavour. There must therefore be a quest to minimize the effects produced by the disparity within the region of institutional structures and research resources. Furthermore, there is a clear need to develop new means to enhance efforts undertaking dissemination of the information on research work. By the same token, attention should be turned to the difficulty in the dissemination of research work which is accentuated by linguistic obstacles. Often, the results and implementation of research work are little known outside the region due to a language barrier and to problems of translation and publication in a foreign language from that in the region.

Although with limited means, UNIDIR is determined to make concrete contributions to research undertakings and the formation of human resources in the region. Among other things, UNIDIR invites young and experienced scholars and diplomats to conferences and research groups in Geneva and elsewhere, it endorses publications produced in the region, and it invites to Geneva, normally on a yearly basis, a researcher from Latin America or the Caribbean under its research fellow programme. Additionally, UNIDIR also provides its *Newsletter* and *DATARIs* database as vehicles of information on regional research on security and disarmament matters. In this connection, the last paper presented in this Conference addressed ways and means to enhance information exchange between research institutes and proposed the establishment of a regional database system. UNIDIR is prepared, in co-operation with regional research institutes, to participate in the implementation of this proposal.

))

Acknowledgments

Editing the proceedings of a conference of this magnitude is a demanding and tedious job and I was kindly assisted in my task. I am grateful to Pamela Thompson, a graduate student at the Graduate Institute for International Studies in Geneva and an intern at UNIDIR during 1992. Besides being busy with her own work at UNIDIR, Ms Thompson has kindly found the time to revise the english language of most texts in this book. My thanks are also extended to Anita Blétry of UNIDIR, who has greatly assisted me in preparing the final layout for the publication of this book.

Péricles Gasparini Alves
Research Associate

26 June 2002