

South America's New Dialogue: Another integration is possible

R:A. Dello Buono, Editor

Diana Avila, PCS

Aram Aharonian / Ximena de la Barra / Leopoldo Múnera /
Germán Rodas / Jorge Rojas / Ariela Ruiz Caro / Andrés Serbin /
Esteban Silva / Luciano Cárcamo / Mario Yep

This publication has been made possible thanks to the generous support and assistance of:

- Inter Pares, Ottawa, CANADA.
- Project Counselling Service (PCS), Lima, PERU/Latin America.
- Le Centre de recherches pour le développement international/International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ottawa, CANADA.
- Droits et démocratie / Rights and Democracy, Montréal, CANADA.

© 2006, Project Counselling Service (PCS), Lima, Peru.

© 2006, R. A. Dello Buono.

All rights reserved. Materials may be freely reproduced for non-profit, educational purposes with citation of source.

Contents

Preface,	7
<i>Diana Avila, PCS</i>	
'Actually Existing Integration' and the Emerging South American Dialogue: Another Integration is Possible	12
<i>R. A. Dello Buono, Editor</i>	
Book Outline	23
Abstracts	26
Advances and Obstacles of South American Regional Integration Schemes	26
<i>Germán Rodas Chaves</i>	
Challenges and Dilemmas of Regional Civil Society in Latin America and the Caribbean: The Difficult Transition towards the Construction of a Regional Citizenship	27
<i>Andrés Serbin</i>	
Changing Paradigms: Communications and Democracy, Mass and Alternative Media	27
<i>Aram Aharonian</i>	
The Role of Social Movements and Political Parties in South American Integration	28
<i>Leopoldo Múnica Ruiz</i>	

The Impact of FTA's on Inequality and the Regional Integration Process Ariela Ruiz Caro	29
Looking to the Future: The Role of the New Southern Dialogue <i>Ximena de la Barra</i>	30
Excerpts from the Quito Symposium	31
Appendices	39
- Programme of the Quito Symposium	39
- List of Quito Symposium Participants	42

We believe in the necessity for dialogue and debate, beginning with the fact that all of us in the region need to go beyond the borders of our own countries, to transcend our national dynamics and problems, and construct a more global analysis of the historic opportunities that have materialised in South America.

Diana Avila, Project Counselling Service

The nature of integration has changed. It is no longer just an issue for governments but rather a peoples' issue. Beyond just discussing trade and commercial matters, the process has become transformed into a struggle for creating a more inclusive and hopeful integration based on solidarity among our peoples.

Ximena de la Barra, Chile

Preface

Diana Ávila, PCS

PROJECT COUNSELLING SERVICE (PCS) is an international cooperation organisation with more than twenty-five years of experience working in Latin America. Supported by the Danish Refugee Council, Swiss Inter-Church Aid (HEKS), and Inter Pares of Canada, PCS has helped develop bolster programmes in countries experiencing armed domestic conflicts. Their activities are designed to ensure that the victims of political violence act as protagonists in the creation of their own solutions and in struggling for justice, equity, and peace. PCS took the decision to facilitate the organisation of the Quito Symposium out of its commitment to strengthening the process of dialogue between key social actors in South America.

The Quito Symposium was entitled “South American Dialogue: Another Integration is Possible” so as to reflect the intention of creating an interesting and constructive space for exchanging points of view from throughout the region. It all became possible thanks to the participation of the Simón Bolívar Andean University-Quito and the accompaniment and support offered by various international cooperation agencies likewise committed to democratic processes and the promotion of human rights. These included Inter Pares, PWRDF-Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund (of the Anglican Church of Canada), IDRC-International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ford Foundation, Secours Catholique/Cáritas France and Lutheran World Relief of the United States.

The history of PCS dates back to its initial work around conflicts of the Southern Cone countries. At that time, it worked in support of the democratisation

processes and in facilitating the returning home of refugees to Argentina, Uruguay and Chile. As the armed conflicts of Central America intensified, PCS aimed its work at supporting refugees and internally displaced populations, supporting the emergent peace processes, and promoting truth commissions, justice and reparations as a way of guaranteeing that such atrocious events would never again be repeated.

In the Andean countries, we began to work in the 1990s, mostly in Peru and Colombia, and in those border areas that were experiencing and continue to experience the impact of internal armed conflicts particularly to this part of the region. Our activities worked to favourably impact upon the quality of life and the security of refugee populations and all those victimised by the conflicts, and to inform and sensitise the larger public about how these domestic armed conflicts were affecting the different expressions of life, culture and development of Latin American peoples.

Project Counselling Service has always intended to play a political role in Latin America. Its basic idea is that if internal armed conflicts require humanitarian aid and protection for victims and for the civil society that suffers from these conflicts, in the final analysis, the resolution of these conflicts can only be brought about through negotiation and political dialogue. Within these processes, there is a fundamental role that can be played by the international community, of neighbouring countries and friends, including the mobilisation of international solidarity in coordination with national actors.

This is the context in which we took the decision to convene the Quito Symposium "South American Dialogue: Another Integration is Possible." At a historical juncture in the region where Latin Americans are developing various democratic experiences and with new political winds blowing across the region, the time was deemed ripe for this kind of initiative. We have sought to bring together political party leaders and progressive forces from all across South America, including academics and political analysts, social movement activists, civil society actors and international cooperation representatives in a common dialogue. The aim is to explore opportunities that are today open for South America in the search of resolution and transformation of its principal conflicts.

We have worked in the organisation of the Symposium with a team of persons that includes Ricardo Dello Buono, a Latin Americanist; Germán Rodas of the Simón Bolívar Andean University; Esteban Silva of the Convenio Hipólito Unanue, and other friends and colleagues from various countries, including Camilo Castellanos of the Inter-american Platform of Human Rights, Democracy and

SOUTH AMERICA'S NEW DIALOGUE: ANOTHER INTEGRATION IS POSSIBLE

Development; Eduardo Cáceres, Policy and Human Rights Advisor for OXFAM, Great Britain; Hugo Cabieses of Sustainable Rural Development (DRIS); and Kimberly Stanton, associate director of PCS and representative in Colombia.

We believe in the necessity for dialogue and debate, beginning with the fact that all of us in the region need to go beyond the borders of our own countries in transcending our national dynamics and problems. We need to construct a more global analysis of the historic opportunities that have materialised in South America. It can be seen that in many places, we are transversing through important new processes of change. The democratic forces that govern us, now more progressive in character in various countries, are without doubt opening new possibilities for resolving old and new conflicts alike, and for advancing in the deepening of our democracies, of making them genuinely more participatory and inclusive.

We believe that processes like the Social Forums are opening spaces and new paths for advancement. There are thematic and sectoral networks that are very active and valuable in their support of these evolving processes. On the other hand, it is evident across the region that there remains considerable distance between progressive NGOs and political parties, social movements and political parties and academics. In this context, how can we best contribute our efforts towards advancing the present struggle for the integration of our peoples? While this has been the topic of numerous meetings between states and multilateral organisations, there has been very little discussion at other levels. It is precisely this kind of dialogue that we are proposing and we believe it is essential to promote it all across South America. Integration must be seen as something taking place at distinct levels from below, from among our peoples themselves, from within migrant populations, and at a cultural level.

How can we help recover the spaces for creating a distinctly Latin American school of thought and from South America in particular? We remember that in earlier decades, Latin American thought was being widely discussed and debated with Europeans, North Americans, and others. The times of ECLAC, dependency theory and the dialogues and debates that revolved around the processes of South America amounted to schools of thought that were broadly influential for many of those who presently govern or aspire to do so.

When there was a distinctly Latin American way of thinking, it was something being discussed throughout the region, something being learned and taught in the universities. Clearly, this is something that has become substantially weakened in recent years. It seems very important to us to recover these experiences and

work so that a new generation can enjoy the same opportunity that many of us once had in advancing a shared school of thought rooted in our region. It is through this line of reasoning that that we arrived at the decision to facilitate this symposium of regional dialogue. We are convinced of the fundamental need to bring together political parties with other social actors from academic institutions, social movements, churches, national and international NGO's.

Conflicts in the region continue to break out, but as we draw our peoples closer, we are building an integration from below and putting forward new proposals to reshape the institutionalised forms of integration pursued on the part of states from above. The latter forms are too often concentrated only in building free trade, never equal for sure, much less free. But to advance towards another America, we need to begin to overcome our differences in resolving conflicts. To this end, the democracies of South America need democratic political parties, rooted in the citizenry and legitimate. We must recover politics and the active participation in political parties as positive attitudes and as important elements towards a more inclusive integration. Women, men, indigenous peoples and afro-descendents of this part of the world still have much to learn about ourselves, of our own social processes and about how to come closer together to each other.

In working to build the South American Dialogue, we wanted to add our efforts in this direction, conjugate what others are already doing such as networks like ALOP, the Inter-American Platform of Human Rights, Democracy and Development, the Citizen Diplomacy Network, and various observatories concerning diverse issues in the region such as immigration and border disputes. We see valuable work taking place in other spaces as well, articulations of social movements, trade unions, indigenous peoples, women, and political parties such as the Sao Paulo Forum and the Latin American Socialist Coordination. In the end, we hope that the principal aspects of the Dialogue that began in Quito will help bring forth elements to continue important discussions and contribute to resolving existing conflicts in our region. We must learn how to both prevent and transform conflicts in the service of our peoples. We must push forward with integration as a process not just for trading goods and services but for constructing new social, political and cultural identities; of advancing the resolution of the problems of nation-states, which should also help us put an end to exclusion, discrimination and racism among our peoples and to help resolve persistent border conflicts.

We are conscious of the efforts that already exist, of the coordinated actions that are underway, and we are working to add our efforts to these processes. Our contribution is based in promoting and deepening the discussions between

SOUTH AMERICA'S NEW DIALOGUE: ANOTHER INTEGRATION IS POSSIBLE

political figures, social movement leaders, academics, church leaders and international and national agencies active in the region. This is the process that we want to energise by articulating them in a process of sustained dialogue. How to continue and deepen this process? This will depend on the efforts we invest and the plans agreed upon by all those participating.

From the vantage point of international cooperation, what is missing is a more political perspective that can aid and support regional processes. The reduction of funding that has occurred, something that in the present era often limits projects to being very small and not very consequential in their results, is not conducive to the Latin American process. There were other times when more regional efforts were being made, with greater aid and more comprehensive proposals for the region.

For our part, we have to cast aside the fear of politics. The construction of a more integrated Latin America, one with greater equality and justice, free of social exclusion, will only be possible in this manner. Our thinkers in the region, Simón Bolívar, Eloy Alfaro, José Carlos Mariátegui, had proposed this many years ago. Now we must put their ideas into practice in the Twenty-First Century in this very difficult, unipolar world that remains so profoundly unjust and exclusionary at present. The task before us is a formidable one. The opportunity that we have today in South America is real and we believe that the present moment is propitious. In the final analysis, we must be creative if we are to, in the words of Mariátegui, "conquer both Bread and Beauty."

'Actually Existing Integration' and the Emerging South American Dialogue: Another Integration is Possible

R. A. Dello Buono, Editor

THE *QUITO SYMPOSIUM* held at the Simón Bolívar Andean University - Quito Campus on November 21-22, 2005 convened with 75 participants representing regional integration organisations, political parties, social movements, NGOs, international cooperation agencies and the academic sector of Latin America. Its goal was to engage in substantive discussion and to generate proposals for deepening the emerging dialogue in South America for promoting a more genuine process of regional integration. As part of the follow-up to the *Symposium*, a book was published to summarise the key discussions and to disseminate it throughout the region¹. As a prelude to the envisioned English-language edition of this book, the present work offers a brief glimpse at some of the numerous sentiments that were expressed in Quito.

At the onset, it is important to grasp that the *Quito Symposium* pulled together an extraordinary collection of political actors from a broad cross-section of South American societies. In a region where deeply entrenched structural factors such as marked asymmetries among nations, geopolitical divisions, and the disparities and conflicts among social classes, races, genders, etc., limit any inclusive process

¹ Dello Buono, R. A., ed. (2006), *Diálogo Sudamericano: Otra integración es posible*, Consejería en Proyectos (PCS), Lima, Peru.

of regional integration, these same factors typically conspire to impede the possibilities for dialogue about how to overcome them. For this reason, the dialogue encompasses not only urgent political and economic discussions, but also a reflexive dimension about the dynamic process implied in sustaining an inclusive and progressive South American dialogue. The latter component was a tacit recognition of the devastating social fragmentation that exists following a sustained period of neoliberal domination and of the real obstacles that must be overcome in order to transform it. The symposium organisers felt that the careful attention given to the methodology of the dialogue must be disseminated so as to enhance subsequent instances of dialogue. The idea was not so much to pose as a model for regional dialogue but rather as a valid experience to take into account. In short, we sought to draw attention to the importance of ensuring conditions within an ever more inclusive regional dialogue where the voices of all sectors can be heard.

IS ANOTHER INTEGRATION POSSIBLE?

What is meant by the slogan *another possible integration*? The origins of this phraseology are pretty clear. More than two decades of neoliberal policies in Latin America and other regions yielded a dramatic increase of poverty, unemployment and social inequalities of all kinds. It was inevitable that this crescendo of negative tendencies would eventually create demands on the part of the popular sectors. The new social movement that eventually emerged was born out of the throes of social exclusion and fragmentation produced by capitalist globalisation in its neoliberal configuration (Dierxsens, 2006). Particularly in the underdeveloped countries, this movement manifested a diverse social composition based in all those sectors under attack, including public sector workers, peasant farmers, students, oppressed national minorities, women and even some sectors of a newly impoverished middle class. This disparate grouping yielded the social base of mobilisation that would eventually regroup and organise, initially within their respective sectors, and later in an intersectoral manner under a plethora of anti-neoliberal umbrella organisations.

In Latin America, associations such as *El Grito de los Excluidos*, the *Alianza Social Continental*, the *Vía Campesina*, among others, have been particularly active. These new social actors went on to develop new slogans and distinctive forms of protest, taking advantage of new mass media technologies to construct increasingly more complex networks. While initially dispersed, this movement began to strengthen in different parts of the world until becoming a global social movement. Its visibility quickly expanded with the consolidation of the World Social Forums whose central unifying slogan began to take hold: "Another World

Is Possible." This imagery fostered the view of a more inclusive and democratic alternative to the options offered under neoliberal hegemony. An important part of this struggle consisted in leading protests against a whole new generation of commercial schemes designed to make neoliberal policies eternal through their enshrinement in international trade laws. The World Trade Organisation (WTO), created in 1995, is the best example of this; just as the 1999 protests against the WTO in Seattle marked the intensification of popular resistance against it.

Almost at once, the reaction of the elite-led global establishment was to impose a label to the movement as an expression of "globalphobia." For their part, an ever more monopolised mass media played the important ideological role of portraying the incipient movement as an "expression from the past," a primitive refusal of technology and progress, and so on. The economic superpowers rushed to praise statements made by their allies in the underdeveloped countries, such as when Ernesto Zedillo declared before the 2000 World Economic Forum in Davos, as President of Mexico, "Any individual or group that utilise reasons of labour or environmental protection to oppose free trade ... is wrong. They are also 'globalphobic' ... since only with free trade can there economic growth, rising wages and the protection of nature."¹

The movement proved resilient, however, and began to develop its own labels of struggle in embracing an ideology of "alter-globalisation," showing ever greater clarity that its struggle aimed to confront the specific *kind* of globalisation being imposed, i.e., a neoliberal project designed in the interests of foreign, hegemonic powers. In building this struggle, the movement exploited the possibilities of Internet and other alternative information sources as new instruments to strengthen its coordination, networking, and in consolidating itself as a transnational opposition movement.

In Latin America, the alterglobalist movement that emerged out of the multisectoral fronts against neoliberalism was particularly energised by opposition against U.S.-sponsored free trade agreements. With the NAFTA agreement going into effect in 1994, the Washington had initiated a new stage of its hegemony over the Americas. The Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) was formally initiated shortly afterwards, a project that envisioned the consolidation of a hemispheric free trade scheme based on the same logic of NAFTA. It was expected that this NAFTA-isation of the hemisphere would systematically limit the sovereignty of independent states and assure capital its maximum freedom of

1 Quoted in "Fustiga Zedillo a globalifóbicos" [Zedillo Lashed Out at Globalphobic Detractors"], *La Jornada*, January 28, 2000.

SOUTH AMERICA'S NEW DIALOGUE: ANOTHER INTEGRATION IS POSSIBLE

mobility without national barriers or restrictions. But the same day that the NAFTA agreement entered into force, the Zapatista insurrection had surfaced as a new expression of the popular resistance in the region. By a little over a decade later, the consolidation of a hemispheric opposition to the FTAA had managed to impede the completion of a final agreement in 2005, the year designated by Washington to finish the negotiations.

The issue of U.S.-sponsored Free Trade Agreements (FTA's) has since become a geopolitical wedge in Latin America and a flashpoint for protests. Anticipating Latin American resistance to the FTAA, Washington had initiated early on a parallel track through bilateral and subregional negotiations in a building-block approach to ensure an eventual triumph of its FTAA project. After thirteen years of talks and two years of negotiations, the United States signed its first free trade agreement in South America with Chile at the end of 2002. To top it all, there was even a brief delay on the part of Washington in passing it in 2003 as "punishment" for the unwillingness of Chile to join the "coalition" that invaded Iraq (Anderson, 2003). In the end, Washington's long-term economic interests inevitably prevailed over its aberrations in short-term geopolitics and the U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement (FTA) was ratified and came into force in January, 2004. Since then, this agreement has become Washington's model for FTAs in the rest of the region (Gandásegui, Jr., 2006), one that is particularly unfavourable for the most undeveloped countries. This notwithstanding, Washington pursued shortly afterwards a similar agreement with Central America. In August, 2004, the Project of the Central America-FTA (CAFTA) turned into the DR-CAFTA, when the Dominican Republic signed its inclusion with the other States members. The DR-CAFTA agreement was concluded following a process in which each of these Latin America countries had previously signed a bilateral FTA with the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, the DR-CAFTA is not a simple customs agreement, but rather "a package of rules among state-of-the-art agreements for 21st-Century trade." This is something that as a whole favours the transnational-dominated exchange of products produced by globalised commodity chains. But the DR-CAFTA, for its part, resulted in protests by the social movements of each of the member countries. There is a multi-pronged set of interests that resist attempts to transform what have traditionally been selective concessions to transnational capital into perpetual rights that fall out of reach of the domestic laws of pacting nations. Those sectors that have stood to be the most harmed have arranged national and regional actions in defence of their interests. In the case of DR-CAFTA, only the Costa Rican government

responded to the domestic political pressures generated by this resistance, first in delaying its passage of the agreement and later in its ratification.

Following DR-CAFTA, Washington speeded up its plan to form an Andean FTA. In response, the multisectorial movements of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru also began to strengthen. Indeed, the key transversal issue of popular movements in these countries since May of 2004 has been the Andean FTA, whose negotiations formally opened in that month. The Andean FTA negotiations constitute a commercial agreement that effectively begins to dismantle the Andean Community of Nations (CAN). It also represents a *de facto* annexation of its States members to the Andean Regional Initiative, a U.S. sponsored package of military interventionism. In this sense, it has developed much like the DR-CAFTA agreement, i.e., in the context of growing repression and expansion of a U.S. military presence.

In the face of these threats to sovereignty and the attempts to deepen a neoliberalism already in crisis, the multisectorial movements of the regional civil society are beginning to look increasingly stronger in their opposition to the FTAs. In this context, the imagery of "another possible integration" opens the way for envisioning and struggling for an alternative regional development project, one based on a more authentic regional integration, organised "from below" and which better responds to popular interests within the existing structural confines of globalised capitalism.

The struggle for *another possible integration* is not exclusively predicated upon furthering the interests of the region's national elites. Rather, it signifies the search for an inclusive agreement that is capable of analysing and formulating solutions that favour the popular interests of the region. The goal is a more genuine and inclusive strategy for regional development that takes into account those sectors most affected by regional obstacles. The movement towards *another possible integration* is based in an emancipatory process. If, for example, the social sectors involved in the Bolivarian Revolution of Venezuela or those involved with the transformative project headed by the Movement to Socialism in Bolivia constitute processes that intend to construct a new national order, the larger struggle for *another possible integration* implies a process of changing the present state of affairs in favour of a more just and egalitarian regional order.

In short, *another possible integration* envisions a regional political project promoted by a broad social mobilisation and accompanied by a developing ideological consensus. The base of this project rests upon a plethora of contradictory social processes, created by centuries of asymmetries and now

crystallised in the twisted social relations of presently existing globalisation. Neoliberalism, a political project of social restructuring in favour of the expansion of the globalised capitalist accumulation, undoubtedly managed to redefine ideologically and materially the role of the state. The neoliberal State that was created out of this globalised restructuring of regional affairs has increasingly found it necessary to turn to repression in holding this precarious order together. With neoliberalism now falling into a pervasive social crisis, there is a newfound urgency to transforming the region and restoring a path to genuine social development.

TOWARDS A NEW SOUTH AMERICAN DIALOGUE

The neoliberal political project that unfolded in the region was initially born in the midst of dictatorships and became later consolidated under democratic and quasi-democratic regimes. The social restructuring associated with its implementation succeeded in weakening the very popular organisations that must ultimately lead the transition to *another possible integration*. It is in this weakened context of opposition that the regional struggle led by popular forces was born and must now map out their political strategy.

In very general terms, the discussions that arose out of the dialogue organised at the *Quito Symposium* demonstrated that the subject of another possible integration had not yet been adequately contemplated among all political parties and social movements in the region. A clear need was revealed for widening and deepening the consensus about a strategy for more inclusive forms of regional integration, something that was viewed by participants as being *urgent, possible and necessary*.² This ratified the necessity of continuing the development of a regional dialogue that is capable of involving diverse kinds of political actors. The extraordinary role played by the Simón Bolívar Andean University in Quito in support of this dialogue also confirmed that the region's universities are indispensable in providing a legitimate social space in this process.

1 This phrase in fact came from the conclusions of the Declaration of Caracas, issued by a broad group of NGOs and popular organisations who met subsequently: "Because we understand our central role in building hope, a new political culture and a really democratic institutionality which can guarantee a future with equity and justice for present and future generations. We invite all social networks, organisations and social movements to participate and join in building a movement of movements for constructing a Latin American citizenry and another form of regional integration; all of this is urgent, possible and necessary." Declaration of Caracas, January, 2006.

Also expressed was an awareness of the necessity to create an adequate language if the process of dialogue in favour of *another possible integration* is to reach its fullest potential. The idea would be to cultivate a socially inclusive language that does not exclusively pertain either to the political parties or limited to the slogans of the sectoral social movements, much less to one or another of the region's states. Above all, what is needed is a language that is not excessively intellectual, but rather one that is at once regional, popular and emancipatory. It is necessary to make a maximum effort to guarantee that the regional dialogue be accessible, if we expect it to be more inclusive of all the peoples of the region, women, children and adolescents. In short, we must struggle for a language which facilitates participation and the task of greater inclusiveness.

What became clear in the course of the *Quito Symposium* is that the democratisation of the region's mass media is part of the broader ideological struggle for a new regional order. Projects such as that of TELESUR represent the embryonic development of a sovereign Latin American voice. This media corporation based in Venezuela and supported by other countries in the region constitutes a challenge to the *CNN-isation* of the region's mass media. The recovery of regional influence over media broadcasting and television is a significant advance in the struggle to guarantee virtual spaces for carrying out and deepening an alternative dialogue. This provides a key component to a vital scenario whereby it can now be imagined that members of political parties, NGO's and social movements could meet in a public and accessible university setting, express their ideas on equal terms, and find their ideas being transmitted throughout the region by regional mass media such as TELESUR.

So then, is another kind of integration possible? What is clear is that a dialogue concerning *another possible integration* now really exists in South America and it is searching for a new consensus amongst the diverse political trends and the civil society dynamics of the continent. This region does not lack historical expressions of regional integration as some of the participants at the *Quito Symposium* eloquently expressed through references to the writings of Martí, Bolívar and others. From the viewpoint of various participants in Quito, it was important to distinguish between the possibility of a genuine, more inclusive integration on the one hand and the recent history of regional integrationist schemes on the other. In that sense, pacts such as the Andean Community of Nations (CAN) and MERCOSUR do not constitute the real object of inquiry for the analysis of regional integration. They are more properly conceptualised as important political projects to be analysed in the context of a net-representation of one or another configuration of national elite interests.

In this sense, the break that took place at the beginning of 2006 among the CAN States members suggests a clash of political projects with different underlying class interests. Likewise it is clear that the ALBA initiative being proposed by Venezuela is also a project of interests albeit with a very different content, and is representative of the presence of new powers in the region. The political question in all of this becomes: To what extent can one or another of these projects lead towards one or another possible form of regional integration?

It is altogether common and reasonable to assume that integrationist agreements like CAN and MERCOSUR are indispensable to the struggle for a more authentic regional integration, if for no other reason than for their strategic capacities of shaping a geopolitical bloc to hold hegemonic projects in check, such as that of the FTAA (Taccetti, 1997; Jaguaribe, 1998). In addition, they can operate as a mechanism for further broadening the parameters of existing integrationist schemes, stressing the social and cultural components of integration (Di Masi, 2002). But others argue that these projects can eventually turn into obstacles to the formation of a more adequate alternative. As Heinz Dieterich Steffan argued a few years back, the elites forged through underdevelopment have never displayed a steady and consistent ability to confront foreign hegemonic powers. This implies that popular forces must fight for democratising and transforming the very nature of these blocs (Dieterich, 2000) if they are to have any enduring possibility of genuinely defending regional sovereignty.

The case of the nationalisation of the natural gas industry in Bolivia is an illustrative example. The measure taken by the Bolivian government in accordance with popular forces in that country was strongly criticised by other governments, such as that of President Lula's in Brazil. The sovereign act of Bolivia was seen by Brazil and others in the region as conduct contrary to the consolidation of regional integration. From the viewpoint of those seeking *another possible integration*, however, a regional agreement favouring the social transformation of the elitist relations that have long characterised the commercialisation of gas in that country can also favour the regional struggle for energy sovereignty. At the end of the day, regional sovereignty may indeed be better defined by class interests than by the elite interests of state members working within existing integration schemes, notwithstanding all of the geopolitics of regional blocs. These and similar topics regarding "regional integration for what?" and "regional integration for whom?" were discussed throughout the dialogue developed in the *Quito Symposium*.

Even though the presence of the CAN and MERCOSUR in the dialogue at Quito helped to stress the regional achievements of these interstate covenants, mostly

in terms of the reinsertion of states members in the global economy, it did not prevent a larger consensus from forming concerning the limitations of these agreements. Decades ago, the popular sectors, their movements and their political parties were locked in debate over the role that national elites should play in confronting the aggressive incursion of transnational capital. In that context, many leftist political parties acknowledged the progressive role that national capital could play in defence of national sovereignty. In the current context of struggle for *another possible integration*, an analogous debate is taking shape concerning the role that regional organisations such as CAN and MERCOSUR should play. An additional element that can broaden this discussion still further, one that still needs to be systematically explored, is a balance of costs involved with "non-integration" (or the failure to integrate) as considered from the point of view of the popular sectors.

What became clear in Quito is that the organised popular sectors of this region have achieved a high degree of clarity concerning integration schemes imposed from the North. They represent forms of hegemonic integration, i.e., of integration imposed from abroad, and amount to a form of domination that throughout history has often come south via military invasion as in the case of Puerto Rico. In the present day, the more common modality consists of "free trade projects," such as those of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the FTAA and CAFTA. In each of these cases of hegemonic integration, the trail of military interventionism is never far behind. This is something most evident today in the growing regionalisation of the Colombian crisis. If by previous intervention, a regime can be molded and/or institutionalised that later appears as legitimate, such as earlier occurred in Panama, the subsequent adherence of that country to these hegemonic schemes can be made to appear more "natural."

The conceptual opposite of hegemonic integration is a mutually beneficial integration based on solidarity and the authentic and democratically determined development needs of the region. To paraphrase Hugo Chávez, this is the ideal reference for the South that should be placed at the top of the regional compass. The consolidation of this more genuine form of integration based in human needs and solidarity is fully incompatible with globalised capitalism. It is unreasonable to expect that the globalised structures of capitalism, due to their very nature, can ever lead to the genuine integration based in solidarity in any region of the world.

Between the two antipodes of hegemonic integration and a genuine integration based in solidarity, there are two intermediate points between which the present regional drama can be conceptually located. If the consolidation of a hegemonic integration is the vision that guides the project of the regional superpower, what

SOUTH AMERICA'S NEW DIALOGUE: ANOTHER INTEGRATION IS POSSIBLE

we see emerging around the region today is what we can call "actually existing integration." This actually existing integration is defined by the accumulation of popular resistances and the resulting incapacity of foreign hegemonic powers to fully achieve their goals. In other words, actually existing integration as a historical social configuration is ultimately the outcome of struggle, however seemingly one-sided it may appear.

Since the beginning of the wave of free trade agreements with NAFTA, the actual outcome of these agreements have reflected negotiations that to a greater or lesser extent were shaped by protests by the popular sectors in all of the participating countries. When NAFTA was finally passed, it included two additional and rather inconsequential sidebar agreements regarding labour relations and environment that serve at least as a symbolic reminder of the struggles that had unfolded during the negotiations period. The later attempts of imposing the FTAA on the region resulted in the still unimplemented "FTAA-*light*," and the decision to opt for seeking bilateral and sub-regional agreements. Even though the outcome has remained inside the logic of the hegemonic scheme, its historic content is not exactly as the hegemonic power would have wanted it. Far from a harmonious and stable system, "actually existing integration" is a contradictory social process that is subject to continual resistance and social mobilisation. It is out of those dynamics that the impulse arises towards the other intermediate configuration, that is, the struggle for *another possible integration*.

Hegemonic Integration	Actually Existing Integration	Another Possible Integration	Genuine Integration (based in solidarity)
----------------------------------	--	---	--

The struggle for *another possible integration* signifies a political project that better answers to the needs of the popular sectors within the prevailing structures of globalised capitalism. It is a supranational project that embodies a regional drama of struggles and conflicts, involving political parties and social movements in a class, race, gender and sectoral context of confrontation that extends across diverse geographical locations and national borders. The project has an emergent, transitory and cumulative character that implies a longer term goal of a more democratic, egalitarian and post-capitalist future.

The outcome of the struggle for *another possible integration* depends on the efficacy of political coordination on the part of the region's popular forces and

their ability to seize upon current opportunities and realise their maximum potential within the confines presented by the present neoliberal crisis. In this regard, the dialogue of the *Quito Symposium* called attention to the need to build permeable spaces within each political party, each social movement, each NGO and each university that can facilitate constant interchange in support of a larger correlation of forces in waging this struggle. In short, everything has pointed to the necessity of expanding and deepening the ongoing dialogue between these critical social actors.

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, Sarah, Phyllis Bennis y John Cavanagh (2003), "Coalition of the Willing Or Coalition of the Coerced? How the Bush Administration Influences Allies in its War on Iraq", IPS, Feb. 26.

DI MASI, Jorge Rafael (2002), "La contribución del MERCOSUR a un proyecto de integración regional en América Latina", In Víctor López Villafañe and Jorge Rafael Di Masi (coord.), *Del TLC al MERCOSUR: Integración y diversidades en América Latina*, México, DF., Siglo XXI Editores.

DIERXSENS, Wim (2006), "Social Movements and the Capitalist Crisis: Towards a Latin American Alternative", in Richard Dello Buono and José Bell Lara, *Imperialism, Neoliberalism and Social Struggles in Latin America*, Brill Publishing Co., Leiden, Holanda.

DIETERICH, Heinz (2000), "Crisis capitalista mundial y alternativas latinoamericanas", in Alberto Acosta (ed.), *El Desarrollo en la globalización: El reto de América Latina*, Caracas, Venezuela, Editorial Nueva Sociedad.

GANDASEGUI, Jr., Marco (2006), "Latin America and Imperialism in the XXI Century", *Critical Sociology*, V. 32, No. 1, Leiden, Holanda.

JAGUARIBE, Helio (1998), "MERCOSUR y las alternativas de ordenamiento mundial", in *Globalización y relaciones externas de América Latina y el Caribe*, Edición No. 53, Caracas, Venezuela, January-June.

TACCETTI, Victorio (1997), *Constelación Sur: América Latina Frente a la Globalización*, Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Book Summary

The book *South American Dialogue: Another Integration is Possible* as published in Spanish was thematically organised to reconstruct the topical sequence of the *Quito Symposium*.¹ The symposium was organised into four basic panels, with an extended, structured dialogue following each panel. A fifth panel was dedicated to sharing perspectives on future prospects of integration in the region. As a follow-up to the *Symposium*, this book features ten essays written by participants in the Symposium. It starts off with an introductory essay by the editor, followed by a brief context essay describing the present political, economic and social trends in South America. Five of the works that follow aim to summarise the main discussions of the panels while the remaining three consist of revised versions of papers presented during the event. In addition, the book contains excerpts from the dialogue that took place around the panels, a reflexive epilogue that discusses the methodology utilised in the dialogue, and a series of appendices that contain several primary documents and other reference materials.

Esteban Silva's opening chapter establishes the social context of South America and suggests a series of questions that the Quito Symposium should address. His work provided a discussion paper for the Symposium organisers prior to the event and helped guide their thinking in defining the main topics treated in Quito. The subsequent chapter by Germán Rodas provides a brief review of the history of integration schemes in Latin America, this derived from the inaugural speech

1 See Appendix 1.

he presented at the opening of the Symposium.² He then offers reflections about what the Andean Community of Nations (CAN) and the South Common Market (MERCOSUR) have meant for the region over the course of their development. Finally, he contrasts that experience with the initiative of the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA) as a new integrationist strategy of a different character. These topics capture the essence of the presentations making up the first panel of the Quito Symposium that aimed to summarise both the advances and limits of existing regional integration projects.³

The following two chapters come directly from the presentations of the second panel that was dedicated to examining the social dimension of regional integration. Andrés Serbin puts forward an analysis of the challenges and dilemmas that the region's civil society is presently facing. His sophisticated conceptualisation helps us to grasp the nature and complexity of regional civil society in an increasingly globalised world. As he shows, there are points of convergence in the campaigns of "No to ..." among the region's popular movements. But he also explains why it is much harder for these same social actors to advance their agenda in a more proactive way with clear alternatives for change. Aram Aharonian's chapter weighs in on the pivotal role of the mass media in supporting a progressive regional movement in favour of a more inclusive and anti-hegemonic integration. As the architect and director of the TELESUR project, he discusses how this incipient media tool can contribute to breaking down the domination of the "mass media *latifundia*."

The following two chapters come directly out of the third panel of the Symposium which turned attention to the counter-tendencies that impede a more genuine integration of the region. Ariela Ruiz Caro's essay offers a careful analysis of the Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) fostered by the United States and clearly shows how their net impact works against the interests of a more inclusive integration of the region. She discusses many important topics, including the disarticulating effect that the FTAs have had upon Andean Community of Nations (CAN)

2 Germán Rodas, "Reflexiones sobre la historia de la integración de nuestra América" [Reflections on the integration history of our America], Opening of the Quito Symposium, Simón Bolívar Andean University, Ecuador, November 21, 2005.

3 The presentations of this session include those by: Luis Alberto Adrianzén, Advisor to the Secretary General of the Andean Community of Nations (CAN); José Luis Cancela, Secretary General of the Uruguayan Ministry of Foreign Relations, South American Common Market (MERCOSUR); and Judith Valencia, Venezuelan Presidential Commission for FTAA Negotiations and spokesperson for the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA).

members, something that eventually resulted in the withdrawal of Venezuela from the pact. In general, she develops the thesis that the FTAs place limits on the structural changes that regional integration could otherwise promote in the interests of development. Jorge Rojas, in contrast, reflects upon the important role of migration and displaced populations, something that has profoundly affected the region in recent years and particularly in the Andes. His analysis ratifies the urgency for integrating questions of peace and human rights in the dialogue concerning *another possible integration*.

The discussion then turns towards the role of social movements and political parties in the struggle for democratising the process of regional integration. The chapter by Leopoldo Múnera, the distinguished Colombian political scientist who directed the fourth panel and subsequent dialogue in Quito, is a highly synoptic one. He presents a synthesis of the discussion which took place based in the respective views of political parties and social movements on the necessity of a more genuine and inclusive integration for the region.

The final chapter by Ximena de la Barra finishes with an extensive panorama that summarises many of the issues discussed in the final panel of the symposium dedicated towards perspectives on the future. The synthesis that she skilfully puts forth draws a summary positioned from diverse angles of view, not only from the political parties and social movements, but also from the perspective of international cooperation agencies. The epilogue which follows was prepared by Luciano Cárcamo and Mario Yep, two sociologists who participated in the organisation of the event. They offer a critical evaluation of the participatory methodology employed by the organisers of the dialogue in Quito, something which will undoubtedly be useful for those seeking to replicate this kind of event in a variety of other contexts.

Abstracts

Advances and Obstacles of South American Regional Integration Schemes

Germán Rodas Chaves, Simón Bolívar Andean University, Quito

Latin America has lived through various processes of integration, each of which responded to its diverse conditions during distinct historical stages. The unity of the Amerindians in the Pre-Columbus Era; creole struggles in later times of colonisation in unionist efforts that resulted in the wars of emancipation against colonial powers and enabled the formation of independent national states; and the subsequent integration efforts of different economic and social fractions—national and external—amidst their intertwined interests, have all marked, among others, the integrationist cycles of the region.

Pan-Americanism that was promoted towards the end of the 19th century by the United States of America, a means of giving continuity to the Monroe Doctrine, resulted from their interest in consolidating a geopolitical and geo-economic space that would solve their recurring accumulation crises. This of course affected the sovereignty and the independent integration of Latin America. The promotion of nationalist ideas attempted to favour unionism in accordance with the region's own needs, something that in the 20th century engendered a persistent conflict due to the accelerated transnationalisation of economies and the end result of mortgaging the region to U.S. interests.

In this context, the type of unity of the Andean countries has constituted a set of domestic and international interests mainly of a commercial character. Due to the lack of significant participation by social and political actors, this process of integration has been beset with constant obstacles. The recent unionism of the

Southern Cone emerged to consolidate certain democratic formalities of the region following the period of military dictatorships. This process has been maturing and has managed to achieve a more advanced political and social level of participation, thanks in part to the advent of progressive regimes seeking new economic, political and social relations within the global order. The implications of these advances for the future are important and their impact on the Andean Community is increasingly evident.

South American unity will not be a unification of disparate parts of Latin America, but rather the result of a building process with broad social and political participation, based on the strengthening of states, the respect for sovereignty and the construction of more radical democracies. Other attempts of unionism, such as the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA), are contributing to the debate about this historical state of affairs. While growing difficulties can be seen, significant advances are being made through the increasing involvement of civil society actors in the process.

Challenges and Dilemmas of Regional Civil Society in Latin America and the Caribbean: The Difficult Transition towards the Construction of a Regional Citizenship

Andrés Serbin, CRIES (Regional Coordinator of Social and Economic Research), Buenos Aires

This chapter sets out to analyse the emergence of global civil society and its articulation with an emerging regional civil society in Latin America and the Caribbean. This formation is characterised by its heterogeneity and complexity as well as by a series of distinctive features found in its process of formation both at the national and regional levels, defined in the final analysis by its respective interlocutors and spaces of participation. In this sense, it is suggested that at the present juncture, regional citizenship is a process under construction and reflective of a vigorous dynamism with eventual repercussions in the formation of a regionality with its own particular characteristics.

Changing Paradigms: Communications and Democracy, Mass and Alternative Media

Aram Aharonian, TELESUR, Caracas

Mass media is intertwined with the future of our democracies. The dictatorial reign that the media currently possesses in Latin America effectively seeks to

supplant the former military dictatorships of the past. In utilising mass media, large economic elites can decide who has and does not have a voice, who is the protagonist and who is the antagonist. As a whole, it constitutes the most vociferous voice against any proposed changes in the economic, political and social model, systematically depriving the vast majorities of any voice or visibility.

Access to the mass media of information, as public and global goods, must be participatory, universal, inclusive and democratic while the dramatic asymmetry in this area between North and South must be confronted. Informational technologies at the disposal of the people can help to eradicate illnesses and epidemics, and contribute to ensuring that people have adequate nutrition, clothing, shelter, education, freedom and peace. It can enable them to participate more fully in the culture of knowledge. Now is the time to think big, to construct an alternative mass media on a hemispheric scale, one that disseminates a real vision of our social and cultural diversity.

After decades of the weakening and privatisation of national states, the development of TELESUR is without doubt a political and strategic project. It represents an attempt to recover and promote the construction of hemispheric audiovisual media by broadcasting a real view of the social and cultural diversity of Latin America and the Caribbean. The mission of this alternative media project is to begin to dismantle the Latin American media *latifundia* and to help consolidate emerging processes of political change as an instrument in the battle of ideas against the hegemonic processes of globalisation.

The Role of Social Movements and Political Parties in South American Integration

Leopoldo Múnera Ruiz, National University of Colombia, Bogotá

From the complex and alternative multilateralism achieved in the *South American Dialogue: Another Integration Is Possible*, this chapter treats the positions and proposals of the participating political parties, social movements and civil society organisations. Framed through an assertion of autonomy with respect to the official and institutional forms of existing integration schemes, the social and political actors present in the *Quito Symposium* sketched the outlines of a more genuine kind of regional integration. This construct emerges from the grassroots and is contrary to exclusionary forms of existing integration which have become hegemonic within the intergovernmental and interstate regional integration

projects. Moreover, they demonstrate the symbolic importance of figures such as that of the "border crosser," in the midst of the necessary, permanent, irresolvable and multiple tensions that exist between the social heterogeneity of the masses and the political homogeneity of the state and political parties. Finally, the challenges and difficulties of this genuine integration point to a practical necessity for discovering the bridges between these two dimensions within the universe of social and political sectors of progressive and left-wing forces, this if another possible integration is to be built in South America.

The Impact of FTA's on Inequality and the Regional Integration Process

Ariela Ruiz Caro, Regional Consultant, Buenos Aires

This work considers that the Free Trade Agreements (FTA) which three Andean countries may sign with the United States, regardless of the benefits they might generate for agroexport and textile sectors, consolidates a concentrated and exclusionary development model that seeks to render permanent the economic liberalisation and deregulation policies implemented during the 1990s under the guidelines cast by the Washington Consensus. In Latin America, these policies produced important macroeconomic balances and a relative modernisation of the productive apparatus in certain sectors. However, they also deepened the concentration of economic power, fostered a greater inequality in the distribution of income, and increased social exclusion. They also limited the economic policy options of states and, in many cases—and what was most serious—resulted in a devaluation of democracy in the region. This model is now being increasingly questioned.

The FTAs have the effect of annulling the subregional processes of integration. We refer not only to the existent ones such as the Andean Group or MERCOSUR, but also to the incipient project of the South American Community of Nations. The question thus becomes whether we should "Guantanamoise" this model of economic policy, turning it in an international agreement, and close the door on ourselves in attempts to go at this by other avenues, albeit via options that are not as of yet well-articulated.

The South American Community of Nations has the potential for counteracting some of the most negative aspects of globalisation. But that will only be possible if it facilitates and stimulates the guiding action of the State, making a break with the logic of the market as the sole institution capable of allocating resources. It is only through integration and a common voice in international forums that this region will come to have a bearing on the design of global policies that can guarantee a fairer and more favourable outcome for the region.

Looking to the future: The Role of New Southern Dialogue

Ximena de la Barra, Chile

After a long period of neo-colonialism supported by the imposition of neoliberal policies, the region has reached a promising moment, immersed in a positive, transformative process of change in which actors engaged in liberation struggles have become multiplied and are acting in concert. A new type of regional integration seems to be emerging as a core element of this historical period. Integration has ceased being an issue exclusively for governments, more or less submissive to the plans of global capital, and has instead turned into a peoples' issue. The region needs to develop its own development agenda that not only contributes to alleviating the effects of an unfair world order, but which also contributes to changing it.

Integration based in solidarity, something that embodies the concept of cooperation, constitutes one of the principal instruments for implementing this progressive development agenda. The viability of the integration processes depends in large measure upon its ability to manage the asymmetries among countries. Likewise, national integration is essential to achieving this vision of regional integration since the need to address intra-national disparities remains an unavoidable issue. This is especially true in Latin America which displays the worst income distribution in the world.

It is also valid to invert this relationship since it is not possible to speak of solidarity as a guiding principle of a nation if it does not manifest solidarity with the other peoples of the region. This is why the salient element is not to focus upon improving the economic competitiveness of a country with respect to others, as neoliberalism urges, but rather to search for systemic competitiveness of the larger group of countries in order to better promote the Bolivarian ideal of the *Patria Grande*. Likewise, regional integration can only be successful in the context of a more just world order, and for that reason, it is indispensable to transcend the disintegrative and anti-redistributive tendencies of neoliberalism. To this end, regional integration based in solidarity and cooperation becomes an instrument for justice, compensating for existing asymmetries and disparities at the national, regional and global level. Solidarity-based integration can promote systemic competitiveness of the region just as it promotes a new and more just world order.

Excerpts from the Dialogue:

"... The integration of the Andean sub-region is a recent process that remains under construction and it is even more recent in terms of moving towards regional political cooperation. It is essentially since the year 2000 that we have begun to visualise in greater detail what must be done in the area of political cooperation and this is based in a decision, which is a law for us, about forging a common foreign policy...

We have advanced towards the definition of a common foreign security policy, the product of an Andean decision that was passed in July, 2004 at the meeting of the Presidential Council here in Quito. This policy incorporates into the domestic policy of our countries each and every one of the new elements of security. This is no longer foreign security solely viewed from a military viewpoint, but rather security more broadly related to other issues, such as a shared strategy to combat drugs, something which affects our security, fuels corruption, and so on.

So now there are Andean norms that express what must be done concerning that issue. With respect to concerns expressed about participation in this process, there exists within the normative framework just recently being operationalised a need to create an Andean network of security in which NGOs, academic institutions and other representatives of civil society play a role in establishing a zone of peace at the Andean level. This is the seed of what we have presently begun to operationalise in the area of a common regional security policy that also deals with domestic security and it has to be effectively formulated.

Given that the framework for a common security policy includes the issue of combating drugs, the UN approved a plan of action of what

all of our countries should be doing so that by 2008, we can proceed to evaluate our advances in this regard. The Andean Community has basically proposed to accomplish, among other things, the formulation of an Andean strategy for sustainable, comprehensive and alternative development. This represents an agreement of the five member countries to work on the issue of alternative development, mainly taking into account the issues about poverty in the zones of production and their surroundings, along with the necessity for dealing with institutional matters of the participation of peasants, village mayors, regional governments, national governments and the international community together with everything that involves international cooperation. Besides the institutional issue, we have the economic, social and environmental issues to take into account and we are specifically taking into account environmental conditions.

Coca in itself is not harmful. What is harmful is to mix the coca with other elements for the purpose of transforming it into cocaine. So we have made a decision at the level of the five countries to combat this through more effective fiscal control and supervision of chemical substances that might possibly be diverted towards the production of cocaine. We are trying to strengthen the custom territory in a manner so that this situation can be controlled. Until very recently, there was no common customs list of these chemical inputs but simply smuggling, products being imported from other countries that had no control over them and they flowed into our countries to make possible the production of illegal drugs or their precursors. We are beginning to elaborate a plan of action that will need to be evaluated in 2008 concerning the new generation of drugs that are synthetic in nature, and we have also begun work on the creation of national drug observatories so as to contribute to the follow-up of policies on this matter and the formulation of new policies in the framework of the Andean Community..."

Adolfo López, Andean Community of Nations (CAN)

"... It is clear that integration when addressed from an exclusively commercial perspective, obviously leads nowhere, and the experience of Latin America in this respect - thinking in terms of the failed Latin American Free Trade Association (ALALC) - has particularly reaffirmed this. But nor can we say that integration should be based only in a political element.

Regarding policy-making, I believe that even with the best of intentions, with our best efforts, if integration is not based in real elements - as others mentioned - in elements related to the infrastructure, to the economic base, it is hard to see how we will be able to move forward. I think we have to talk of three pillars or components of integration: the commercial-economic component, the political component and the social component. In my view, we should look for an intelligent combination of these three factors. We are not alone in the world. As part of a world economy, we should foster our competitiveness in order to integrate ourselves in a way that is beneficial for our peoples and our countries.

The issue of popular participation in the integration process is an ineludibly important dimension so that the integration process signifies something more than just a set of treaties or innocuous legal documents. Through the 'We are MERCOSUR' and 'Citizen MERCOSUR' initiatives, we have carried out a series of meetings that have brought together workers, students, businesspeople, and others with the goal not only of disseminating information about MERCOSUR among their sectors, but also so that people feel like MERCOSUR is their own space, like an area of opportunities, which is essentially what it is all about. I am glad to say that Argentina, the country following us [Uruguay] in the presidency of MERCOSUR next year has assumed the responsibility of continuing this work of 'Citizen MERCOSUR' and there are many activities that the Argentinean presidency is planning for the first semester of 2006.

An important element for the democratic components of the integration process is the MERCOSUR Parliament. As I mentioned earlier today, we will be going forward in December with a proposal for a parliament that in its first stage will be made up of parliamentarians of the member states. In a second stage, it will be a parliament whose election will be made directly by the citizens of the MERCOSUR countries. This is a parliament that will have reached, in my opinion, a highly acceptable equation for everyone regarding the number of representatives and the diverse countries involved in the agreement. I believe that this will play an important role in strengthening the democratic component of the process..."

José Luis Cancela, Uruguay, MERCOSUR

"... The FTAA fights for the free reign of the investor, that is to say, that the only figure that would have a juridical presence is the capital investment or the investor. In contrast, ALBA (the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas) defends fights to defend the territory for the inhabitants and for its peoples. In other words, the FTAA represents annexation while ALBA seeks emancipation. They are two logics, one positioned from the exercise of established powers, while the other one involves the exercise of the people's power.

What is the ALBA position with respect to the South American Community of Nations? President Vásquez and President Chávez have sent a letter to all of the presidents, recommending that a South commission be formed to deal with this. The idea would be to avoid that it be discussed with the prior imprint of MERCOSUR and the CAN, thus allowing it to assume a more innovative and fundamentally social agenda at the outset. In the words of President Chávez, the CAN and MERCOSUR can in time go about dissolving its prior accords as new principles and more adequate modalities for integration arise. This is precisely the polemical line that Venezuela is bringing forth both in the CAN and in MERCOSUR.

One of the policies that can be seen more clearly related to the Andean Community, and which will push Venezuela ever further away from the Andean Community, is the exercise of a common foreign policy. Different regimes of government cannot exercise a common foreign policy by way of supranationality. What began to happen in 2003 dramatically complicated the possibility of a political relationship because it did not respect plurality and the differences among members, leaving it as merely a totalitarian dictatorial statute which does not respond to the needed changes being demanded by our peoples.

The same thing happens with the CAN policy regarding drugs. A discussion takes place on development, talking about a policy for alternative development, but this turns into an attempt to create an executive secretary on drugs, with total autonomy, with statutes of an executive secretariat. Venezuela, for example, now that it holds the presidency pro tempore, would remain as executive secretary of this campaign against drugs, at the same time that we broke off our relations with the DEA. We did so because the DEA was being utilised for espionage in the domestic affairs of Venezuela. This obviously creates a set of contradictions in the operation of things, trying to

enforce a whole set of principles supported by Venezuelan governments of the 1990s..."

Judith Valencia, Venezuela, ALBA

"...If we start by considering civil society more in the way of citizenships and the exercise of the rights, we may be able to understand it as a counterpart and a complement to the state and not necessarily just an outcome of anti-governmental actions. This is particularly the case if we frame it in the deepening of democratic processes in Latin America over the last 20 years. In that sense, civil society has had a late development and it is only now being built, taking-shape the same way as the democratic framework within which it was created. This framework that is democracy also had a late development and remains under construction. From this point of view, there is no civil society without a rule of law and without a strong democratic state. To a strong democratic state corresponds a vigorous civil society and this is the equation that is appearing throughout the entire region in this building process."

...

There has been a broad development, within the heterogeneity of the regional civil society, of the movements for the "no" — no to the FTAA, no to the external debt, no to U.S. militarisation and interference, no to exclusion and no to discrimination. Far less developed have been the proposals and mobilisations to say "yes to —;" to favour mechanisms for more democratic participation, mechanisms for the prevention of armed and/or violent conflicts, policies for implementation of security policies, etc. That is to say, the anti-statist origins of many movements and organisations of civil society, particularly at its roots, make it hard to combine normative views with functionally necessary views of proposals in a region where, in principle, democratic systems and the institutional mechanisms for citizenship and citizen participation prevail, at least in their formal appearance and at the national level."

Andres Serbin, CRIES

"Today we know that it is indispensable to have alternative mass media in order to confront the permanent barrage of information from the

North. In order to promote cultural diversity, strengthen historical memory and help build the collective identity of our peoples while encouraging greater participation, we must enhance the organisation of people through the creation of spaces for broadcasting the voices of their movements. When we talk of "alternative", we should ask ourselves "alternative" to what? If we want to be alternative to that hegemonic message which bombards us from the north, obviously the only way to do it is to have our own mass media, and to have their own mass media, they must also have new contents. This is an essential component for democratising the creation of media content and for guaranteeing that diversity and plurality because an alternative TV broadcasting system without new content is of no use at all.

... TELESUR is a channel to build new bridges for creating an integration space for meeting with close friends. It is a place for discovering, loving and reinventing ourselves through our own lens, escaping from the stereotypes that have kept us in the bounds of others' sight, and with our own language and a visual identity that can allow us to see ourselves from a different perspective, ours."

Aram Ahonian, TELESUR

"Without any doubt, U.S. policies themselves constitute counter-tendencies with respect to any kind of inclusive integration in Latin America and require concerted political positions of our peoples and their states in order to confront them."

Leopoldo Múnera, National University of Colombia

"Talking of any kind of "integration" means, above all, to acknowledge that what converges are components representing a diversity of different activities. Integrating is not that someone swallows another. Integrating means that everyone coincides in this desire for integration and the capacity of acknowledging their own otherness in this process of living together. Integrating presupposes the coordination necessary to write a common history and that common history cannot be written by political elites any longer, but by the people, from everyone, from the actors and movements that are part of it."

Carlos Moya, Vice-President of the Chilean Socialist Party

"For us, the integration engineered by governments means an integration taking place within the same state structures that have never allowed the inclusion of diverse social sectors—an integration within the same frames of exclusion, marginalisation, and social exclusion. An integration within that very traditional framework cannot work. It would simply be an integration of governments, of ministries, of that so-called traditional political class and it will never be a true integration.

...We say that genuine integration is possible when it involves people to people, acknowledging the cultural diversity existing in our countries. That integration would be possible when those so-called "democracies" existing in our countries become participatory, when they are no longer merely representative democracies. Integration is possible when there is solidarity among peoples.

...When they say that the issue about fighting drugs could be a basis for integration, I would like to know exactly what that policy would be. In the Andean countries such as Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, in the countries that produce them and in the countries that consume them such as Argentina or northern Chile, or in some regions of the Brazilian Amazonia, there is proof that the indigenous peoples have consumed coca since ancient times and see in this a core element of their culture, of their identity. From Bolivia we believe that the policies that have been applied in order to combat narcotics trafficking cannot continue. They have resulted in the installation of military bases and extensive spraying, causing a series of ecological consequences to the environment. These policies of repression and violence, in the name of fighting narcotics trafficking cannot continue. They have also used this to discrediting great social movements, such as in the Bolivian case, to discredit the Coca cultivators movement, or discrediting new leaders of these social movements. Look at how some officials of the U.S. administration use the term "narcoterrorists" or terrorist leaders for people like Evo Morales. At one point, he was called the Andean Bin Laden. I am left wondering, then, what policy for fighting drugs can be put in the name of Latin American integration?"

Dionicio Nuñez Tangara, MAS, Deputy in the Bolivian Parliament

"It is not only the exogenous factors that determine our integration processes. At the national and regional levels, we have interests, elites, classes, oligarchies, various power sectors that have their own project of regional integration and they struggle for it each day accordingly. In Brazil, these sectors control the press, they are clearly against MERCOSUR and in the headlines they only put forth the problems that MERCOSUR brings us. Even amidst the competition between the oligarchies and other financial sectors, they have very clear commercial and financial interests which points puts them in a much more favourable position towards integration with the United States or FTAA."

Ana María Stuart, Brazil Workers' Party

"We live under a hegemony that wants to impose its conditions and policies and if we don't keep our descendants fresh in our minds, what are we going to leave to our children and our grandchildren? If we are damaging our natural resources, what is left? That is why, at least from the point of view of indigenous peoples, we believe in national sovereignty, a sovereignty where we would be able to say what we want. This means we could seek an integration based on three axes: solidarity, complementarity and the convergence of peoples."

Pedro de la Cruz, National Confederation of Rural, Native and Afro-descendant Organisations (FENOCIN) of Ecuador

"I believe that this Symposium is of the affirming type who those who believe in a positive perspective on integration. The idea is to leave here in affirmation that another integration is possible, as opposed to searching for motives of exclusion or divisiveness. In other words, our differences are being affirmed and there is no reason to be afraid of them. As I see it, this posture enriches our vision."

Aída García Naranjo, Socialist Party of Peru

"In my view, the possibilities regarding the quality of our integration is highly dependent upon our national states and the kind of democracy we have in them."

Silvio Caccia Bava, ALOP

Appendix 1:
The Quito Symposium Programme

SYMPOSIUM

South American Dialogue: Another Integration is Possible

Quito, Ecuador

November 21-22, 2005

NOVEMBER 21

09:00-11:00

Opening

- Diana Avila, Executive Director, Project Counselling Service (PCS), Peru
- Enrique Ayala, Rector, Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (UASB), Ecuador

Inaugural Presentation

- "Historical Reflections on the Integration of Our America," Prof. Germán Rodas, UASB Ecuador

Panel I: Advances and Shortcomings of Existing Integration Schemes

Moderator: Ximena de la Barra, Chile

- Luis Alberto Adrián, Advisor to the General Secretary, Andean Community of Nations (CAN)
- José Luis Cancela, General Secretary of the Uruguayan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South American Common Market (MERCOSUR)
- Judith Valencia, Venezuelan Presidential Commission for Negotiations on the FTAA; Director of the Technical Support Team of the Commission for the Secretariat Pro-Tempore of the CAN, 2005-2006; Spokesperson for the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA)

Coffee Break

11:15-12:45

Dialogue

Moderator: Ximena de la Barra, Chile

LUNCH

14:30-15:30

Panel II: Social Processes of Integration in the South American Region

Moderator: Leopoldo Múnera, Universidad Nacional de Colombia

- "Challenges and Dilemmas for the Regional Civil Society of Latin America and the Caribbean," Andrés Serbin, CRIES, Argentina
- "Communications Mass Media, Cultural Industries and Integration," Aram Aharonian, TELESUR, Uruguay

15:30-16:15

Diálogo

Moderador: Leopoldo Múnera, Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Coffee Break

16:30-17:30

Panel III: Counter-Tendencies to Developing an Inclusive Integration

Moderator: Hugo Cabieses, Peru

- "Impact of FTAs on Inequality and the Processes of Regional Integration," Ariela Ruíz Caro, Peru
- "Regional Security of the Americas at the Onset of the 21st Century, Manuel Salgado, Universidad Central del Ecuador
- "Borders and Integration," Jorge Rojas, CODHES, Colombia

17:30-18:30

Dialogue

Moderator: Hugo Cabieses, Peru

18:30

Wine Reception

NOVEMBER 22

09:00-10:30

Panel IV: The Role of Social Movements and Political Parties in Integration

Synthesis of Day 1 / Moderator: Leopoldo Múnera, Universidad Nacional de Colombia

- "Political Parties and Integration," Carlos Moya, Vice-President of the Socialist Party of Chile
- "Social Movements and Integration," Dionicio Núñez, Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS), Bolivia

Commentaries

- Ana María Stuart, Workers Party of Brazil (PT)
- Pedro de la Cruz, National Confederation of Peasant, Indigenous and Afro-Descendent Organisations (FENOCIN), Ecuador

Coffee Break

10:45-12:45

Diálogo

Moderator: Leopoldo Múnera, Universidad Nacional de Colombia

LUNCH

14:30-16:30 Looking Towards the Future

Moderator: Andrés Serbin, CRIES, Argentina

- *From the Perspective of Political Parties:* Hugo Rodríguez, Socialist Party of Uruguay
- *From the Perspective of Social Movements:* Eduardo Ballón, Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana, Perú
- *From the Academic Perspective:* Prof. Marco Romero, UASB, Ecuador
- *From the Perspective of International Cooperation Agencies:* Ximena de la Barra, Chile

16:30-17:15 Dialogue

Moderator: Andrés Serbin, CRIES, Argentina

Coffee Break

17:30 -18:00

How Do We Continue the Dialogue?

- Diana Avila, Organising Committee, PCS
- R. A. Dello Buono, Organising Committee
- Germán Rodas, Organising Committee
- Esteban Silva, Organising Committee

18:15

Closing Comments

Appendix 2: List of Participants in the Quito Symposium

Acevedo, Jesús *PCS. Guatemala*
Aharonian, Aram, *Telesur. Venezuela*
Avila, Diana, *PCS. Perú*
Argüello, Santiago, *Plan País. Ecuador*
Ayala, Enrique, *Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar. Ecuador*
Gustavo, Ayala, *Universidad Andina Somón Bolívar. Ecuador*
Bastardo, Gustavo, *Embajada de La República Bolivariana de Venezuela*
Bedoya, Maruja, *PCS. Perú*
Béjar, Héctor, *Frente Amplio. Perú*
Bengoa, Juana, *CONGDE. España*
Bruer, David, *Inter Pares. Canadá*
Cabieses Cubas, Hugo, *Desarrollo Rural Integral Sustentable (DRIS). Perú*
Caccia Bava, Silvio, *Asociación Latinoamericana de Organizaciones de Promoción (ALOP).*
Cancela, José Luis, *Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores.MERCOSUR. Uruguay.*
Carcamo, Luciano, *PCS. Estudiante de Sociología de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú*
Carrera, Hilda, *Secours Catholique. Francia*
Castellanos, Camilo, *ILSA, PIDHDD. Colombia*
Castelnau, Juan Gabriel, *Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Argentina. MERCOSUR.*
Castillo, Zoraida, *Lutheran World Relief. Colombia*
Cedano, Maria Ysabel, *DEMUS Estudio para la Defensa y los Derechos de la Mujer. Perú*
Contreras, Adalid, *Qhana. Bolivia*
Crosby, Alison, *Inter Pares. Canada*
de la Barra, Ximena, *Consultora independiente. Chile.*
del Barrio, Pilar, *PCS. Guatemala*
Dello Buono, Ricardo, *Comité Organizador del Simposium*

SOUTH AMERICA'S NEW DIALOGUE: ANOTHER INTEGRATION IS POSSIBLE

Durán, Filinto, *Parlamento Latinoamericano. Venezuela*
Durán, Blanca, *PCS. Colombia*
Eslava, Adriana, *Caritas. Colombia*
Estabridis, Iliana, *PCS. Perú*
Fernández, Hugo, *UNITAS. Bolivia*
Fjallhed, Anders, *Consejo Noruego para Refugiados. Colombia.*
Florez, Gloria, *MINGA. Colombia*
Ferreira, Janete, *Comité Pro Refugiados - Conferencia Episcopal Ecuatoriana*
García-Naranjo, Aida, *Partido Socialista. Perú*
González, María José, *Cáritas. Venezuela*
González, Fermín, *Fundación Trabajo y Vida. Colombia*
Hansen, Merete, *Consejo Noruego para Refugiados. Colombia*
Londoño, Jenny del Pilar, *Coordinadora Política de Mujeres Ecuatorianas*
León, Victor, *Parlamento Amazónico. Venezuela*
Lozano, Angel, *Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales-FLACSO. Ecuador*
Lopez, Adolfo, *Secretaría General de La Comunidad Andina*
Morin-Labatut, Gisele, *International Development Research Center- IDRC. Canadá*
Moya, Carlos, *Partido Socialista. Chile*
Múnera, Leopoldo, *Universidad Nacional de Colombia*
Murphy, Brian, *Inter Pares. Canada*
Nuñez, Dionicio, *Cámara de Diputados.MAS. Bolivia*
Nuñez, Jorge, *Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana*
Ortega, Isabel, *Cámara de Diputados.MAS. Bolivia*
Parker, Carlos, *Comisión Internacional Comando Presidencial de Michelle Bachelet*
Pérez, Gustavo, *Sección Académica de Historia y Geografía de La Casa de La Cultura Ecuatoriana*
Raison, Emmanuel, *PCS. Colombia*
Remache, Alex, *Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar. Ecuador*
Rodas, German, *Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar. Ecuador*
Rodríguez, Hugo, *Partido Socialista del Uruguay. Frente Amplio*
Rodríguez, Óscar, *PCS. Colombia*
Roggo, Marie-Therese, *HEKS, Suiza*
Rojas, Jorge, *CODHES. Colombia.*
Romero, Marco, *Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar*
Ruiz Caro, Ariela Consultora independiente (CAN-MERCOSUR-TLC).
Ruiz, Alfredo Red de Apoyo por la Justicia y la Paz. Venezuela
Sáez, José, *Partido Socialista de Chile*
Salgado, Manuel, *Facultad de Economía de la Universidad Central del Ecuador*

Sams, Samantha, *PCS. Guatemala*

Sanchez, Diana, *Asociación MINGA. Colombia*

Sauer, Sergio, *Terra de Derechos. Brasil*

Serbin, Andrés, *Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales (CRIES), Instituto Venezolano de Estudios Sociales y Políticos (INVESP) - Centro de Estudios Globales y Regionales (CEGRE)*

Silva, Esteban, *Comisión Organizadora del Simposium*

Stanton, Kimberly, *PCS. Colombia*

Stuart, Ana María, *Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT). Brasil*

Symes, Jean, *Inter Pares. Canadá*

Valencia, Judith, *Comisión Presidencial de la Comisión Asesora de las Negociaciones del ALCA*

Varela, Patricia, *Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Chile*

Vargas, Ricardo, *Acción Andina. Colombia*

Veliz, Pedro, *Lutheran World Relief. Perú*

Yep, Mario, *PCS. Estudiante de Sociología de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú*

Zunino, Ana María, *PCS. Perú*