

McNair Scholars Journal

Volume 11 | Issue 1

Article 9

1-1-2007

The Latin American Consensus

Amanda Miralrio
Grand Valley State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair>

Recommended Citation

Miralrio, Amanda (2007) "The Latin American Consensus," *McNair Scholars Journal*: Vol. 11: Iss. 1, Article 9.
Available at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair/vol11/iss1/9>

Copyright ©2007 by the authors. McNair Scholars Journal is reproduced electronically by ScholarWorks@GVSU. http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair?utm_source=scholarworks.gvsu.edu%2Fmcnair%2Fvol11%2Fiss1%2F9&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

The Latin American Consensus



Amanda Miralrio
McNair Scholar



Polly Diven, Ph.D.
Faculty Mentor

Abstract

Anti-Americanism has reached an unsettling global high that has been manifested in everything from opinion polls to violent protests. Latin America is geopolitically important to the United States, while harboring anti-American sentiment. The history of U.S.-Latin America relations and the most recent public opinion polls are analyzed to unearth the roots of regional anti-Americanism. Two case studies include a country notorious for its blatant anti-Americanism (Venezuela) and a country traditionally allied with the United States (Mexico). Despite different political or historical relations with the United States, Latin American countries have come to an anti-American consensus.

Introduction

On President Bush's summer 2007 five-nation tour of Latin America, he was met by crowds of protesters angry about the Iraq War, immigration policy, or Bush's leadership. Anti-Americanism in Latin America is at an unsettling high, and there is reason to believe that it will not dissipate as soon as Bush leaves office. Historical, economic, and political causes all contribute to form a complex, sometimes ambivalent opinion of the United States and Americans. "The Latin American Consensus" attempts to determine the causes of Latin America's recent anti-Americanism and unearth the roots of anti-Americanism in the region.

Such a widespread dissatisfaction with the United States is worthy of investigation. Also, it seems a region sharing deep historical ties, numerous trade agreements, membership in international organizations, and millions of its citizens with the United States would be politically important to policymakers and scholars alike. However, Latin America has not been granted the political attention that it deserves, especially regarding research on anti-Americanism.

Research on the causes of global anti-Americanism often brushes over or entirely overlooks Latin America. In addition to lacking in the realm of research, the significance of anti-Americanism in Latin America is undervalued by policymakers as well. Areas like the Middle East have absorbed the majority of Americans' attention and concern about anti-Americanism. Concern over the Middle East is completely understandable, as violent anti-Americanism poses a grave threat. But as author Julia Sweig states, Latin America was "the cradle of Third World anti-Americanism long before radical Islamic terrorist groups would make their wrath felt" (2006, 8). The anti-Americanism Sweig refers to is still prevalent; recent polls unveil a majority of negative opinion toward the U.S. in many Latin American countries.

Methodology

In this study, existing literature, recent opinion polls, and two case study countries are used to unearth the causes of current anti-Americanism in Latin America. Mexico and Venezuela were used as case studies to explain the phenomenally high levels of anti-Americanism in Latin America because of their historical and political ties to the United States. While Mexico shares a border and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the U.S. and is a historical ally of the U.S., Mexicans have demonstrated high levels of anti-Americanism in polls. Mexico serves as a useful case study for other historical allies of the United States that are of the more economically developed Latin American countries. Countries such as Argentina, Brazil, and Chile are all historical U.S. allies and more economically developed than other Latin American countries, and demonstrate anti-Americanism in polls. The elections of leftist leaders opposed to U.S. foreign policy make Venezuela a valuable case study for examining the causes of anti-Americanism in these countries. It is clear how leaders such as Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez feel about the United States, but determining how the citizens perceive the U.S. merits our concern. The three-tiered model created by Polly Diven in her piece "The Complex and Contradictory Nature of Anti-Americanism" (2007) will be used as the theoretical framework for analysis for this study. This three-tiered model best embodies the multifaceted and integrated nature of the components of anti-Americanism.

Diven suggests that there are three categories of anti-Americanism. The first tier is the most long-term and deeply rooted, based on historical grudges held in a nation's collective memory as well as the current unipolar international system structure. These are factors that are either impossible or slow to change. For example, Mexicans still have not entirely forgotten the 1867 territorial acquisition of Mexico by the United States, even though over a century has passed. It is probably not the primary source of anti-Americanism, but it still serves as a base for other causes to add

on to. The second tier includes conflicts regarding cultural and value differences. The third tier includes anti-Americanism fueled by leadership and policy choices. These factors are often mistaken as the cause of anti-Americanism, though Diven claims that these factors are more symptomatic than causal. The third tier is short-term and easily changed, as it is based on opposition to specific leaders and policies. Diven argues that a mixture of the tiers combines to constitute anti-Americanism. Figureheads of U.S. foreign policy often become the target of anti-American protests. As Jose Figueres explained, "people cannot spit on a foreign policy, which is what they meant to do" (McPherson 2003, 9). Although this quote is in response to protests that took place in 1958 when Figueres was president of Costa Rica, this sentiment still holds true. President George W. Bush has been scorned worldwide, and Latin America is no exception. These tiers can be used to explain the depth of anti-Americanism, or how much opinion of the U.S. will change with the upcoming change in presidents, and how much is more deeply rooted and attributed to other factors.

Analyzing history, economics and politics separately yields a very different perception of anti-Americanism in a country than if one examines them in conjunction. Diven's three-tiered model creates a comprehensive view of anti-Americanism in a country because it effectively categorizes the causes of anti-Americanism, and it weights those categories to attribute their significance. Looking at economic relations alone between Mexico and the United States, it would appear that the countries had close relations and there was no reason for anti-Americanism. They are both members of NAFTA and remittances from Mexicans in the United States is Mexico's second largest source of Gross Domestic Product. The model recognizes that there are historical and structural reasons for anti-Americanism in Mexico. Venezuela's current leader is very anti-U.S. but the model recognizes that the Venezuelan people also have other reasons to harbor resentment toward the U.S.

Because each country in Latin

America has its own unique history and relationship with the United States, and because countless factors contribute to anti-Americanism, it is impossible to name every cause of anti-Americanism in each country. Mexico and Venezuela serve as excellent case studies for explaining the phenomena of different relations, yet similar views toward the U.S. Each country shares elements with a number of other Latin American countries that are potential causes for anti-Americanism.

Existing literature makes it clear that anti-Americanism exists and is a problem. Literature alone, however, is not sufficient to determine to what extent anti-Americanism is a problem in Latin America. Recent opinion polls are helpful in examining how Latin Americans feel about the United States for a couple of reasons. First, polls are the best method available of capturing the most recent, collective feelings of a country. Second, there are polls available on a wide range of topics, allowing us to examine the many facets that compose anti-Americanism and pinpoint areas that people feel the most strongly about. For these reasons, in addition to existing literature on anti-Americanism in Latin America this study analyzes the most recent opinion polls available pertinent to Latin Americans' opinions regarding the United States.

Literature Review

The definition of Anti-Americanism is widely debated but varies to include several factors such as opposition to American policies, culture, and economics. Each scholar writing on the topic includes their own definition and typology of anti-Americanism. Many of the works reviewed discuss the purpose of anti-Americanism in Latin America. The purpose of this paper, however, is not to argue the political effectiveness of Latin American anti-Americanism.

Although Latin America is not the focus of much of the existing research on anti-Americanism, the research pertaining specifically to how Latin America frames anti-Americanism in the region in three ways. Anti-Americanism in Latin America is characterized as irrational, as the understandable result of United

States imperialism and the neoliberal policies it advocates, or as a mixture of the two.

In his book *Yankee No! Anti-Americanism in U.S.-Latin American Relations*, Alan McPherson examines the historical roots of anti-Americanism in Panama, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic as case studies for the rest of Latin America (2003). McPherson concludes that anti-Americanism in those countries is a mix of opposition to US intervention in the region, a strong sense of national sovereignty, and the use of anti-Americanism as a political strategy. Although McPherson cites the use of anti-Americanism as a political strategy during Castro's revolution, it remains a useful strategy today. As Julia Sweig stated in an interview on Bush's Latin America tour, "there's nothing like George W. Bush as a target for whipping up nationalism and exploiting divisions in the hemisphere" (2007). McPherson adds to that sentiment in his article "Myths of Anti-Americanism: The Case of Latin America," stating that "something must be present in order to be 'whipped up,'" or anti-Americanism can be exploited by those in power, but cannot be created by those in power (2004, 148).

When describing the specific instances of U.S.-Latin American conflict of the 1960s in his country case studies, McPherson accuses the U.S. of making mistakes in its dealings with Latin Americans, but at the same time accuses Latin American anti-Americanism of being ambivalent. McPherson points out that in a place like Cuba, American culture had become such an integral part of Cuban culture it was almost hypocritical to become so opposed to the United States. In his article, McPherson dispels the "myths" that anti-American is irrational, and also the myth that all anti-Americanism is rational. He faults the U.S. for discounting anti-Americanism as an emotion, and the racism associated with the "perceived natural emotionality of 'Latins.'" Rather, McPherson argues that the emotional responses of Latin Americans are legitimate, given the trespasses of the United States against Latin America throughout history (2004, 144). McPherson notes that not all anti-American responses to the U.S. are

legitimate. He cites instances of Latin Americans rejecting reforms would have been favored, had they not been promoted by "Yankees." Targeting anger toward American citizens that have nothing to do with the formation of U.S. foreign policy is another instance of irrational anti-Americanism. This type of irrational attack occurred in 1965 in Panama, when Panamanians rebelling against U.S. ownership of the Panama Canal attacked anyone they presumed to be American (McPherson 2004).

Alvaro Vargas Llosa goes farther than McPherson in characterizing Latin American anti-Americanism as irrational. Llosa places the blame for Latin America's struggles entirely on the recent emergence of leftist leaders (2007). He rejects the view that the United States committed historical wrongs against Latin American countries. He attributes sluggish economies to be a result of economic mismanagement perpetuated by leaders such as Fidel Castro, Hugo Chavez, and Evo Morales.

Various authors cite rejection of the neoliberal economic policies of the Washington Consensus as the reason for Latin America's new anti-American Consensus. The failure of U.S.-propagated neoliberal reforms to incite growth, advance development, and eradicate extreme poverty has caused disappointment and resentment throughout the region, especially in Latin America's poor majority. As William Finnegan notes in his article "The Economics of Empire: Notes on the Washington Consensus," Argentina is one of the most tragic examples of the failure of neoliberal reforms. Its U.S.-mandated reforms of privatization, deregulation, trade liberalization, and tax reform either caused or failed to prevent its economic collapse in 2001, a letdown Argentineans have not forgotten (2003). It can be argued that this may be one factor in Argentina's current 32 percent approval of the U.S., shown in Table 4. Finnegan delineates the ways in which U.S. financial dominance over Latin America produces negative perceptions of the U.S. American dominance over international institutions serves as a source of negative opinion. Institutions such as the International Monetary Fund supersede national sovereignty and impose

reforms that have massive impact on the lives of Latin Americans. Finnegan argues that massive foreign debt and the repatriation of profits of multinational companies to other countries contributes to anti-Americanism in Latin America (2003).

According to Greg Grandin in his article "Latin America's New Consensus," the U.S. should not ignore the economic intentions of Latin America's leftist leaders. He estimates that roughly 300 million of Latin America's 520 million citizens live under governments that want to drastically reform or eradicate the Washington Consensus entirely (2006). That estimate is now larger, as more leftist leaders have been elected in Latin American countries since then. Leaders of Latin American countries are taking action to counter U.S. domination over regional economics. Mercosur, a trade agreement between a few South American nations, has been molded into a real alternative to the Free Trade Area of the Americas that the U.S. promotes. Those opposed to the Washington Consensus have observed and want to avoid the "market polygamy" that Mexico experienced after NAFTA, where "the U.S. can have multiple trading partners but each of those partners must remain faithful to it [the U.S.] alone" (Grandin 2006, 24).

Julia Sweig agrees with scholars who feel that anti-Americanism is the understandable result of bad U.S. foreign policy. In her book *Friendly Fire: Losing Friends and Making Enemies in the Anti-American Century*, Sweig blames a variety of factors for anti-Americanism. A large portion of anti-Americanism is caused by "the very fact of U.S. power," the same cause Diven allocates to Tier I of her three tiered model (Sweig 2006, 35). Diven and Sweig agree that the U.S. role of the hegemon is enough to incite resentment in countries. Sweig also chastises the United States for getting its information about how Latin Americans feel from the top twenty percent of the country's elites, rather than the eighty percent of the country's poor population. Similar to scholars such as George Grandin and William Finnegan, Sweig cites the failure of the Washington Consensus to produce wealth in Latin America as a

cause of anti-Americanism. Sweig states that if the 1980s were known as the “lost decade” in Latin America due to the economic chaos caused by hyperinflation, the 1990s was the decade of “lost hope” when the wealth that neoliberalism was supposed to bring never materialized. In Sweig’s opinion, this helped set the stage for the anti-Americanism the U.S. now faces in Latin America (Sweig 2006).

While there are many theoretical frameworks for analysis for anti-Americanism, Diven’s model highlights the multidimensional and integrated nature of the causes of anti-Americanism, and separates the categories of anti-Americanism into logical divisions. This model is flexible, in that it can be applied to single countries or stretched to include entire regions. Katzenstein and Keohane distinguish between types of anti-Americanism in their book *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics* (2007), but the division between liberal and social anti-Americanism is unnecessary. Focusing on one topic as the cause of anti-Americanism as Finnegan does is valid, but does not explain all types or the depth of anti-Americanism in the region. Rather than simply describe types of anti-Americanism, Diven’s model demonstrates how the different types build on one another to create anti-Americanism with varying depths. Because of its usefulness in determining potential causes as well as the depths of anti-Americanism, it will be used to analyze anti-Americanism in the following case studies.

Venezuela

Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez makes no secret of how he feels about President Bush. Chavez has made his opinion clear on a number of occasions, notably calling Bush the “devil” in front of the United Nations General Assembly in September of 2006. Examination of the most recent opinion polls reveals that Venezuelans do not have a very high approval of the United States. Only 41 percent of Venezuelans view the United States positively (Table 4), and 85 percent feel that the United States does not solve the world’s problems (Table 1). Venezuelan anti-Americanism goes deeper than the inflammatory language of its leader.

Tier I Analysis- History and System Structure

Latin America’s significance to the United States changed with the end of the Cold War and the emergence of a unipolar global power structure. During the Cold War, the United States battled to keep the Soviet Union from taking the influence over Latin Americans the U.S. had enjoyed since the Monroe Doctrine. In Cuba, the United States lost that battle. Numerous interventions in other countries ensured that other governments hostile to the United States were not allowed to stay in power. In today’s unipolar international system structure, the U.S. is no longer concerned about Soviet influence in the hemisphere and therefore not as concerned with the affairs of Latin American countries.

While most Latin American countries accept the U.S. as the global hegemon and work within that context, Venezuela is part of a growing movement of Latin American leaders who do not. Cuba has tried to undermine U.S. influence in Latin America since the Cold War, but does not have anywhere near the resources Venezuela has. The international system structure has proven to be a powerful source of anti-Americanism for Venezuela. It has spurred Hugo Chavez to strive to not only undermine U.S. power and influence, but to also try to establish Venezuela as the regional power. Chavez’s success in establishing Venezuela as a regional leader has been limited. While he has allies in leaders like Fidel and Raul Castro and Evo Morales, polls indicate that Latin Americans actually have the highest opinion of Brazil’s President Lula Da Silva. In addition, Brazil is the country Latin Americans trust most (Table 6). Regardless, Chavez has been using oil revenues to support the aid packages he extends to countries in an effort to stem U.S. global influence. Chavez has even subsidized oil in poor neighborhoods in New York, perhaps an effort to make the U.S. government appear negligent (Carillo 2005).

Venezuela, like many other Latin American countries, has been ruled by dictators for some time in the nation’s history. Those dictators supported U.S. interests in the region, and in turn received support from the United States.

The U.S. backed Juan Vicente Gomez from 1908 to 1935, and Marcos Perez Jimenez from 1950 through 1958. The United States’ support of Perez is what prompted the 1958 protests at Vice President Nixon’s visit to Caracas (Ewell 1996). There is a strong legacy of intervention attached to the United States in Latin America, one that factors greatly into the first tier of anti-Americanism, and within the context of the tier model, gives Latin America reason to have deeply rooted, or what Joseph Nye would call “legacy” anti-Americanism.

Tier II Analysis- Cultural and Economic Ties

Latin America has an interesting cultural relationship with the United States. Scholars such as McPherson and Patterson who have researched anti-Americanism in Latin America often highlight the ambivalent nature of Latin Americans regarding culture. Because the United States has had so much interaction with and influence in the region, American culture has been prevalent in Latin America as long as the U.S. has been a superpower.

Cuba and Venezuela are perfect examples of countries displaying ambivalence toward the U.S. As a result of the Platt Amendment in Cuba, Cuban culture was so heavily influenced by American culture that Cubans began rejecting America in an effort to define their own culture at the time Fidel Castro was struggling to take power. As Alan McPherson explained, “An anti-Americanism that went to the root of Cuba’s intimacy with the United States urged Cubans to admit how dependent they were on it for their very sense of themselves as a nation; reversing that dependence meant redefining ‘Cubanness’ itself” (2003, 49). Fidel Castro encouraged this rejection of the United States and used anti-Americanism as a source of nationalism and a point of political unification throughout his revolution. Venezuela and Cuba have faced similar situations. According to Judith Ewell, “Geography, history, and petroleum have thus facilitated a greater degree of ‘Americanization’ in Venezuela than any other Latin American nation” (1996, 5). In both Cuba and Venezuela, American baseball has gained more

popularity than futbol (soccer), which is the most popular sport in the rest of Latin America. On the other hand, both Cuba and Venezuela now have leaders that are notorious for their use of vehement anti-Americanism as a political platform. Just as Castro campaigned against American culture in Cuba, Hugo Chavez is enacting laws to preserve Venezuelan culture. Chavez recently passed a law that fifty percent of music played on the radio must be by Venezuelan musicians. Of the Venezuelan music, half of it must be traditional Andean folk music (Washington Post 2007). Despite the leaders of Cuba and Venezuela's distaste for American culture, much of the Latin American public likes it (Table 8). Latin Americans are, however, are opposed to the spread of American ideas and customs (Table 9). This opposition to the spread of American culture along with the emphasis on strengthening nationalism indicates a cultural conflict between the United States and many Latin Americans.

Aside from culture, a conflict that is unique to Venezuela is a conflict over resources, specifically petroleum. Since the economic boom of World War II in the U.S., and Venezuela became a vital oil supplier to the U.S., Venezuelan economy and politics has been influenced by this important investor (Ewell 1996). Throughout Venezuela's history, oil shortages gave Venezuelans bargaining power against the U.S., and in times of oil abundance, Venezuela was at a disadvantage. Oil interests played into which Venezuelan dictators the United States supported, and which leaders it chose to oppose (Ewell 1996). Currently, Venezuela is the world's fourth largest petroleum exporter, and an important supplier to the United States' staggering demand for oil (BBC 2002). The fact that Hugo Chavez has oil to bargain with makes his political rhetoric hard for the United States to ignore, and more reason for his anti-U.S. stance to be worrisome.

Tier III Analysis- Current Leadership and Policies

Venezuela is in no short supply of the components of anti-Americanism that make up Tier III. Venezuelans in general appear to be in contention with the

current leaders and policies of the United States. As was previously mentioned, Hugo Chavez is extremely opposed to the Bush administration and the policies attached to that administration. Chavez, like other Latin American countries, and much of the world for that matter, is opposed to the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Table 3 shows opposition to the Iraq war in four Latin American countries.

In 1992 Chavez was overthrown for a brief period in his first term of presidency by a coup. The U.S. was quick to recognize the new government and the image of the U.S. suffered when his presidency was restored by popular demand. Since then, Chavez has been convinced that the CIA supported that coup and that the Bush administration has planned assassination attempts on Chavez's life. The Bush administration denies this, but Chavez's suspicion adds to his antagonism towards Bush and his policies.

Political relations between the U.S. and Venezuelan governments are tense. Chavez has actively challenged U.S. hegemony by trying to undermine U.S. influence in any way possible. In addition to distributing subsidized oil to poor families New York, he has made political alliances with states hostile to the U.S. such as Iran and Cuba. While the opinions of a leader are not always the same as their constituents', Chavez not only has the support of the poor majority in his country, but also has many state-run media outlets to publicize his rhetoric, including a daily talk show. While Venezuelans may not necessarily agree with Chavez's opinions on the United States, polls indicate a low approval of the U.S., and Chavez may have some influence on those opinions. Regardless, political relations between the two countries are important to examine, as they factor into the third tier of anti-Americanism.

Mexico

Mexico was President Bush's last stop on his recent tour of Latin America, and like all of the other countries on the tour, Bush was met with protesters. The protests in Mexico largely focused on the Iraq war, and as Table 3 indicates, approximately 80 percent of Mexicans disapprove of the U.S. handling of the war in Iraq. Iraq, however, is only one

of the many points of contention Mexico has with its northern neighbor.

Tier I Analysis- History and System Structure

Historically, Mexico has been considered an ally of the United States. The two countries share a border, which automatically increases interaction and makes cooperation on security imperative. Various scholars have established that the unipolar international system structure is a source of global anti-Americanism. The wealth of economic, military, and political power the United States has amassed for itself inspires global criticism and envy. It makes perfect sense then for Mexico to harbor resentment or jealousy toward the United States due to the stark contrast in wealth between the two neighbors. As Mexican author Octavio Paz said, Mexico is "so far from God and so near to the United States" (McPherson 2004, 141). The United States is the wealthiest nation in the world, while around half of Mexico's citizens live in poverty (Rubio and Davidow 2006).

Although most Americans accept the continental United States as a given, Mexicans remember that the southwestern portion of the United States belonged to Mexico until 1867. States such as California, Arizona, and Texas used to be part of Mexico, and are now the states with the most concentrated populations of Mexican immigrants. In light of the fierce debate over the U.S. immigration regulations, Mexicans claim that "we did not jump the border, the border jumped us."

Because the United States is considered the global hegemon, it is often considered "accountable for a disproportionate share of the world's ills" (Diven 2007, 9), and in turn is expected to solve the world's problems. Mexico was not a functioning democracy for the seventy years that the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional* (PRI) dominated Mexican elections. During a substantial portion of this period the United States was the global hegemon and also claimed to promote democracy worldwide. For years, however, it did nothing to fix democracy in Mexico. When the United States is expected to solve problems perceived to be

in its capacity and does not do so, anti-Americanism grows. As Table 1 denotes, 74 percent of Mexicans feel that the U.S. does not solve the world's problems. This is clearly a negative perception of the United States, as this figure includes those who said the U.S. does "too much," those who said it does "too little," and those volunteering that the U.S. does "nothing" (Pew 2002).

In Latin America's case, the wrongdoing of the United States is usually that it has done too much. Starting with the Monroe Doctrine and followed by the Roosevelt corollary, military interventions, and pushing neoliberal economic reforms today, the United States has often taken the liberty of intervening in order to support U.S. interests in Latin America. This legacy of intervention in Latin America makes Latin Americans view U.S. actions as imperialism and an invasion of their sovereignty, a legacy that most do not welcome. Like almost every other Latin American country, Mexico has incidents of intervention by the United States embedded in its history. In 1914 President Wilson's troops took control of the city of Veracruz in order to overthrow the dictator Victoriano Huerta and install Venustiano Carranza in his place. Mexico and Venezuela are just two examples, but the United States has meddled in the affairs of almost every Latin American country at one time or another. This legacy of intervention has built a solid foundation for Tier I anti-Americanism in Latin America.

Tier II Analysis- Cultural and Economic Ties

Adding further cause for resentment is the fact that Mexico and the United States share membership along with Canada in the North American Free Trade Agreement. NAFTA was crafted in order to foment economic growth in all three nations, but over a decade into the agreement, Mexico has not benefited as much as it had desired. Mexico had high hopes for the agreement, and ex-President Carlos Salinas even amended Mexico's Constitution in order to participate in the agreement. Currently, Mexico's GDP growth rate is a modest 4.5%, and a GDP per capita of \$10,600 (CIA World Factbook

2007). NAFTA has exacerbated internal cleavages in Mexico as the southern, mostly indigenous populations feel that Mexicans in the northern states have gained disproportionately from NAFTA (Rubio and Davidow 2006). In fact, southern Mexicans from Chiapas were opposed to NAFTA from the very beginning. On January 1, 1994, the Zapatistas coordinated their peasant uprising to coincide with NAFTA taking effect. Mexican small farmers had reason to fear the effects of NAFTA. NAFTA opened Mexico's markets to U.S. corn imports, and Mexico's small farmers were unable to compete with the heavily subsidized American corn. It is possible that NAFTA could be part of the reason why 55 percent of Mexicans feel that the U.S. increases the gap between rich and poor (Table 1).

The most debated and most contentious conflict in U.S.-Mexican relations at the moment is the issue of immigration. As it stands, 500,000 Mexicans migrate to the United States annually (Reid 2006). An estimated eleven million undocumented immigrants currently reside in the United States, and a substantial portion of those people are Mexican (Rubio and Davidow 2006). Immigration is important to Mexicans because the United States can provide economic opportunities that Mexico cannot. Not only can workers earn better wages in the United States, but the remittances that are repatriated help family members who are left in Mexico to survive. Immigration is an important issue not only on the individual level, but on the governmental level also. The remittances sent from Mexicans in the U.S. comprise Mexico's second largest source of income. The previous president of Mexico, Vicente Fox, made immigration reform a priority of his administration and President Bush seemed receptive to negotiations. Any progress toward reform was lost, however, after the September 11th attacks occurred and securing U.S. borders became a priority.

The authorization by Congress to build a wall along the Mexican border has inflamed hostility from Mexicans. Simply constructing a wall will not stop the flow of unauthorized immigration. It does, however, send a message to Mexicans

that they are unwelcome in the United States. Another message came from the passage of HR4437 by the House of Representatives, a bill that would make unauthorized immigration a felony and allow for prosecution of anyone providing services to undocumented immigrants. This bill failed in the Senate, but sparked protests across the nation.

Current Mexican President Felipe Calderon has not dropped the issue of immigration from his political agenda. Mexico was President Bush's last stop on his recent goodwill tour of Latin America and Felipe Calderon bypassed easy diplomacy of skirting issues and pressed Bush for answers regarding immigration reform (Jackson 2007).

The U.S. government heavily emphasizes the issue of drug trafficking throughout all of Latin America. Because Mexico's shared border serves as an entry point for drugs, the issue is particularly stressed in dealing with Mexico. Because drug trafficking is so frequently the focus of dealings with Latin American countries, the citizens of these countries begin to harbor resentment toward the United States. As President Calderon points out, it is difficult for Mexico to slow down drug trafficking without a decrease in demand from the U.S. (Jackson 2007). There are many pressing issues that Latin Americans would like to see discussed with the United States, yet the discussions so often turn to drug trafficking. In a region that already feels neglected in comparison to other regions like the Middle East, ignoring the interests of Latin Americans does not foster good feelings. Latin Americans may feel coerced into complying with U.S. wishes regarding drugs, as the U.S. supplies aid to those countries who comply and disincentives to those who do not. Colombia has received over \$4 billion to combat drugs while Bolivia receives scorn from Washington for supporting coca production (Sweigt 2007).

Tier III Analysis- Current Leadership and Policies

The most short-term causes of anti-Americanism in Mexico center around the current U.S. administration and its foreign policies. On President Bush's

recent tour of Latin America he was met with protests at every stop. Most of the signs toted by angry Latin Americans were anti-Bush or anti-Iraq War. If Latin Americans' only source of anti-Americanism were what the signs claimed, eradicating anti-Americanism would be somewhat simple. Although the Iraq War has proven to be a greater undertaking than was originally forecasted, it will eventually end. President Bush's Presidency will definitely end in 2008. Tier III clearly plays a role in generating anti-Americanism, but it is unclear how much. Anti-Americanism in Latin America may decline as a result of the current leadership and policies, but it will not disappear based on the longer-term causes in Tier II and I.

Polls

The following collection of polls serves as a mechanism to gauge current levels of anti-Americanism in the region. Collectively, these polls demonstrate Latin American's multifaceted view of the United States. These polls can be cross-examined in several ways. A few polls indicate Latin America's overall approval of the U.S., including Table 2, Table 4, and Table 5. An interesting variable to compare in these tables is how rankings differ by country, and also how levels change depending on how the question is asked. In this example, it is unclear which of the three tiers any disapproval can be attributed to. On the other hand, polls such as Tables 8 and 9 fit into Tier II anti-Americanism, and Table 3 and Table 6 can be clearly classified as Tier III anti-Americanism.

The polls used are all conducted by the nonpartisan organizations of the Pew Research Center, Corporacion Latino-barometro, and the Program on International Policy Attitudes. All of the polls used are no less recent than the year 2002.

Polls from the Pew Global Attitudes Survey were all performed face-to-face, and while the polls in some of the countries claim to represent one hundred percent of the adult population, a problem in a few of the countries was that the sample was disproportionately urban, which could potentially influence people's opinions.

The Program on International Policy Attitudes conducted all four of the surveys in Latin American countries face-to-face. The surveys in Argentina and Mexico are supposedly representative of the entire nation, but the surveys in Brazil and Chile are representative of the urban population.

Surveys executed by Latinobarometro all claim to represent one hundred percent of the adult population living in the countries surveyed, with the exception of Chile and Paraguay. The percentage represented in those countries was 70 percent and 97 percent, respectively.

Table 1. Latin Americans' Opinions about the U.S. Solving the World's Problems and Increasing the Poverty Gap

	U.S. Doesn't Solve World's Problems (%)	U.S. Increases Poverty Gap (%)
Venezuela	85	48
Bolivia	76	74
Mexico	74	55
Guatemala	69	55
Honduras	67	45
Argentina	65	67
Brazil	65	60
Peru	60	55

* Includes those who said the U.S. does "too much," those who said it does "too little," and those volunteering that the U.S. does "nothing." The percentages above reflect that Latin American countries feel the United States does not act appropriately to help solve the world's problems, whether that means it does too much, not enough, or nothing at all. The other poll above shows that Latin American countries feel that the United States actually increases the gap between the world's rich and poor. Because Latin America is a region containing developing countries, poverty is a pressing problem to many Latin Americans. These polls reflect dissatisfaction with the U.S. role in solving global problems.

Source: Pew Global Attitudes Survey 2002

Table 2. Latin Americans' Opinions About U.S. Influence in the World as Mainly Positive or Mainly Negative

	Mostly Positive(%)	Mostly Negative (%)	Depends/Neither/Don't Know(%)
Argentina	13	64	23
Brazil	29	57	13
Chile	33	51	17
Mexico	12	53	35

Source: Program on International Policy Attitudes, 2006

Table 3. Latin Americans' Opinions About the U.S. Handling of the War in Iraq

	Approve (%)	Disapprove (%)	Don't Know (%)
Argentina	3	92	6
Brazil	12	85	3
Chile	23	65	12
Mexico	13	80	7

Source: Program on International Policy Attitudes, 2006

A poll on opinion about the Iraq War is useful because it demonstrates how stratifying an issue from the Third Tier can be. Table 3 demonstrates an overwhelming disapproval of the U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Table 4. Latin American Opinion About the United States

	Approval* (%)
Honduras	87
Panama	83
El Salvador	81
Guatemala	77
Costa Rica	75
Dom. Rep.	74
Peru	71
Colombia	70
Nicaragua	68
Ecuador	66
Chile	57
Brazil	53
Mexico	53
Bolivia	50
Paraguay	48
Venezuela	41
Uruguay	38
Argentina	32
L. America	61

* “Good” plus “very good” opinions of the United States

Source: Latinobarometro 2000-2005

Case studies Mexico and Venezuela have low approval of the United States, with 53 percent approval and 41 percent approval, respectively.

Table 5. Latin America’s Confidence in the United States

A little or no confidence	61%
A lot or some confidence	34%
Did not know/ Did not ask	5%

Source: Latinobarometro 2005

While there is a 61 percent average approval rating of the U.S. for Latin America, when asked a different question the results are much more negative. The same amount responded that they had little or no confidence in the United States, and only 31 percent responded that they had a lot of confidence or some confidence in the U.S.

Table 6. Image of Leaders*

	C. America	S. America	Total
Lula Da Silva	5.6	5.8	5.8
Hugo Chavez	4.5	5.2	5.0
Fidel Castro	3.4	4.8	4.4
G. W. Bush	5.6	4.1	4.8

*Q. I will list you a number of foreign leaders. I want you to evaluate them on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means a very bad evaluation and 10 very good. Or do you not know enough to have an opinion?

Source: Latinobarometro 2005

The above poll shows that despite the tensions between the two, Latin Americans rate Hugo Chavez and George W. Bush very similarly with a rating of a 5.0 and a 4.8 respectively.

Table 7. Most Trusted Latin American Countries

	Percentage Ranked Most Trusted
Brazil	11
Argentina	6
Chile	6
Costa Rica	5
Mexico	4
Venezuela	4
Colombia	3
Panama	2
Uruguay	2
Cuba	2
Ecuador	1
El Salvador	1
Guatemala	1
Honduras	1
Nicaragua	1
Peru	1

Source: Latinobarometro 2005

The above poll shows the frequency with which Latin Americans ranked the listed countries the country they trust most. Lula Da Silva is the leader Latin Americans trust most (Table 6) and Brazil the country Latin Americans trusts most. Mexico and Venezuela both earned

the same ranking for trustworthiness. Incidentally, the countries with the highest approval rating of the United States, such as Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala (Table 4), are also among the least trusted by other Latin American countries (Table 7). The inverse is also true: Brazil and Argentina have low approval ratings of the United States and are also the two most-trusted countries.

Table 8. Latin Americans’ Opinions on American Popular Culture

	Like (%)	Dislike (%)	Don't Know/ Refused to Answer (%)
Venezuela	78	20	2
Honduras	71	25	4
Guatemala	70	26	5
Brazil	69	29	2
Mexico	60	30	10
Peru	46	43	11
Bolivia	39	54	7
Argentina	52	38	10

Source: 2002 Pew Global Attitudes Survey

Table 9. Latin Americans’ Opinion on the Spread of American Ideas and Customs

	Good (%)	Bad (%)	Don't Know/ Refused to Answer (%)
Venezuela	44	52	4
Honduras	44	53	4
Guatemala	40	53	7
Peru	37	50	13
Brazil	30	62	8
Mexico	22	65	13
Bolivia	22	73	5
Argentina	16	73	11

Source: 2002 Pew Global Attitudes Survey

Latin Americans like American popular culture (Table 8), but disapprove of the spread of American ideas and customs (Table 9). Although Venezuela has a lower general approval of the U.S. than Mexico (Table 4), Venezuelans actually like American popular culture and approve of its spread much more than Mexicans. The approval of American culture but disapproval of the U.S. overall highlights the ambivalence that is an integral aspect to Latin American anti-Americanism.

Conclusions

The combination of polls and case studies have illuminated findings on anti-Americanism in Latin America in general, and in Venezuela and Mexico in particular. Although every country has its own unique history and relations with the United States, Mexico and Venezuela are case studies that are applicable to the rest of Latin America because they have events in their histories and elements in their relations that are shared with other Latin American countries. Diven's three-tiered model is a useful tool for analyzing anti-Americanism in Latin American countries. It has been able to explain why countries that have close relations with the U.S. can have reason to harbor resentment toward the United States. The model is also useful because it predicts how much of the anti-Americanism seen in polls is short-term and has the potential to dissipate with a new administration in power in the U.S. and how much is long-term and harder to change.

This research has tested a model that has never before been tested and found it to be very effective in determining the causes and significance of anti-Americanism in a country. Determining the causes of anti-Americanism is valuable in any region, and Latin America is not the exception it is treated as. Latin America is a region that was strategically important to the U.S. during the Cold War. The U.S. is no longer battling the Soviet Union for influence over the Western hemisphere but that does not mean that the U.S. is not in a battle over influence. Opinion polls indicate that anti-Americanism in Latin America is prevalent. While there is debate over the

consequences of anti-Americanism, an outcome of anti-Americanism is never that it advances U.S. interests and influence in an area where it is present.

It is not proven that the recent elections of leftist leaders in Latin America is a result of, or even correlated to, anti-Americanism in the region. It should not be discounted entirely, however, that this is not in any way a consequence of anti-Americanism, or will foster anti-Americanism as a consequence. Opposition to the neoliberal economic model promoted by the U.S. known as the Washington Consensus has fostered plenty of anti-Americanism on its own. The U.S. has made clear its position on the aforementioned leaders of Bolivia, Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Ecuador during their campaigns, and yet they were still elected into office. If the citizens of these countries were more concerned with staying in the good graces of the United States they would not have elected these leaders. Yet they did, which sends the message that anti-Americanism is undermining U.S. influence over the region.

A study of the causes of anti-Americanism in Venezuela reveals that a great deal of it can be attributed to Tier I and Tier III causes. The United States has a legacy of intervention in Latin America, and Venezuela is no exception. The U.S. has a history of supporting unpopular dictators in Venezuela and of opposing popular leaders. Infringement on sovereignty is cause for resentment in Venezuela and every other Latin American nation that has experienced it. A puzzling observation, however, is that the U.S. has much higher approval ratings in Central America, a region where the United States was very involved in horrific civil wars. This may mean that Tier I anti-Americanism plays a greater role in Venezuela than it does in Central American countries. It also appears that anti-Americanism in Venezuela comes from the Tier III causes or current U.S. leaders and policies.

Anti-Americanism in Mexico appears to come from more of a mixture of tiers than Venezuela. While Mexico has reason to harbor Tier I anti-Americanism and seems to be opposed to current U.S. leaders and policies, Tier II anti-Ameri-

canism has a greater role in Mexico than in Venezuela. This can be seen in Tables 8 and 9 where Mexicans generally like American popular culture but really dislike its spread. These conflicting opinions are an example of what scholars describe when they refer to Latin American ambivalence towards the United States. The United States and Mexico are still allies, but the current debate over immigration reform contributes greatly to Tier III anti-Americanism.

A mixture of history, politics, economics, and culture makes Latin America's view toward the U.S. a complex one. While countries as different as Mexico and Venezuela may disagree on a variety of issues, they are in agreement on the issue of the United States. Mexico and Venezuela are not, however, the only examples of countries in Latin America with very different ideologies and histories that are in consensus in their opposition toward the United States. A study of data and literature reveals that many countries, regardless of their differences, display anti-Americanism. ■

References

- Ballvé, Marcelo. 2005. "A New Wave of Anti-Americanism." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 38 (6): 37-41.
- Blinken, Antony J. 2001. "The False Crisis over the Atlantic." *Foreign Affairs* 80: 35-48.
- Carrillo, Karen Juanita. 2005. "As Promised, Chavez Sends Oil." *New York Amsterdam News* 96 (49): 4-45.
- "CIA - the World Factbook -- Mexico." 2007. *CIA World Factbook*: 149.
- Corporacion Latinobarometro. 2005. *Latinobarometro Report 2005*. Santiago: www.latinobarometro.org.
- "Country Profile: Venezuela." 2007. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/country_profiles/1229345.stm (June 19, 2007).
- Diven, Polly J. 2007. "The Complex and Contradictory Nature of Anti-Americanism." Conference Paper ed. Allendale.
- Economist. 2006. "A Partnership Constrained." 381 (849): 44-6.
- Ewell, Judith. 1996. *The United States and the Americas: Venezuela and the United States*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Finnegan, William. 2003. "The Economics of Empire." *Harper's Magazine* 306 (183): 41.
- Foreign Affairs. 2002. *America and the World*. Foreign Affairs.
- Gitlin, Todd. 2003. "Anti-Anti-Americanism." *Dissent* Winter.
- Globe Scan, and Program on International Policy Attitudes. 2004. 19 *Nation Poll on Global Issues: Questionnaire and Methodology*. Washington, D.C.: Program on International Policy Attitudes. http://www.pipa.org/archives/global_opinion.php (March 7, 2007).
- Grandin, Greg. 2006. "Latin America's New Consensus." *Nation* 282 (17): 23-7.
- Grandin, Greg. 2006. "Your Americanism and Mine: Americanism and Anti-Americanism in the Americas." *American Historical Review* 111 (4): 1042-66.
- Jackson, David. "Calderon Asks U.S. for Investment, Not Barriers." *USA Today*.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., and Robert O. Keohane, eds. 2006. *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*. Cornell University Press.
- McPherson, Alan. 2004. "Myths of Anti-Americanism." *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 10: 141-52.
- McPherson, Alan. 2003. *Yankee No! Anti-Americanism in U.S.-Latin America Relations*. Harvard University Press.
- Palast, Greg. "Warning to Venezuelan Leader," *BBC*, sec. Newsnight Archive. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/1985670.stm> (June 19, 2007).
- Paterson, Thomas G. 1994. *Contesting Castro: The United States and the Triumph of the Cuban Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pew Research Center. 2005. "Global Opinion: The Spread of Anti-Americanism." In *Trends 2005* Anonymous 2005th ed. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, 105-106-119. <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/206/trends-2005>.
- Reid, Michael. 2006. "Time to Wake Up." *Economist* 381 (8504): 3-5.
- Reuters, "Chavez Backs Ecuador in Attacking U.S. Drug War," *The New York Times*, December 21, sec. A; Foreign Desk. 15.
- Rubio, Luis, and Jeffrey Davidow. 2006. "Mexico's Disputed Election." *Foreign Affairs* 85 (5): 75-85.

Schama, Simon. 2003. "The Unloved America." *The New Yorker* 79 (3): 54.

Slouka, Mark. 2002. "A Year Later." *Harper's Magazine* 305 (182): 34.

Sweig, Julia E. 2006. *Friendly Fire: Losing Friends and Making Enemies in the Anti-American Century*. Public Affairs.

Sweig, Julia, and Bernard Gwertzman. 2007. "Sweig: Bush's Latin America Trip 'Ineffective'." <http://www.cfr.org/publication/12837/sweig.html> (May 24, 2007).

"The View from Abroad." 2005. *Economist* 374 (8414): 24-6.

World Public Opinion. 2007. "Latin American Publics are Skeptical about US—But Not about Democracy." <http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/brolatinamericara/328.php?nid=&id=&pnt=328&lb=brla> .