Repression, Human Rights, and US Training of Military Forces from the South

Ruth Joanna Blakeley

A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Bristol in Accordance with the Requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, Department of Politics, October 2006

Word Count: 79,971

ABSTRACT

In order to understand whether US training of military forces from the South has resulted in the use of repression or improvements in human rights, we need to situate the training within the broader context of US foreign policy objectives and strategies. The main aims of US foreign policy are to maintain its dominant global position and to ensure control of resources and markets in the South. These objectives are being pursued through an emerging, US-led transnational state, using the instruments of legitimation at least as much as repression. This contrasts with the Cold War, during which US foreign policy strategy towards the South emphasised repression. US training of military forces from the South during the Cold War played a key role in a US-led network, through which many states in the South were connected to the US and each other by cooperation between their militaries, police and intelligence services. The training was dominated by a particular form of counterinsurgency instruction which advocated repression of groups that might potentially threaten US control of Southern economies and assets. This contributed to widespread human rights violations, particularly in Latin America. Following the end of the Cold War, reliance on coercion diminished, and it was subsumed within the emergent transnational state. In line with this shift in US foreign policy strategy in the South, some aspects of the training began to be characterised by the promotion of legitimation. In the wake of 9/11, the US has intensified both its legitimation efforts and its use of repression, and the training continues to play a significant role in the service of US foreign policy objectives.

For Steve, best friend, first love, and biggest inspiration,

and for Eric, great friend and mentor

Acknowledgements

I have been wonderfully supported throughout this research, professionally and personally, and acknowledge all those who have helped me along the way.

A very big thank you to Eric Herring, for his support and guidance throughout the project. The learning curve would have been steeper without him.

The UK Economic and Social Research Council funded the research, for which I am grateful.

I would like to thank the thesis examiners, Richard Jackson and Paul Higate, for invaluable comments and suggestions which have helped further refine the work.

The project would not be what it is without those who helped arrange my field work at the Pentagon and at WHINSEC, particularly Kent Johnson, who has also read drafts of the work, and Ken LaPlante and Lee Rials. I also offer my thanks to all interviewees at the Pentagon and at WHINSEC, and to Deborah Avant and Steven Schneebaum, both members of the WHINSEC Board of Visitors in 2004.

I am grateful to members of various NGOs in Washington DC who agreed to be interviewed, including Roy Bourgeois, Jacqueline Baker, Eric LeCompte, David Mazzera, Eric Olson, and Rachel Stohl.

Special thanks to Adam Isacson from the Centre for International Policy, who has read drafts of the work and suggested various sources, and to Carlos Osorio at the National Security Archive, who was so generous in provided access to many thousands of valuable documents.

I thank the following for providing comments on drafts of the work at various stages: Stephen Blakeley, Anna Stavrianakis, Doug Stokes, Rob Dover, John Pilger, Vernon Hewitt, Judith Squires, Dave Whyte, Jonny Burnett, Dave Miller, Sam Raphael, Bill Bowring, Tony Mckeown, and Nick Kerton-Johnson.

Thanks to Vicky Mendez-Goya and René and Cathy Padilla who helped inspire the work.

And finally, special thanks to Stephen Blakeley, Anna Stavrianakis, Rob Dover, Pam Richards, Vicky Noy, Andy Butterworth, Katie and Steve Kelly, Helen and John Gilbert, James and Tamsin Gilbert, Isobel and Philip Blakeley, Joni Breault, Robert Schmidt, the Stephens family, Yvonne Wilbanks, Kate Smith, Lucy McFarlane, Jenny Wills, Lisa Yates, Julia Odell, and Nick Kerton-Johnson, who have all helped me practically and been patient, understanding and supportive throughout the project.

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the Regulations of the University of Bristol. The work is original, except where indicated by special reference in the text, and no part of the dissertation has been submitted for any other academic award. Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author.

Signed…… Date…….

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AI	Amnesty International
CI	Counterinsurgency
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIP	Centre for International Policy
DoD	Department of Defence
DoS	Department of State
DSCA	Defence Security Cooperation Agency
FARC	Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia)
FMF	Foreign Military Financing
FMLN	Frente Farabundo Martí de Liberación Nacional (left-wing party, El Salvador)
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
FOIA	Freedom of Information Act
FRAPH	Front for the Advancement and Progress of Haiti
FTAA	Free Trade Agreement for the Americas
GAO	General Accounting Office (US)
HRW	Human Rights Watch
IAAFA	Inter-American Air Force Academy
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IHRL	International Human Rights Law
IMET	International Military Education and Training
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
LOAC	Laws of Armed Conflict
LOW	Laws of War
MI	Military Intelligence
MTTs	Mobile Training Teams
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NED	National Endowment for Democracy
NSA	National Security Archive
NSS	National Security Strategy
OACSI	Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence
ONUSAL	UN Observer Mission to El Salvador
PICs	Province Interrogation Centres (Vietnam)

PKI	Indonesian Communist Party
ROE	Rules of Engagement
SOA	School of Americas
SOAW	School of Americas Watch
SROE	Standing Rules of Engagement
TSE	Tribunal Supremo Electoral (Supreme Electoral Tribunal, El Salvador)
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAICS	US Army Intelligence Centre and School
USARCARIB	US Army Caribbean Command
USARSA	United States Army School of the Americas
VCI	Vietcong Infrastructure
WHINSEC	Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation
WTO	World Trade Organisation

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This project explores the impact of US training of military forces from the South on the use of repression and the promotion of human rights.[1] The US currently trains military forces from 150 countries worldwide.[2] This training takes place at various military training schools across the US, as well as at military bases in many countries. Unknown numbers of small teams of Special Forces are sent all over the world to deliver training every year.[3] While some of the training is paid for by the recipient countries, much of it is funded by the US tax payer. The US is the most powerful country in the world in terms of its military reach, responsible for 48 percent of the world's total military expenditure, which exceeds the combined military spending of the next fourteen countries.[4] Its military training of forces from other states has increased significantly since the advent of the "War on Terror", with funds appropriated for foreign military training increasing from $50 million in 2000 to $70 million in 2002, and $90 million expected for 2007.[5] There is no recent research that assesses the nature and functions of this training in the South.[6] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman analysed the relations between the US and the Third World, or South, over a quarter of a century ago, in 1979, focusing on human rights, with some analysis of US foreign military training.[7] There has been no comprehensive research in this area since their study. My research will build on and modify those aspects of their work that relate to the training. I will situate this within the context of US foreign policy continuities, and shifts in US strategies associated with the end of the Cold War and 9/11.

---

[1] I use the term "military forces" throughout to refer to the official armed forces (air force, navy and army) of a particular state. This excludes paramilitary and volunteer forces and the police. I acknowledge that the US military, and private US military companies, also provide training for various other state and non-state armed actors in the South, beyond the official armed forces. Where reference is made to US training of groups other than the official armed forces, such as paramilitaries or police, I explicitly stated that this is the case.

[2] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)', US Department of State, 2002-2007, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/cbj/>

[3] Laura Lumpe, 'US Foreign Military Training: Global Reach, Global Power, and Oversight Issues', Foreign Policy in Focus, May 2002, <http://www.fpif.org/papers/SRmiltrain.pdf>

[4] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), 'The Fifteen Major Spender Countries in 2005', 2006, <http://www.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_trends.html>; 'SIPRI Year Book 2006: Armaments, Disarmament, and International Security, Chapter Summaries', 2006, <http://yearbook2006.sipri.org>

[5] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)'; DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts. As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 2003, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf>

[6] Deborah Avant has nevertheless undertaken work which assesses the increasing subcontracting of such training by the US to private military companies, but without delving deeply into the nature and functions of the training in relation to repression and human rights. See Deborah Avant, *The Market for Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp.152-154.

[7] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism: The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol I, (Boston: South End Press, 1979); and After the Cataclysm. Postwar Indochina and the Reconstruction of Imperial Ideology. The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol II, (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1979).

To date the only public debates about the training have been initiated by human rights groups who allege that some of this training has resulted in repression. A key question that my research addresses is the purpose of the training and its relationship to repression and human rights. This needs to be understood within the wider context of US foreign policy, particularly, the role of the US state within the global capitalist system. This is because US foreign policy objectives include increasing returns for US capital and expanding the global capitalist system in the South. It may be that the training, either directly or indirectly, plays a role in achieving this goal. This project therefore accesses and contributes to the global capitalism debate by exploring the role of US foreign policy more broadly and the training specifically in the spread of global capitalism. The study focuses initially on training of Latin American military forces, and then broadens out to consider training across the South. This is because US engagement with Latin America has been more intensive than with any other continent. It also considers the attempts by School of Americas Watch (SOAW), a human rights NGO, to close one of the US training schools for Latin Americans, the School of the Americas (SOA), and considers the impact of the SOAW campaign on SOA and the rest of the training.

Drawing on historical materialist theory and critical security studies, I take a normative approach, the purpose of which is to offer a critique of foreign policy within a broader social and political context, with the aim of generating ideas to help emancipate people from oppression.[8] For this reason the research emphasise the human rights impacts of the training. This approach contrasts with orthodox IR approaches, because it rejects the notion that the purpose of IR is to solve problems within the limits of the existing systems and structures.[9] Those existing systems and structures can themselves exacerbate or even cause oppressive practices. The dominant approach in IR, for example, has and continues to be political realism. This has, as Ken Booth argues, "attempted to impose just one image of reality on a world […] with predefined answers to key global questions."[10] This can result in ideological bias, because it serves to maintain certain national, sectional or class interests, while claiming to be value-free and objective.[11] In the case of realism, the notion of a fixed political and social order is, as Booth points out, "congenial for those who prosper from the intellectual hegemony of a top-down, statist, power-centric, masculinised, ethnocentric, and militarised worldview of security."[12] It has, however, been detrimental to large portions of the world's

[8] Ken Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics,* (London: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2005), p.11.
[9] Ibid. p.10.
[10] Booth, Critical Security Studies, p.4.
[11] Robert Cox, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies,* vol.10, no.2, (1981), p.129.
[12] Booth, Critical Security Studies,p.9.

population. Such images of reality, and the behaviours that ensue, should be challenged.[13] We can of course seek to find solutions to problems, but we do so by standing outside the given framework and calling into question its institutions and social and power relations in order to assist in the emancipation of those who are oppressed.

Chapter outline

The remainder of this chapter will outline the relevant literature, key concepts and methodology. In chapter two I develop the theoretical framework for the thesis. I argue that US foreign policy objectives in the South have been characterised by continuities, namely the protection and promotion of US political and economic interests. I then theorise the relationship between these objectives and the role that the US state plays, along with a number of other agents, in the spread of the global political economy in the South, in order to ensure that its foreign policy objectives are met.

Chapter three argues that while US foreign policy objectives have been characterised by continuities, the means for achieving those objectives have been characterised by discontinuities. I develop a periodisation of US foreign policy strategy comprising three phases: the Cold War, characterised primarily by coercion including support for repression; the post-Cold War years, characterised primarily by legitimation, which involves securing popular endorsement for democracy and neoliberalism; and the period since 9/11, during which legitimation efforts in the South have intensified, but have been accompanied by a resurgence in repressive strategies, including torture. Repression as a key US foreign policy tool is then contextualised, and I show that despite its prominence, it is largely precluded from mainstream IR studies. As a consequence, the use of torture by the US and its allies is also largely ignored. I develop a framework to account for the functions of torture and establish the degree to which democratic Great Powers from the North, and the US in particular, differ from authoritarian states in relation to its use. The degree to which repression, including torture, features as a tool of US foreign policy is then threaded through the remaining chapters.

In chapter four, I provide a more detailed analysis of US foreign policy strategy during the Cold War, demonstrating that the use of repression by the US was extensive, particularly in Latin America and Indochina.

[13] Ibid. p.11.

Chapter five assesses US military training of forces from the South during the Cold War in relation to repression and human rights, using the School of the Americas (SOA) as the primary case study. This includes an exploration of the nature and purposes of the training, through analysis of training materials used at SOA, and of the ways in which the US was involved in sponsoring torture during that period. I show that the training reflected wider US foreign policy strategies during the Cold War.

In chapter six I analyse US foreign policy strategy in the post-Cold War period, showing that US foreign policy strategies were broadly characterised by legitimation in order to spread capitalism in the South up until 9/11, but which, since the advent of the "War on Terror" have involved increased support for repression by the US state, including the use of torture.

Chapter seven comprises an analysis of the training since the end of the Cold War, in relation to repression and human rights. This explores whether the shift in US foreign policy strategy since the Cold War was reflected in the training, with a specific focus on WHINSEC, and then determines whether the resurgence of repression since 9/11 is reflected at WHINSEC and beyond.

In the concluding chapter I outline the nature, purposes and intended outcomes of the training in relation to repression and human rights during the three periods explored in the preceding chapters. I then provide an account of the transnational collaborations that the US has had to establish in order to achieve its foreign policy objectives in the South, showing how the training fits within them. I then evaluate limitations of the research, and possible future research agendas. Finally I outline the implications of this research for activists, policy-makers and academics.

Relevant literature and its limitations

This research draws on five main bodies of literature: historical materialism; US and Latin American relations; the role of the military in Latin America; repression and human rights; and US training of military forces from the South and its relationship to repression and human rights.

The historical materialist literature provides the theoretical underpinnings of this project. Firstly, as I will show in chapter two, the continuity thesis provides the theoretical framework

for this project.[14] The historical materialist literature also considers the relations between the US and the South, the differing functions of repression and legitimation within US foreign policy, the way in which global capitalism operates, and the role that the US plays in its operation.[15] This literature is discussed in detail in chapters two and three.

The literature on US and Latin American Relations does not directly address the question of the impact of US military training upon repression and human rights. It does look at the role of the US more broadly in Latin America. This literature falls into two main categories. The first is the orthodox approach, which considers the role of the US in supposedly containing communism. This body of literature falls into two sub-divisions, the more conservative literature which argues that the policy of containment was necessary to curb the expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union;[16] and the more liberal literature which accepts the continuity thesis, but argues that sometimes US fears were overstated. It also accepts a more important role for the influence of domestic groups over US foreign policy, in contrast to the more conservative literature which sees US domestic politics as playing an insignificant role.[17] The revisionist literature comprises the second, and contrasting body of literature that

---

[14] Doug Stokes, 'Why the End of the Cold War Doesn't Matter: the US War of Terror in Colombia', *Review of International Studies*, vol.29, no.4, (2003), pp.560-585; and Doug Stokes, *America's Other War*, (London: Zed Books, 2005), pp.18-38. See also Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy*, Second Edition (London: Vintage Books, Verso, 1992); and Gabriel Kolko, *Confronting the Third World. United States Foreign Policy 1945-1980*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), pp.ix-xiii.

[15] On the relations between the US and the South see Chomsky and Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*; Eduardo Galeano, *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*, 1997 (25th Anniversary edition) (New York: Monthly Press Review, 1973), pp.265-285; Stephen Gill, *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), pp.73-92 and 159-180; Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, 'Policing and Global Governance', in Mike Barnett and Raymond Duvall (eds.), *Power in Global Governance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp.59-79. On the differing functions of repression and legitimation within US foreign policy see Stephen Gill, *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), pp.73-92 and 159-180; Nicos Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, Translated by O'Hagan, Timothy, (London: Verso, [1968] 1987); and William Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention, and Hegemony*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). William Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention, and Hegemony*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, 'Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations', *Millennium*, vol.31, no.1, (2002), pp.109-127; Roger Burbach and Jim Tarbell, *Imperial Overstretch. George W Bush and the Hubris of Empire*, (London: Zed Books, 2004); Alex Colas and Richard Saull (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2006); Peter Gowan, *The Global Gamble. Washington's Faustian Bid for World Dominance*, (London: Verso, 1999); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*, (New York: Harvard University Press, 2000); Bob Jessop, 'Globalisation and the National State', Department of Sociology, University of Lancaster, 2003, <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Jessop-Globalization-and-the-National-State.pdf>; William Robinson, *The Crisis of Global Capitalism and the Folly of Conventional Thinking on It*, (Santa Barbara: University of California, Department of Sociology, 2005); Mark Rupert and Hazel Smith (eds.) *Historical Materialism and Globalisation*, (London: Routledge, 2002); Doug Stokes, 'The Heart of Empire? Theorising US Empire In An Era Of Transnational Globalisation', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, no.2, (2005), pp.217-236; and Susan Watkins, "A Weightless Hegemony", *New Left Review*, vol.25, (2004), pp.5-33.

[16] Martin Diskin, *Trouble in Our Backyard: Central America and the United States in the Eighties*, (New York: Pantheon, 1983), ; Arthur Schlessinger, 'The Origins of the Cold War', *Foreign Affairs*, vol.46, (1967), pp.22-52; and Hugh Seton-Watson, *Neither War Nor Peace: The Struggle for Power in the Post-War World*, (New York: Praeger, 1969).

[17] Thomas Carothers, *In the name of democracy. US Policy towards Latin America in the Reagan Years*, (California: University of California Press, 1991), Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States*, (London and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press); and *National Security and US Policy toward Latin America*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987).

considers US and Latin American Relations. It argues that US foreign policy in Latin America has been shaped by continuity, with a commitment to protecting elite privilege whatever the cost to human rights. It considers the direct impact of US foreign policy on repression and human rights in Latin America, and situates this within the broader, revisionist approach to US foreign policy, as I will discuss in chapter two.[18]

The literature on the role of the military in Latin America considers the development of the militaries in Latin America and their gradual subservience to democratically elected governments, following periods in which they played a key role both as leaders of the state through military dictatorships, and as a force for repression and control under authoritarian governments. This literature is rooted in the thesis most famously developed by Samuel Huntington in *The Soldier and the State*.[19] Huntington argues that all modern countries have created militaries with professional officer corps characterised by extensive training and specialised norms of behaviour. In contrast to pre-professional militaries, the professional military is characterised by its ethical code which defines the military's societal responsibilities and relationship with the rest of society, by which he means individual and collective subordination to higher civilian authority. By implication states not considered to be "modern" are therefore unlikely to have militaries that are subordinate to civilian authorities.

The literature which deals with the role of the military in Latin America, often referred to as the "back to the barracks" literature, builds on Huntington's thesis and views militaries under the dictatorships in Latin America as characteristic of pre-modern military institutions. It argues that following the periods in which numerous Latin American countries came under the control of military governments, the transition to democracy entailed the professionalisation of the militaries, often with the US military as their model, and it was at this stage that the militaries of Latin America began to adhere to the requirement to serve the state, rather than the other way round. Key works that explore this phenomenon are those by J. Samuel Fitch, Wendy Hunter, Robert Harding III, and Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt.[20]

---

[18] Kolko, Confronting the Third World; Noam Chomsky, Turning the Tide. US Intervention in Central America and the Struggle for Peace, (Boston: Pluto Press, 1985); Chomsky and Herman, The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism; Galeano, Open Veins of Latin America; Stokes, America's Other War; "Better Lead than Bread? A Critical Analysis of the US' Plan Colombia", Civil Wars, vol.4, no.2, (2001); and "Why the End of the Cold War Doesn't Matter".

[19] Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* (New York: Random House, 1957).

[20] John Samuel Fitch, *The Armed Forces and Democracy in Latin America*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp.1-35 and 134-174; Robert Harding, 'Military Extrication and Democracy in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Argentina in the 1990s: A Comparative Study', Latin American Studies Association, 2001, <http://136.142.158.105/Lasa2001/HardingIIRobert.pdf>; Wendy Hunter, 'State and Soldier in Latin America: Redefining the Military's Role in Argentina, Brazil and Chile', United States Institute of Peace, 1996, <http://www.usip.org/pubs/peaceworks/state10/summ10.html>; Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt, 'Latin American Political Armies in the Twenty-first Century', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol.22, no.3, (2003), pp.371-384.

The works by Fitch, Hunter and Harding tend to address the extent to which the professionalisation of the military has been successful, and makes suggestions for reform that would further this success. There is little discussion of the role that the US played in condoning the activities of these militaries while they operated in partnership with military dictators.

The work by Koonings and Kruijt is more nuanced, situating the question of ongoing military violence within the context of the causes of contemporary conflict.[21] One such cause, it is argued, is under-development and state failure, which can involve, as Mary Kaldor argues, "the loss of control over and the fragmentation of the instruments of physical coercion."[22] Koonings and Kruijt argue that the failures endemic in these states that are causing increasing violence by various state actors and paramilitary groups are the result of the failure of neoliberal economic policies and weakened state structures to deliver the basic needs of their citizens, such as jobs and minimum standards of living. This work focuses heavily on the failures within those states, with little emphasis on the role played by the US in shaping institutions within developing states for the purposes of easing the transnational flow of capital. I will look more closely at the direct role that successive US administrations have played in shaping the Latin American militaries for very particular purposes.

The literature on US military training of forces from the South and its relationship to repression and human rights is limited to a small number of studies. While not directly exploring the nature of the training, work by Michael Klare on the use of proxy armed groups in the South does explore the secret *quid pro quo* arrangements between the US and numerous states, in which the US offered military training as well as hardware and financial support to states and paramilitary groups in return for cooperation in US-initiated, usually secret, military operations in other states.[23] Michael McClintock, and others in the Latin America Working Group, as well as Doug Stokes, have explored the use of counterinsurgency (CI) by the US during the Cold War in Latin America, focusing on the degree to which this exacerbated repression in Latin America.[24] The Latin American Working Group in conjunction with the Centre for International Policy have, in recent years,

---

[21] Koonings and Kruijt, *Armed Actors.*
[22] Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars. Organised Violence in a Global Era*, Second Edition, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2001), p.92. See also Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, (London: Zed Books, 2001), pp.108-135.
[23] Michael Klare, 'Subterranean Alliances: America's Global Proxy Network', *Journal of International Affairs*, vol.43, no.1, (1989), pp.97-118.
[24] Michael McClintock, *The American Connection, Volume One: State Terror and Popular Resistance in El Salvador,* (London: Zed Books Ltd, 1985); *Instruments of Statecraft,* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992). This is no longer in print, but is available online: <http://www.statecraft.org/index.html> accessed June 2003; and 'The United States and Operation Condor: Military Doctrine in an Unconventional War', (paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association Conference, Washington DC, September 2001); and Stokes, *America's Other War.*

compiled detailed accounts of US training for military forces from Latin America, in terms of numbers of students trained, countries of origin of those students, locations where the training takes place, drawing on the annual foreign military training reports of the US Departments of State and Defence.[25] Work by Deborah Avant has examined the subcontracting of military training for Croatian forces to private military companies in recent years, and while my work focuses on training by US military forces rather than private companies, this development is significant.[26]

Research by Amnesty International (AI) and by Laura Lumpe is the only work to date that has explored the extent of US military training of foreign forces across the globe.[27] In addition, work by Martha Huggins, while not directly concerned with US military training of Latin Americans, does consider the training of police forces in Latin America by the US and is therefore relevant to some of the broader questions of this study.[28] The remainder of the literature focuses predominantly on the School of the Americas (SOA). Such research has been undertaken by Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer; Kathryn McCoy; and Leslie Gill, and is discussed in more detail in chapter five.[29]

The literature on human rights and repression falls into three main categories. The first of these is work undertaken mainly by International Organisations committed to preventing human rights abuses, and by NGOs campaigning against human rights abuses. Often it is these groups that undertake important work to assess the scale of human rights abuses during periods of repression, who seek to support people in their pursuit of justice, and who seek to begin processes of reconciliation following periods of violence. Such work has been undertaken by AI, Human Rights Watch (HRW), and UN Truth Commissions.[30]

---

[25] CIP, 'Just the Facts: A Civilian's Guide to US defence and security assistance to Latin America and the Caribbean', Centre for International Policy, 2002, <http://www.ciponline.org/facts>; Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest: Joint Report to Congress', Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, US Department of State and Department of Defense, 2001-2004, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/>

[26] Avant, *The Market for Force*, pp.152-154.

[27] AI, 'Unmatched Power, Unmet Principles: The Human Rights Dimensions of US Training of Foreign Military and Police Forces', Amnesty International, 2002, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/stoptorture/msp.pdf>; Laura Lumpe, 'US Foreign Military Training: Global Reach, Global Power, and Oversight Issues', Foreign Policy in Focus, 2002, <http://www.fpif.org/papers/SRmiltrain.pdf>

[28] Martha Huggins, Political Policing. The United States and Latin America, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).

[29] Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer, *School of Assassins*, (New York: Orbis Books, 1997 and 2001); Lesley Gill, *The School of the Americas. Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas;* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); Katherine McCoy, 'Trained to Torture: A Statistical Analysis of Human Rights Violations Committed by Graduates of the US Army School of the Americas, 1960-2000', (University of Wisconsin, Master of Science Thesis, 2003).

[30] For work by AI see AI, 'The Inescapable Obligation of the International Community to Bring to Justice Those Responsible for Crimes Against Humanity Committed During the Military Government in Chile', Amnesty International, 1998, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/ENGAMR220161998> For HRW reports see HRW, 'Colombia's Killer Networks: The Military-Paramilitary Partnership and the United States', Human Rights Watch, 1996, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1996/killertoc.htm>; HRW, *El Salvador's Decade of Terror*, (New York: Human Rights Watch / Americas, 1991); HRW, *Untold Terror. Violence Against Women in Peru's Armed*

The second body of literature that falls within the human rights and repression category is that which considers the question of state terrorism. State terrorism is defined as threats or acts of violence carried out by representatives of the state against the people of that state to instil fear for political purposes. Such work has been undertaken by Noam Chomsky, Alexander George, and Frederick Gareau.[31] This work contrasts with mainstream work on terrorism which focuses on the threats posed to Northern democratic states, discussed in more detail in chapter three.

The third body of literature that falls within the human rights and repression category is that which looks at the use, and sponsorship or condoning of torture by Western democratic states.[32] An essential question at the heart of my research, that links to the foreign policy agenda of the US, is that of the relationship of Northern democratic states to the use of torture. One of the main assumptions implicit in the research to date is that US military training of forces from the South has been instrumental in the use of torture in Latin America. However, little research has been undertaken to assess the extent to which Western states in general, and the US in particular, engage in the use of torture, nor to assess what functions it is intended to serve. There is an unspoken assumption that Northern democracies do not

---

Conflict, (Washington DC: Human Rights Watch / Americas, 1992), and for UN reports see Thomas Buergenthal, 'The United Nations Truth Commission for El Salvador', *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol.27, no.3, (1994), pp.497-544.

[31] Noam Chomsky, *The Culture of Terrorism*, (London: Pluto Press, 1989); *The New War Against Terror*, M.I.T., 18 October 2001, < http://www.zmag.org/GlobalWatch/chomskymit.htm>; Chomsky and Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*; *After the Cataclysm*; Frederick Gareau, *State Terrorism and the United States. From Counterinsurgency to the War on Terrorism*, (London: Zed Books, 2004); and Alexander George, *Western State Terrorism*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

[32] On the role of the individual in torture, and the capacity of society to deny its use within and by their own countries, see Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial. Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001); and Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority*, (London: Tavistock Publications, 1974). On the use of torture as a form of punishment see Cesare Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*, Translated by Richard Davies, Edited by Richard Bellamy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1764] 1995); and Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, Translated by Alan Sheridan, (London: Penguin Books, 1977). The following scholars have undertaken research to assess the role of the individual and of totalitarian states in torture: Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966); Edward Peters, *Torture*, (New York: Basil Blackwell Inc, 1985); and Darius Rejali, 'How Not to Talk About Torture: Violence, Theory and the Problems of Explanation', in Martha Huggins (ed.) *Vigilantism and the State in Modern Latin America: Essays in Extralegal Violence*, (New York: Praeger, 1991), pp.127-144. On the involvement of Northern democracies in torture see Chomsky and Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*; George, *State Terrorism and the United States*; Edward Herman, *The Real Terror Network*, Second Edition, (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1985); Huggins, *Political Policing*; Martha Huggins et al, *Violence Workers. Police Torturers and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Alfred McCoy, *A Question of Torture. CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror*, (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006); Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Torture: Cancer of Democracy*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963); and *La Torture Dans la République*, (Paris: Editions François Maspero, 1972). On the use of torture in the "War on Terror" see Alex Bellamy, 'No Pain, No Gain? Torture and Ethics in the War on Terror', *International Affairs*, vol.82, no.1, (2006), pp.121-148; Alan Dershowitz, 'Is There a Torturous Road to Justice?', *Los Angeles Times*, 8 November 2001, p.19; Sanford Levinson (ed.), *Torture. A Collection*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Neil MacMaster, 'Torture: From Algiers to Abu Ghraib', *Race and Class*, vol.46, no.2, (2004), pp.1-21; Alfred McCoy, *A Question of Torture*; and Maureen Ramsey, 'Can the Torture of Terrorist Suspects be Justified?', *The International Journal of Human Rights*, vol.10, no.2, (2006), pp.103-119.

torture.[33] However, the Spanish language manuals mentioned above do advocate the use of torture. The framework developed in chapter three to account for torture discusses this literature.

Concepts, methodology and data

Key concepts

A number of terms that are central to this project are, in various ways, contentious, so it is important that they be clearly explained from the outset. These terms are the North and South, as distinct from the global North and global South; human rights; repression; power and influence; and interests. Torture is considered to be a subset of repression, and will be explored in more detail in chapter three.

The (Global) North and South

Defining the global system is fraught with difficulties, and few of the terms that have been widely used to describe and compare countries, societies and regions, as well as nations or nation-states, are problem-free and uncontested. The terms "first world", "second world", "third world", and "developed" and "underdeveloped", are problematic in that they imply a set of norms, values and judgments. During the Cold War, first world countries were those that were industrialised; second world countries were all the communist states, not just the Soviet ones but also China, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and Cuba; and the third world referred to the rest of the world's countries, considered to be poor and relatively unindustrialised.[34] These terms were therefore tied to a specific Cold War ideology and conception of the relations between states within that period. Likewise, the terms "developed" and "underdeveloped" denote a hierarchy in which "developed" states are considered to be economically, culturally, socially and politically superior to "underdeveloped" states.

The terms "first world", "second world" and "third world" lost their resonance with the end of the Cold War because the world was no longer divided between the capitalist "first world" and the communist "second world", rendering the term "third world" redundant. The terms "developed" and "less developed" are now widely used in contemporary IR literature to

---

[33] See for example, Henry Charles Lee, *Superstition and Force,* Reprint Edition, (New York: Haskell, [1870] 1971); and William Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe,* (New York: D. Appleton, 1872).
[34] Leslie Sklair, *Globalisation, Capitalism and its alternatives*, 3rd Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p.13.

distinguish between the more developed and less developed regions of the world. The terms "North" and "South" mark a deliberate move away from "West" and "East", and from the value-laden terms "developed" and "less developed" and stress the economic disparity between the geographical North and South. The Brandt Commission offers a helpful explanation for their use of the terms "North" and "South":

> There are obvious objections to a simplified view of the world as being divided into two camps. The 'North' includes two rich countries south of the equator, Australia and New Zealand. The 'South' ranges from a booming half-industrial nation like Brazil to poor landlocked or island countries such as Chad or the Maldives. A few southern countries – mostly oil-exporters – have higher per capita incomes than some of the northern countries. But in general terms, and although neither is a uniform or permanent grouping, 'North' and 'South' are broadly synonymous with 'rich' and 'poor', 'developed' and 'developing'.[35]

Building on the terms "North" and "South", the terms "global North" and "global South" go beyond a simple geographical dichotomy, and beyond a state-centric approach which precludes class differences from our conceptions of the differences within and between states, regions and hemispheres. As Leslie Sklair argues, the state-centric approach serves a particular ideological purpose, namely, "to deflect criticism of and opposition to its [capitalism's] hegemonic control of the global system onto the claims of competing 'nations'."[36] The terms "global North" and "global South" also demonstrate an appreciation of the fact that there are minority areas and peoples within the South whose experience and history identifies them more closely with particular elites within the North. Likewise, there are minority areas and peoples within the North whose experience of exploitation and marginalisation is more akin with that of the majority of people situated in the South.

I define marginalisation as the exclusion of people from various benefits enjoyed by those incorporated into capitalism, such as access to production, consumption, heath care, education, pensions, and social security. Significant levels of policing resources are devoted to marginalised groups. In contrast, the majority in the North are incorporated rather than marginalised, and they are subject to far less disciplining and policing. The concept of exploitation rests on the assumption that what the majority in the North enjoy and have access to is predicated on others not having those things, and indeed being exploited in order that those of us privileged enough to be a part of the majority within the global North can enjoy those benefits that the majority in the global South are excluded from. There are, of course, degrees of marginalisation and exploitation, and both operate at a moral as well as a technical level. For instance, the seamstresses working in sweatshops in China are marginalised and exploited, but at the same time are incorporated into the capitalist system,

---

[35] The Brandt Commission, *North: South. A Programme for Survival. The Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues under the Chairmanship of Willy Brandt*, (London: Pan Books Ltd, 1980), p.31.
[36] Sklair, *Globalisation*, p.26.

albeit in a minimal way. They are exploited in the sense that they only receive a small fraction of the value of their labour, but incorporated in the sense that they do have minimal access to production and consumption. Much of Africa, while formally incorporated into the global economy through trading in oil, diamonds and arms, most Africans are marginalised from that process.[37]

The South exists on the periphery of the developed countries of the North and has not enjoyed the development and progress that the North has.[38] Residents of slums, for instance, now constitute 78.2 percent of the world's urban population, and again, these are largely situated in the South.[39] The North, by contrast, constitutes less than a third of the earth's surface, constitutes only a minority of the world's population, yet twenty percent of the world's people living in the highest-income countries, situated in the North, account for 86 per cent of the total private consumption expenditures. The world's poorest 20 percent, situated in the South, account for only 1.3 per cent of the total private consumption expenditures.[40]

These disparities, as Sklair argues, are not simply "a geographical accident of birth … but a question of class location."[41] As Sklair states, "The poor of all countries struggle against the domestic and global forces that oppress them and their resistance takes many forms."[42] There is a struggle common to the majority of people in the countries of the South, as the South Commission indicates:

> The countries of the South vary greatly in size, in natural resource endowment, in the structure of their economies, in the level of economic, social and technical development. They also differ in their cultures, in their political systems and in the ideologies they profess … Yet in this diversity there is a basic unity. What the countries of the South have in common transcends their differences.[43]

However, there is also a struggle common to the world's poor, whether they are situated in the North or the South. I therefore define the "global South" as constituting those people of the geographical North and the South who are most vulnerable to the effects of global

---

[37] Regions of Africa, and elsewhere in the South, are also integrated into the global economy through informal or "shadow" transactions, for example through the illicit trade in commodities, arms and narcotics. Such exchanges are as important to the global economy as the more formal transactions carried out between states and organisations. See Peter Andreas, 'Illicit International Political Economy: the Clandestine Side of Globalization', *Review of International Political Economy*, vol.11, no.3 (2004), pp641-652; Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, (London: Zed Books, 2001); and William Reno, *Warlord Politics and African States*, (Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 1998).

[38] The Brandt Commission, *The Challenge to the South. The Report of the South Commission*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p.1.

[39] UN-Habitat, *The Challenge of the Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements 2003,* (London: UN-Habitat, 2003), pp.2-3.

[40] United Nations Development Programme, 'Human Development Report: Globalisation with a Human Face', United Nations Development Programme, 1999, <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1999/en/>

[41] Sklair, *Globalisation, Capitalism and its alternatives*, p.26.

[42] Ibid.

[43] The Brandt Commission, *The Challenge to the South*, p.1.

capitalism, and who are struggling against the forces that keep them in poverty. The "global North" on the other hand, constitutes those who profit from the exploitation of those in both the North and the South who are marginalized and exploited in the pursuit of capital.

A distinction should be made between states in the North for the purposes of this study. Despite the similarities between many Northern states, such as levels of development and democratic norms, there are important differences between what we might call the Great Powers and small and middle power democracies, particularly in relation to repression. Certain middle power democracies such as New Zealand, Sweden, Canada, Norway, and Finland, among others, have never officially sanctioned repression overseas. As Peter Lawler has argued, their foreign policies also reflect a commitment to a humane internationalism which differs markedly from "the muscular militarism" most recently exercised in the US-led invasions and occupations of Iraq.[44] By contrast, Great Powers such as the US, Britain, France and Italy have used coercion regularly, and have sanctioned torture in violation of international law, as I show in chapter three. Moreover, in some senses the US, as the sole remaining superpower, is a unique type of actor that differs not just from small and middle power democracies but also from the other Great Powers. Its military reach is unmatched, and as this research will show, so is its use of repression in the South.

This study on US training of military forces from the South focuses primarily on the training of forces from countries situated geographically in the South. Thus, NATO forces trained by the US military are excluded. Those individuals from the South who actually receive US training tend to be drawn from the upper echelons of the military, and of the class structure within their home countries. In a number of ways these forces have more in common with the North than they do with the South. However, the outcomes of that training are likely to have a much wider impact, whether positive or negative, on the poorer populations of those countries that receive training, rather than simply affecting the technical conduct of the military forces of those countries. In many of those states, the military forces are often called upon to perform policing duties of various kinds. Meanwhile, in the North, security forces are also used to police the poor and marginalized, particularly where resistance to their marginalised and exploited role in capitalism emerges, and where the needs of Multinational Corporations are deemed to need protection. This has been explored by Mark Laffey and

---

[44] Peter Lawler, 'The Good State: In Praise of "Classical" Internationalism', *Review of International Studies*, vol.31, no.3, (2005), pp.428 and 436. I agree with Lawler that we might therefore refer to such states as "good states", since their foreign policies have been largely ethical, stemming from certain domestic attributes, and this is extremely positive. In the case of the Scandinavian countries, this includes open, consensus-based governance, a social-democratic intellectual tradition, and an emphasis on solidarity as both value and organisational principle. In the cases of New Zealand and Canada, Lawler points to very positive practices with regard to the treatment of indigenous peoples, which contrast with the Australian experience.

Jutta Weldes in their work on policing and global governance.[45] The role of the training in such policing will be discussed in chapters five and seven.

Human rights and repression

My interpretation and use of the terms human rights and repression are drawn directly from the two bodies of international law which deal with human rights: International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and International Human Rights Law (IHRL).[46] Human rights are those rights which all citizens share under international law, both in peacetime and during armed conflict. They are to be guaranteed by armed actors under IHL, and by the state and armed actors under IHRL. The most fundamental of these are the right to life, the prohibition of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, prohibition of slavery and servitude and the prohibition of retroactive criminal laws. In addition to these, human rights comprise the prohibition of discrimination on any basis, provisions for the protection of women and children, and the regulation of aspects of health and food provision, as well as labour.[47] Repression is considered to be any act which violates these. In assessing the impact of the training on the promotion of human rights, I will be focusing particularly on the promotion of democracy, as democracy is a significant vehicle for the realisation of human rights.

Military forces are subject to both IHL and IHRL, so these will be the yardstick by which to assess the relationships between the training and human rights and repression. The US military and the US state claim to recognise and uphold IHL and IHRL, and to adhere to the Laws of Armed Conflict (LOAC) which it states encompass various IHL and IHRL treaties. For example the US Doctrine for Joint Urban Operations manual reads:

> The LOAC encompasses numerous international treaties, conventions, or protocols. The United States recognizes most of these agreements either through signature and ratification or as customary international law. However, certain agreements and their applicability to any military operation may be subject to disagreement. There exists a large body of agreements containing provisions for the protection of civilians. These agreements include not only the LOAC, but also recent international human rights treaties. The decisions by commanders and civilian leaders are often influenced by recognized international law, domestic law, and policy. [48]

Thus the LOAC are informed by IHL and IHRL treaties, but the US military argues that IHL and IHRL treaties may not always influence commanders and leaders. What ought to be the case is that all military decisions be in accordance with international law. Nevertheless, the

---

[45] Laffey and Weldes, 'Policing and Global Governance', pp.59-79.
[46] This research will not pronounce on international law, but is concerned with the interpretation of the law.
[47] International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), ICRC, 'International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law: Similarities and Differences', International Committee of the Red Cross, 2003, <http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/57JR8L/$FILE/IHL_and_IHRL.pdf?OpenElement>
[48] Department of Defense, 'Doctrine for Joint Urban Operations (Joint Publication, 3-06)', US Department of Defence, 2002, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/doctrine/jp3_06.pdf>

US military claims to have the most developed LOAC in the world, and claims that its own training of military forces from overseas is intended to promote respect for human rights and democracy.[49] Given these claims, and given the clear obligations of military forces under both IHL and IHRL, it is appropriate to assess the impact of training on repression and human rights according to IHL and IHRL.

Another reason for this is that the US state also upholds the provisions of IHRL, and claims that it has a responsibility within the international community "to speak out on behalf of international human rights standards," especially with regard to countries in receipt of various forms of US assistance, including military training.[50] As part of this assumed responsibility, the US Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 states:

> The Secretary of State "shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate by February 25 'a full and complete record regarding the status of internationally recognised human rights, within the meaning of subsection (A) in countries that receive assistance under this part, and (B) in all other foreign countries which are members of the United Nations and which are not otherwise the subject of a human rights report under this Act'."[51]

The US has thus designated itself monitor of compliance with human rights law in the rest of the world. Those aspects of international human rights law emphasised by the Department of State in its country reports are:

> Freedom from torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, from prolonged detention without charges, from disappearance or clandestine detention, and from other flagrant violations of the right to life, liberty and the security of the person.[52]

In the past, countries with poor human rights records, as determined by the State Department's annual reports, were forbidden from receiving US military training.[53] It is therefore appropriate that any assessment of the intended outcomes of US military training of foreign forces also be assessed on these grounds.

There are key differences between the circumstances in which IHL and IHRL apply to military forces. The ICRC states that the rules of IHL apply primarily to issues that are "outside the purview of IHRL, such as the conduct of hostilities, combatant and prisoner of war status and the protection of the red cross and red crescent emblems."[54] IHL is applicable in times of armed conflict, whether international or non-international. The main treaty

---

[49] Joseph Bialke, 'Al-Qaeda and Taliban Unlawful Combatant Detainees, Unlawful Belligerency, and the International Laws of Armed Conflict,' *Air Force Law Review*, Spring 2004, <http://www.defenddemocracy.org/usr_doc/Pages_from_Air_Force_Law_Review_Volume_55_(Fall_2004)_(6)_2.pdf>; Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities'.
[50] US Department of State, 'Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004', Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour, US Department of State, 2005, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/>
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Lumpe, 'Global Reach, Global Power'.
[54] ICRC, ICRC, 'International Humanitarian Law'.

sources for IHL are the four Geneva Conventions of 1949, and the Additional Protocols I and II of 1977.

IHRL tends to deal with aspects of life in peacetime that are not regulated by IHL, such as the freedom of the press, the right to assembly, to vote and to strike.[55] The main treaty sources for IHRL are the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), as well as Conventions on Genocide (1948), Racial Discirmination (1965), Discrimination Against Women (1979), Torture (1984), and Rights of the Child (1989). The main regional instruments are the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950), the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (1948) and Convention on Human Rights (1969) and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981).[56] IHRL, in principle, applies at all times, i.e. both in peace time and in situations of armed conflict, according to the ICRC. However, some IHRL treaties permit governments to derogate from certain rights in situations of public emergency threatening the life of the nation:

> Derogations must, however, be proportional to the crisis at hand, must not be introduced on a discriminatory basis and must not contravene other rules of international law – including rules of IHL. Certain human rights are never derogable. Among them are the right to life, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, prohibition of slavery and servitude and prohibition of retroactive criminal laws.[57]

No derogations at all are permitted from the provisions of IHL because it deals with the exceptional circumstances of armed conflict.[58]

Interests

The interests of states and of capital are central to the thesis. Defining the interests of capital is somewhat more straightforward than defining the interests of the state. The primary aim of the owners of capital is to increase returns through growth. This can be objectively measured, both in terms of levels of investment made to achieve this aim, and in terms of its success – how much profit is generated. Defining the interests of the state, or what is known as the "national interest" is more complicated. There are two approaches to understanding

---

[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid. NB. In terms of who is bound under these two bodies of law, IHRL binds governments in their relationships with individuals, and there is a growing body of opinion which argues that non-state actors ought also to be bound by IHRL. IHL, in contrast, imposes obligations on individuals and provides that individuals may be held criminally responsible for grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I, and for other war crimes. While individuals do not have specific duties under IHRL, it does provide for individual criminal responsibility for violations that may constitute international crimes, such as genocide, torture and crimes against humanity. IHRL applies at all times, and military forces are bound by this, except during armed conflict, when they are bound by IHL. This has important implications for the activities of military forces at all times.

what the national interest is and how it is perceived and articulated by decision-makers. The first can help us to identify, from empirical data, what the national interest was perceived to be, and the second can tell us about how discourses surrounding those interests are socially constructed in order to secure the identities of the actors involved. These approaches are not mutually exclusive, although are often assumed to be. The first involves empirical enquiry, the starting point for which is a theoretical assumption.[59] In relation to the national interest, we can develop a hypothesis about the functions that might be served by foreign policy actions, based on our assumptions, we can then test this empirically, and if it is confirmed through empirical enquiry, we can then deduce what the decision-makers involved considered the national interest to be.

The above approach was favoured by realist international relations theorists in order to establish what the nature of foreign policy was. Hans Morgenthau, for example, pointed out that for political realists, the character of a foreign policy could be established "through the examination of the political acts performed and of the foreseeable consequences of these acts," and that "from the foreseeable consequences of their acts we can surmise what their objectives might have been."[60] He argued, however, that examination of the facts alone was not enough, and that "to give meaning to the factual raw material of foreign policy, we must approach political reality with a kind of rational outline, a map that suggests to us the possible meanings of foreign policy," which would "give theoretical meaning to the facts of international politics."[61] For Morgenthau, the concept of interest, defined in terms of power, was "an objective category which is universally valid," but he acknowledged that it "depends upon the political and cultural context within which foreign policy is formulated."[62] For Morgenthau, therefore, the national interest in and of itself constitutes the theoretical assumption that realists start from in formulating their hypotheses, but how the content of the national interest as a category is understood will vary, depending on the cultural and political context. For realists then, developing a theory about the content of the national interest, and then analysing the relevant empirical data is how we deduce what the content of the national interest was in a given context.

The second approach, known as constructivism, argues that we cannot know what the national interest is, we can only develop an understanding of how it was interpreted and

---

[59] Colin Hay, *Political Analysis. A Critical Introduction*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p.30. For examples of work which takes an objectivist approach, see Friedrich Kratochwil, 'On the Notion of "Interest" in International Relations', *International Organisation*, vol.36, no.1, (1982), pp.1-30; Zeev Maoz, 'Framing the National Interest: The Manipulation of Foreign Policy Decisions in Group Settings', *World Politics*, vol.43, no.1, (1990), pp.77-110.
[60] Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Fifth Revised Edition (New York: Alfed A. Knopf, 1978), pp.4-5.
[61] Ibid. p.5.
[62] Ibid.

represented by the actors involved.[63] Constructivists reject the above approach, arguing that it is overly objectivist, even though, as I have shown, it does allow for subjectivist understandings of how the national interest comes to be understood. Constructivists argue that the national interest can only be understood as a socially constructed phenomenon, in that it is contingent on the identity constructions developed in the minds of decision-makers according to their own subjective understandings and assumptions. They argue that phenomenon such as the national interest are born out of the creations of inter-subjective worlds of particular actors, who assign specific identities to other actors and articulate particular relationships between those actors. What is not clear is how these social constructions are different from what Morgenthau refers to as the ways in which political and cultural contexts shape foreign policy. For constructivists, actors will include the self and others, such as other states, decision-makers, non-state actors, social movements and domestic publics. Each of the actors are given identities and characteristics in relation to each other. In the Cold War, for instance, representations of the US state by US decision-makers involved positing the US, or the self, as a "preserver of peace",[64] and "a force for peace and progress in the world",[65] and the others, and specifically the Soviet Union and its allies as "duplicitous",[66] "foes of freedom",[67] "enemies of freedom",[68] and "totalitarians".[69] This allows for a benign reading of US actions and a malign reading of the actions of others. Such constructions of identity and the way that they appear in relation to each other are, for constructivists, what define the national interest, as it is perceived and understood by those inside and outside of the decision-making process.[70]

The emphasis for constructivists is to analyse the social constructions described here, in order to generate interpretations of how it was that the national interest was articulated and the effects that this had. They seek to uncover the ways in which identities are constructed in order to understand how it is that a particular vision of the national interest is formulated. Rather than being mutually exclusive, I propose that these two approaches provide us with two streams of evidence in relation to the national interest: the first, what can be inferred from specific foreign policy actions about what decision-makers considered the national

---

[63] Jutta Weldes, 'Constructing National Interests', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol.2, no.3, (1996), p.279.
[64] President Richard Nixon,, 'Second Inaugural Address', Watergate Info, 20 January 1973, <http://www.watergate.info/nixon/inaugural-speech-second.shtml>
[65] President Ronald Reagan, 'Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress Reporting on the State of the Union', 26 January 1982, <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1982/12682c.htm>
[66] George Kennan, 'The Sources of Soviet Conduct', 1947, <http://www.historyguide.org/europe/kennan.html>
[67] President Lyndon Johnson, 'Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union', National Archives and Records Administration, 4 January 1965, <http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/Johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/650104.asp>
[68] President Ronald Reagan, 'Defence and National Security, Address to the Nation', 23 March 1983, <http://www.afa.org/magazine/Feb2004/dns.pdf>
[69] Ibid.
[70] Weldes, 'Constructing National Interests', p.279.

interest to be; and the second, what can be inferred from the identity constructions of decision-makers. When we combine these two approaches we get a more developed understanding of not only what it was that decision-makers were pursuing, but also how the national interest was already defined by the process of representation and how this was then presented to the public in order to secure particular identities. In the remaining chapters I combine analysis of empirical data in light of a specific theory about the US' interests in the South, and analysis of the discourses of decision-makers, in order to determine what US decision-makers perceived the interests of the US to be and how foreign policy has been geared towards pursuing those interests.

This is not to say that we can always determine what the national interest was perceived to be. It may prove ambiguous. For instance, it may be that what individuals say in relation to the national interest does not necessarily reflect what the national interest is perceived to be. Equally, sometimes decision-makers may act for bureaucratic, party, or organisational reasons that have little to do with the pursuit of what is perceived to be the national interest, and the objectives of these groups may not always be congruent with what is broadly perceived to be the national interest. As Bernard Brodie argues, interests are "the products of fallible human judgement, on matters concerning which agreement within the nation is usually less than universal."[71] A key consideration in this research will be the degree to which articulations of the national interest by US decision-makers mesh with interests as can be identified through the analysis of empirical data.

Power and Influence

Implicit in an analysis of the impact of US training of military forces from the South on the use of repression and the promotion of human rights is the degree to which the US is able to exercise power and influence through that training. The concept of power is contested in IR, but is generally understood as the ability to ensure a particular outcome, so to induce actor A to ensure that actor B carries out a specific act. Influence tends to be understood as being less directive, constituting the ability to make broad categories of outcomes more likely. Bertrand Russell defines power as "the production of intended effects".[72] There are two main advantages of this definition. Firstly, "effects" encompasses both specific outcomes and less defined ones. Influence can therefore be seen as a form of power. Secondly, as William Domhoff notes, Russell's definition "allows for the possibility that different types of power

[71] Bernard Brodie, *War and Politics*, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1973), p.343.
[72] Bertrand Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, (London: Allen and Unwin, 1938), p.35.

may combine in different ways in different times and places."[73] Influence and more direct power can combine, but so too can the various types of power. Adopting Domhoff's analysis, I define these as four overlapping networks.[74] These are ideological, economic, military, and political, and constitute the institutional means of attaining human goals. The power structures within Western civilisation are best understood by determining the intertwinings and relative importance at any given time of the organisations based in these overlapping networks. The ideology network is concerned with meaning, norms and ritual practice, and is usually manifested in organised religion. The economic network is the set of institutions concerned with the satisfaction of material needs, and it is this which generates classes, defined as positions within the social structure that are shaped by the degree of power over the economic process. The ruling class is that which monopolises other power sources in order to dominate a state-centred society. The military network consists of the power to direct coercion, and throughout history was the most dominant of the networks, although now, as Domhoff shows, in certain states, and particularly the US, the economic network is predominant over the others,[75] discussed further in chapter two. The state network is defined as a political network, the function of which is territorial regulation. This alone can provide needed regulatory and judicial systems, particularly by the economic network.[76]

Power in foreign policy terms consists of the ability of the ruling elite of a particular state to achieve certain outcomes on the international stage through the organisations of any, some or all of the four networks of power. These outcomes might be specific, or they may comprise more general conditions that lend themselves to the objectives of that state. In different circumstances the various networks will be more and less dominant in the exercise of foreign policy.[77] The exercise of power in foreign policy does not simply constitute the ability to coerce through the military network, but can manifest itself through economic, state, and even ideological institutions. As this research will show, in US foreign policy, recently the economic network has been at least as important as the military one for the ruling elite to achieve its intended foreign policy outcomes.

One of the purposes of the thesis is to assess the degree to which US training of military forces from the South is one of the means through which the US ruling elite has exercised power in international relations. The training may have been intended as a means of

---

[73] William Domhoff, 'Studying Power', April 2005, <http://sociology.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/theory/studyingpower.html>
I am grateful to Eric Herring for assistance with this conceptualisation of power and influence.
[74] William Domhoff, 'The Four Networks Theory of Power: A Theoretical Home for Power Structure Research', April 2005, <http://sociology.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/theory/four_networks.html>
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.

achieving specific outcomes. For example, if training was given to particular battalions in order to undertake a covert operation or coup in a particular state, then we could consider the US to have exercised power in a direct way through the training. The majority of the training is more likely to have been intended as a means of influencing the general practices and activities of armed forces in the South, in line with US foreign policy objectives more broadly. For example, the training may have been aimed at ensuring the armies of states in the South developed practices that would help curtail political opposition to US objectives within the region. Or it may be, as US policy-makers claim, that the training is intended to influence armed forces in the South to adopt appropriate civil-military relations whereby they respect democratic rule and uphold human rights.

Methodology

Research question

The research question addressed in this thesis is, "What have been the relationships between US training of military forces from the South and repression and human rights?"

There are a number of plausible answers to the question. It could be that the training has had no relationship with either repression or human rights. This is the least plausible outcome. Evidence has already emerged that some Cold War training encouraged repression, including at SOA, so a relationship already exists. More recently the Department of Defense has been asserting that its training of foreign military forces is intended to promote respect for human rights and democracy.[78] Nevertheless, it may be that individuals that have received training are in no way connected with repression. This must be considered.

It could be that the training is not primarily intended to have any impact either on repression or on professionalisation, on the grounds that the motives and purposes of the training have nothing to do with its content per se. Rather, it could be that the training is intended as a means of creating elite-to-elite networks that will result in the exercise of influence by the US in other states in the long term. In this sense it would be similar to attempts by the US to exert influence through various private actors, such as the Ford and Rockefeller foundations. The scholarships they offer are intended to develop networks of elites all over the world through the positive experience that their recipients have in America.[79] In this case the content of the training would be secondary to the goal of developing elite-to-elite networks.

---

[78] See, for example, the WHINSEC website: <http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec/>
[79] Inderjeet Parmar, 'Institutes of International Affairs,' in Diane Stone, Andrew Denham, (eds.), *Think Tank Traditions,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

While an important element of the training is to establish such elite-to-elite cooperation, the research is unlikely to result in the conclusion that this is its main function. This is because there has been a very deliberate intent on the part of the Department of Defense to use coercion and repression as a means of controlling populations, and to advocate this in the training, discussed in chapter five. Similarly, certainly at WHINSEC, a primary objective underpinning all the training has been the professionalisation of the Latin American armed forces, and this is an important principle at the heart of all of WHINSEC's training, as discussed in chapter seven.

It may be that US military training in the South encouraged repression during the Cold War, but that training since the Cold War has encouraged respect for human rights. It could be that the training encouraged repression in the Cold War, encouraged respect for human rights in the years following the Cold War and up until 9/11, but that since 9/11 it has encouraged repression again. It could be that the training encouraged repression during the Cold War, encouraged respect for human rights in the years following the Cold War, but that since 9/11 there has been an intensification of both repression and respect for human rights. This would be consistent with US foreign policy more broadly, as I show in chapters three, four and six. It could be that the training has always encouraged both repression and human rights for different purposes at different times and in different places. It could also be that there is an obvious pattern to this, and that from this research I will be able to spot trends in when, where and in what circumstances the training is likely to promote repression and when, where and in what circumstances it is likely to promote respect for human rights. The research sub-questions will help to uncover such trends.

Research sub-questions

a. What is the nature, the purpose, and the intended outcome, in relation to repression (including torture) and human rights, of US military training of forces from the South, and what role does the training play within the context of changing strategies within US foreign policy?
b. Is US military training in the South serving the US state, US capital, other core capitalist states or international capital?
c. What role can activists inside and outside academia, especially SOAW, play in investigating and challenging US military training in the South?

Case selection

Rationale behind the focus on US military training of forces from the South

The broad choice of research subject has been outlined above. I have chosen to focus initially on training of Latin American military forces, and then to compare this with US training of foreign forces across the South. Some comparisons will also be made with US training of domestic military forces. I will now outline the cases considered and how they are ordered.

Why training of Latin American military forces?

There are three main reasons for beginning with training of Latin American military forces. Firstly, Latin America as a region has consistently been one of the highest recipients of US military training since World War II, and continues to receive enormous amounts of training, currently in the name of the "drug war" and the "War on Terror". It is also a region in which some of the most repressive regimes in recent history enjoyed US military support. If the training is to have had any impact upon repression and human rights, Latin America is an appropriate region for examining this. Secondly, I have spent time in Latin America working with NGOs, and have had contact with people whose family and friends disappeared under the military dictatorship in Argentina during the 1970s and 1980s, and with people who were involved in the civil war in El Salvador during the 1980s. This alerted me to alleged US complicity in repression against the populations of Latin America, at the very least through its financial and military support of various repressive regimes. Finally, and most importantly, the Latin American case, and SOA/WHINSEC in particular, provides an entry point for looking at training more broadly. SOA/WHINSEC has been the primary focus for those who argue that the training promotes repression. Therefore, not only is it a useful starting point for assessing the training itself, but it also enables me to look at sub-state groups that have attempted to change US policy.

Central to the analysis of SOA/WHINSEC, then, will be the question of whether changes that have taken place at the School are a reflection of shifts in the strategies employed to achieve US foreign policy objectives, or whether they are the result of the pressure exerted by the SOA Watch campaign, or indeed, whether the changes are a reflection of both changes in foreign policy strategies and the efforts of SOA Watch. Although previous research has attempted to show a causal connection between the training and human rights abuses, I do not think it is possible to show such a connection with a high level of confidence. Instead, I am interested in assessing the degree to which the training is intended to encourage, condone or exacerbate repression, or whether it is intended to reduce repression and promote human rights. The claims made about the effects of the training by both human rights groups and by

the Department of Defense will also be investigated, even though it will be difficult to prove, by which I mean show conclusively, the validity of these claims. However, the discourses and claims made in relation to these issues can be analysed.

Why broader foreign military training initiatives?

As discussed above, very little research has been undertaken to assess the scope and nature of US military training initiatives beyond Latin America, although as noted above, some work has been undertaken to examine the subcontracting of training to private military companies, specifically for Croatian forces.[80] As I will show in chapters five and seven, a whole range of training initiatives are run by numerous US government departments, and since 2001, training provision has increased, but there has been no research on the nature, functions and intended outcomes of the training beyond SOA/WHINSEC. Central to this aspect of the research will be the question of the similarities and difference between training at SOA / WHINSEC and these other initiatives. The research will also explore the degree to which these other training initiatives are linked to repression and human rights.

Data sources

Primary and secondary data sources were used, and supplemented with interviews with members of various human rights organisations based in Washington DC, members of staff at the US Department of Defense, members of staff and students at WHINSEC, and members of WHINSEC's external oversight board.

Primary sources

The websites of various human rights groups concerned with human rights abuses and repression in Latin America proved invaluable:
School of Americas Watch: <http://www.soaw.org>
Foreign Policy in Focus: <http://www.fpif.org>
Centre for International Policy: <http://www.ciponline.org>
Amnesty International: <http://www.amnesty.org>
Federation of American Scientists: <http://www.fas.org>
HRW: <http://www.hrw.org>

[80] Avant, The Market for Force, pp.152-154.

These contain a great deal of information about repression and human rights in Latin America, as well as information about US foreign policy in Latin America. Some contain details of foreign military assistance to Latin American countries. Various reports investigating human rights abuses in Latin America have been produced by these organisations and some of them include the names of individuals alleged to have been involved in repression who had received US military training. They also contain information about various campaigns directed at reducing human rights abuses by government-sponsored forces in Latin American countries.

The websites of various Department of Defense and Department of State sub-sections were also used:

WHINSEC: <http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec>
US Department of Defense: <http://www.defenselink.mil/>
US Defence Security Cooperation Agency: <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/>
US Department of State: <http://www.state.gov/>
These sites contain details of military training initiatives for foreign military forces and the financing of these, including: the annual FMTR's to Congress from the Departments of State and Defence for the years 2001-2004;[81] policy documents, such as the State Department's account of US overseas presence in the 21st Century;[82] documents relating to deliveries of training;[83] numerous training manuals used by the CIA and the Army and by SOA;[84] and information brochures on training produced by the Department of Defense.[85]

The National Security Archive (NSA): <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/>
The NSA is an independent research organisation based at George Washington University, which acquires US official documents of public interest through the US Freedom of Information Act, and makes them available to researchers all over the world. This proved invaluable. The Archive has a comprehensive on-line library of declassified documents, and also provided me with hundreds of declassified documents relating to US training of military

---

[81] Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities'.
[82] Department of State, 'America's Overseas Presence in the 21st Century', US Department of State, 1999, <http://www.state.gov/www/publications/9911_opap?rpt-9911_opap_instructions.html>
[83] DSCA, 'IMET Programme Deliveries', Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 2001, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20IMETPrgDel.xls>
[84] US Department of Defense, *Field Manual 30-5: Combat Intelligence,* (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, Army, 1973); *Field Manual 33-5: Psychological Operations,* (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, Army, 1962); *Handling Sources, School of Americas Training Manual,* (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1989); and *Field Manual FM 8-2: Counterinsurgency Operations,* (Washington DC: US Department of Defense: Navy, 1967).
[85] US Department of Defense, *Information Brochure: The United States Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme,* (Washington DC: Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Department of the Army, 1965); and *Information Brochure: The United States Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme,* (Washington DC: Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Department of the Army, 1972).

forces from the South when I visited in 2004. This research is informed by those declassified documents.

Various news articles from media sources, mostly based in the US, concerning allegations of abuse by US-trained personnel from the Latin American security forces also informed the research. These tend to be articles gathered by interviewees both from SOAW and from Department of Defense personnel that they pass onto me, because of their relevance to my research.

Secondary sources

Academic literature (books and journals) on the role of the US in international relations from a historical materialist perspective; US and Latin American relations; the role of the military in Latin America; US foreign military training and repression and human rights; and repression, torture and human rights were also useful, as outlined above.

Interviews

I interviewed 45 people from the Department of Defense, various human rights organisations, the staff of WHINSEC, and various students in attendance at WHINSEC, as well as members of WHINSEC's external oversight board. The interviews took place between June and September 2004, and have led to a deeper understanding of the issues explored via publicly available sources. Their purpose was to elicit individuals' views on the nature of US military training of forces from the South and its relationship to repression and human rights in the wider context of US foreign policy. It is important to understand how different groups of people perceive the training, and interviewing is a suitable way of gaining insight into peoples' experiences and responses. It also helps to highlight patterns of thought and areas of contradiction between individuals involved in the same institutions. This is central to analysing the cultural attitudes that shape institutions such as the Department of Defense, human rights groups, and the Latin American militaries. (The interview schedule is included in Appendix 4.)

Interviewees were selected in such a way as to ensure that as many views as possible could be represented.

The majority of interviews at the DoD were less dependent on my preferences, and more dependent upon who was available, and who my main contact within the Department of Defense could help arrange interviews with. However, I was able to interview a range of

Department of Defense personnel who had been involved in US-Latin American relations at different times throughout the last 30 years. I gained further contacts from Department of Defense staff: when interviewing people I asked them if they could suggest other people that might be willing to talk to me, and whether they might be able to help put me in touch with other potential interviewees. This is known as "snowballing".[86] I was also able to secure interviews with various members of WHINSEC's external oversight board, from the most conservative (former US ambassadors to Latin American countries) to the most liberal (human rights lawyers and academics engaged in research critical of US foreign policy).

WHINSEC staff were selected on the basis that WHINSEC is a school that has been surrounded by controversy for a number of years, and is the only Department of Defense foreign or domestic training institution which has been on the receiving end of any public protest in relation to the training. I selected interviewees in order to ensure that they represented various aspects of the training and varying ranks with varying levels of experience. I was also able to interview civilian staff including translators and language tutors.

WHINSEC students were selected on the basis of me having met them through observing training that they received, and on the basis of whether they were willing to be interviewed. I did try to ensure that both male and female students from various ranks and various Latin American countries were interviewed. These interviews were conducted in Spanish.

School of Americas Watch staff and members were selected on the grounds that SOAW is the only human rights NGO whose purpose is to challenge US training of military forces from the global South, specifically that provided by SOA / WHINSEC. Paid members of SOAW staff, SOAW's founder, and members were all interviewed in order to gain a broad insight into the views of different groups within the organisation.

The other NGOs tended to have just one person involved in human rights issues in Latin America, so I interviewed that individual where possible. They were selected on the grounds that they represent an NGO that has in some way been involved in research or campaigns intended to prevent human rights abuses in Latin America, with some awareness of and interest in US training of Latin American military personnel.

[86] Sara Arber, 'Designing Samples', in Nigel (ed) Gilbert, *Researching Social Life*, (London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2001), pp.58-82.

The interviews were focused. In focused interviews, the interviewer works from a list of topics which they want to cover with the respondent, but are free to phrase questions as they wish, in any order that is appropriate at the time.[87] I had a set of key themes relating to the research question that I presented to the three groups of interviewees (Department of Defense and WHINSEC personnel, including members of the external oversight board; WHINSEC students; and members of human rights groups). This set of themes was to help cover a range of key subject areas, but often these led to further questions being formulated during the interviews in response to my interviewees' comments. No interview was the same as any other, but various key themes did recur. Also, as the field work took place, my own understanding of the research issue developed, and so the interview questions also evolved in light of new insights. This was a real benefit of being able to conduct the interviews over a three month period, and in some circumstances I was able to re-interview. In every interview, levels of attribution were established, and my contact details were given to interviewees for any follow-up. All were invited to read the research once it is complete. I recorded the material from all interviews using written notes, which were typed up immediately following the interview where possible. All interview material was protected according to University and Data Protection Act guidelines.

I established a number of key themes based on my reading of primary and secondary documents that I thought it would be helpful to discuss. These included:

a. The nature of US military training of forces from the South. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 3, 5 and 7).
b. The purposes of US training of forces from the South. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 3, 5, and 7).
c. The intended outcome of the training in relation to repression and human rights. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 3, 5 and 7).
d. The purposes of the training within the broader context of US foreign policy. (This corresponds to research sub-questions 1 and 3 and is relevant to chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8).
e. Changes in the nature of the training as a result of changes in US foreign policy. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 3, 5 and 7).
f. The similarities and differences between SOA and WHINSEC. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 5 and 7).

[87] Nigel Fielding and Thomas Hilary, 'Qualitative Interviewing', in Gilbert, *Researching Social Life;* and Ibid. p.124.

g. The nature and functions of the external oversight board of WHINSEC. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapter 7).
h. The role of SOA Watch in the replacement of SOA by WHINSEC. (This corresponds to research sub-question 2 and is relevant to chapters 5 and 7).
i. The similarities and differences between WHINSEC training and other US military training for foreign and domestic forces. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapter 7).
j. The abuse of prisoners by US personnel at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and possible parallels with SOA. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 3, 5, 6, and 7).
k. Whether the School of the Americas advocated torture. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapters 3 and 5).
l. Whether WHINSEC advocates torture. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapter 3 and 7).
m. People's knowledge of the Spanish language manuals that advocated repression. (This corresponds to research sub-question 1 and is relevant to chapter 5).
n. The future of the SOA Watch campaign. (This corresponds to research sub-question 2 and is relevant to chapters 5, 7 and 8).

Depending on the role of the individuals that I interviewed, I also asked questions relevant to their own particular experience.

There is a large literature concerning the use of interviewing as a research technique.[88] There are three main issues that must be considered when undertaking interviews. Firstly, it is important to be aware of the dangers associated with interviews as an approach. Various dangers present themselves when relying on interview material. These include questions over the reliability of the information given, the biases with which questions may be formulated, the interpretation of interview material. For instance, there is a danger of a "biasing effect leading respondents to take positions they thought were consistent with [the interviewer's] views".[89] It is important, therefore, not to offer any responses to comments from interviewees, either vocally, or through facial expressions. However, it is possible, and indeed appropriate, to challenge inconsistencies in answers, and to indicate when it is felt that

[88] Julia O'Connell Davidson and Derek Layder, *Methods, Sex and Madness,* (London: Routledge, 1994); Gilbert, *Researching Social Life*; Jonathan Grix, *Demystifying Postgraduate Research, From MA to PhD,* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2001); Steven Kull, *Minds at War. Nuclear Reality and the Inner Conflicts of Defence Policymakers,* (New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1988); Raymond Lee, *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics,* (London: Sage, 1993); Claire Renzatti and Raymond Lee, *Researching Sensitive Topics,* (London: Sage, 1993); and Herbert Rubin and Irene Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing. The Art of Hearing Data,* (London: Sage Publications, Inc, 1995).
[89] Steven Kull, *Minds at War. Nuclear Reality and the Inner Conflicts of Defence Policymakers*, (New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1988), p.36.

the question has been adequately answered. Secondly, there is the important question of ethics when engaging in interviewing. It is essential that the levels of attribution be established, that the interviewees' personnel data and identities be properly protected, and that the Data Protection Act is adhered too. Various works have helped me to think about my own approach in dealing with interviewees.[90] Finally, the actual formulation of interviews, in terms of the types of question that are to be asked, requires considerable thought and planning. The work by Rubin and Rubin and by Grix was particularly helpful as I dealt with these issues. Grix, for instance, comments on issues of access to interviewees, the amount of time that the interviewee might have available, and how this will affect the nature of the interview, and the importance of analysing the interview material as soon as possible following the interview.[91]

Non-participant observation

While at WHINSEC I was able to observe training and administrative meetings that took place during the course of my two-month visit. I was present as a non-participant observer. The purpose of this was to gain an insight into the nature of the training, in terms of its content and the attitudes it fosters. This entailed taking detailed notes of the proceedings, observing the reactions and responses of those present, reading any written materials that were handed out, and in the case of meetings, the responses of other attendees, and gathering any minutes available from meetings. There are a number of precautions that are necessary when observing sessions such as these, and there is a helpful body of literature within social science research methods that I found useful in preparing for this aspect of the research. (The semi-structured interviews and non-participant observation took place between June and September 2004, during which time I spent one month in Washington DC, interviewing Department of Defense personnel, members of WHINSEC's external oversight board, and members of various human rights NGOs, including School of Americas Watch. I then spent two months observing training and interviewing staff and students at WHINSEC).

Some of the most helpful literature for dealing with the potential risks associated with observation and interviewing as methods is the literature on ethnographic study. This includes Nigel Fielding's chapter on ethnography in Nigel Gilbert's Researching Social Life.[92] A further helpful work was the ethnographic study undertaken by Liisa Malkki which

[90] Rubin and Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing*; Lee, *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics*; and British Sociological Association, *Statement of Ethical Practice,* (Durham: British Sociological Association, 1993).
[91] Grix, *Demystifying Postgraduate Research,* p.75.
[92] Nigel Fielding. 'Ethnography', in Gilbert, *Researching Social Life,* pp.145-163.

explores the experiences of Hutu refugees in Tanzania.[93] While I was not engaged with staff and students for 24 hours each day, I spent my whole working week for two months at the School observing and talking with people there. I was alert to the dangers faced by those undertaking ethnographic research. For instance, an obvious risk associated with immersing oneself into a culture is that of "going native".[94] Being aware of such risks helps to develop strategies for countering this risk. There is also the danger of one's biases shaping one's interpretation of what one observes. It is important that, as far as possible, preconceived ideas be left at the door, and that the observations themselves be as fresh as possible, free of one's already existing assumptions. Of course we must acknowledge that we are already socially, culturally and politically situated, but we should try to maximise our objectivity within our inescapable subjectivity. There is also the risk that personalities and peoples' responses shape one's analysis of what one observes. It was important to balance my experiences with reading material from other sides of the debates relating to the research question.

Having highlighted the risks associated with non-participant observation, it is important to stress that the benefits far outweigh these. A significant weakness of the research to date is that it has relied almost entirely on reports of abuses committed by SOA graduates, and extrapolations have been made based on second-hand summaries of the nature of the training. To actually observe the training first hand enables me to have a much more in-depth understanding of the nature of the training, the attitudes that are fostered through the training, and the purposes that it serves.

Method

The method used is qualitative empirical analysis, using structured, focused comparison.[95] This involves asking the same set of questions of each of the cases explored. The cases explored in the thesis relate to two key questions. The first is the relationship between US training of military forces from the South and repression and human rights. The second is the relationship between various agents, and particularly the US state, involved in and affected by the spread of global capitalism in the South. In relation to the first key question, the three cases that are analysed in the thesis are training at the School of the Americas; training at WHINSEC; and training beyond WHINSEC. The following questions are asked of each case: a) What is the nature of the training in relation to repression and human rights? b)

---

[93] Malkki, Liisa, *Purity and Exile*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
[94] Judith Bell, *Doing Your Research Project*, 3rd edition (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999), pp.157-159.
[95] Alexander George, 'Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured Focused Comparison', in P Gordon Lauren (ed.) *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy*, (New York: Simon And Schusster, 1979), pp.43-68.

What is the purpose of the training in relation to repression and human rights? c) What are the intended outcomes of the training in relation to repression and human rights? d) To what extent does the training reflect broader US foreign policy strategies? Within the context of the second question the cases considered are the individual agents that are assessed. They are the US state, US capital, other states, other core capitalist states, non-US capital, and the national capitals of other core capitalist states. The same set of questions are asked of each of them: a) To what extent is each agent involved in the expansion of the global capitalist system in the South? b) To what extent does each agent benefit from the expansion of the global capitalist system? c) To what extent does each agent drive the reproduction of the global political economic system in the South? d) To what extent does each agent overlap with other agents? e) To what extent does each agent shape the training offered by the US to military forces from the South? f) To what extent does each agent benefit from US training of military forces from the South?

This research relied on the following sources: documentary analysis, focused interviews, and non-participant observation. Qualitative case study research involves the use of a range of methods including interviewing and observation, as well as analysis of a range of primary and secondary documents. Using interviews allows the interviewer to learn about peoples' feelings, thoughts and experiences concerning an issue and they provide the data that researchers analyse and share with others through books, reports and articles.[96] The analysis of the interview notes allows the interviewer to read and re-read the material until different themes emerge.[97] Themes can be labelled and coded according to pre-specified codes, for instance, the response of the interviewee to the campaign to close WHINSEC, but new codes can also be generated from the interview material according to issues raised by the interviewees, such as the frustration on the part of a Department of Defense member of staff with the Bush administration's policies on the International Criminal Court and the tying of foreign training provision to a willingness on the part of other states not to prosecute US personnel via the ICC. It is important to analyse documents as individual sources. A process of triangulation should also take place in which they are cross-referenced with and analysed alongside the interview material and the observations gathered through non-participant observation. This is because it is important that documents are checked from more than one angle in order to establish their validity.[98] This means that the conclusions reached are likely to be more plausible and accurate.

---

[96] Herbert J Rubin and Irene S Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing. The Art of Hearing Data*, (London: Sage Publications, Inc, 1995), p.2.
[97] Ibid. p.238.
[98] Keith MacDonald, 'Using Documents', in Gilbert, *Researching Social Life*, p.208.

The plausibility of the interpretations and conclusions reached also depends upon analysing the data sources in relation to the key research sub-questions outlined above. This introductory chapter has introduced the significance of the project, has outlined the relevant literature and its limitations, has defined key concepts and terms, and has outlined the project's methodology. Chapters two and three will establish the project's theoretical framework. Chapters four to seven consider foreign military training within different time periods in relation to repression and human rights, (the Cold War, the post-Cold War, and the post-9/11 periods). Primary Department of Defense sources and interviews with Department of Defense staff were used to assess the purposes and nature of the training, and to assess the intended outcomes of the training. The websites and various documents and reports produced by various NGOs and by SOAW were used to establish the impact that foreign military training is considered to have had upon repression and human rights in countries in receipt of training. Primary Department of Defense sources and secondary documents, as well as interviews with Department of Defense and WHINSEC personnel were used to establish the role played by foreign military training within the context of evolving US foreign policy. Primary Department of Defense sources, and SOAW sources, and particularly interviews with WHINSEC staff and SOAW members were used to determine what role SOAW has played in changing the nature and function of foreign military training, particularly at SOA / WHINSEC. The differences between WHINSEC training and other training initiatives were assessed using primary Department of Defense sources and secondary works. Primary Department of Defense sources, primary sources produced by human rights NGOs and secondary sources on the use of torture, as well as interviews with Department of Defense and WHINSEC staff, were used to assess the role, if any, of torture within US military training of forces from the South. The concluding chapter considers the role of the training within the context of global capital, and the future for activism, both inside and outside of academia, in challenging US foreign military training in the South. Primary SOAW sources and secondary sources, as well as interviews with SOAW members and WHINSEC and Department of Defense staff inform this chapter, in relation to activism.

PART I

CHAPTER TWO: US FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

The purpose of this chapter is to establish a contextual framework for assessing the role of US training of military forces from the South. This is because the training needs to be understood in relation to broader US foreign policy objectives. Recently, IR scholars have debated the ways in which US foreign policy, in pursuit of US interests, also benefits international capital. This has also included discussion of repression as a tool of US foreign policy. Missing from these debates, however, is the question of the role that US training of military forces from the South plays within this context. There are two components of US foreign policy in the South that must be fully understood if we are to make sense of the functions that are served by the training. The first is the relationship between US foreign policy objectives and the spread and intensification of capitalism. The second is the strategies that the US uses to achieve its foreign policy objectives. It is the second of these that is most relevant to the relationships between the training and repression and human rights. By developing an understanding of these two components, I can address the following two questions. Firstly, what is the relationship between US training of military forces from the South and US foreign policy goals? Secondly, what is the relationship between the training and the strategies that the US uses to achieve those goals? In this chapter I will begin by showing that US foreign policy in the South is shaped predominantly by continuities, namely that it has been driven primarily by ensuring that the interests of the US state are secured and promoted, and that US capital is also protected and expanded. The pursuit of these objectives has involved the US attempting to subjugate the South to its interests. I will then situate these continuities within a theoretical framework which accounts for the relationships between US foreign policy and the various agents and beneficiaries of the spread of capitalism, looking specifically at the role that US foreign policy plays in this process.

Continuities in US foreign policy objectives

US national security, US primacy, and the protection and promotion of US capital have been central to US foreign policy ever since President James Monroe delivered a speech to Congress, on 2 December 1823, which became known as the Monroe Doctrine. The principle at the heart of the Monroe Doctrine was the protection of the Western hemisphere from colonisation by the European powers. Monroe declared:

> We owe it, therefore, to candour, and to the amicable relations existing between the US and those powers [the European powers], to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.[1]

The US thus declared itself the protector of the independent nations of the Americas, with the role of protecting the Western Hemisphere from European states, seen as potential sources of threat, which might undermine that position of the US in the hemisphere.[2] Latin American states were identified as existing to serve the US, and therefore, an extension of US territory, in that any efforts by European states to invade them would be seen as an attack on the peace and safety of the US itself.

The resolve to ensure US primacy has shaped US foreign policy ever since, not only in the Western hemisphere, but globally. US foreign policy is therefore characterised by this continuity. Yet orthodox scholars of IR tend to understand US foreign policy within the context of a historical account of the Cold War and post-Cold War periods, which assumes that there was no real continuation of Cold War policies in the post-Cold War period.[3] They have argued that the end of the Cold War was a watershed in US foreign policy, with new threats to face and new policies needed to tackle them.[4] They see US Cold War foreign policy in the South to have been benign and pro-democratic, and dominated by containing Soviet expansion. By contrast, and in agreement with revisionist scholars including Gabriel Kolko, Noam Chomsky and Doug Stokes, I argue that US foreign policy in the South was, and continues to be, shaped by continuities. US foreign policy has been driven by the defence of US primacy and capital since the early 1800s, and the Cold War was as much a war for dominance of the South by the North, and particularly the US, as between East and West.[5]

Evidence of these continuities dating back to the Monroe Doctrine is found in the planning of the US Council on Foreign Relations, in its War and Peace Studies Project, during World War II, for a Grand Area in which the US could ensure its economic supremacy. The Council worked closely with the US government to establish a world order which would serve the US.[6] In 1940 the Council began to assess the degree to which the Western Hemisphere was

---

[1] Monroe Doctrine, quoted in Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine 1823-1826*, 3 vols, Vol. I, (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927),
[2] James Richardson, 'Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents (volume II): The Monroe Doctrine', 1907, <http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/50.htm>
[3] For a critical overview, see Stokes, 'Why the End of the Cold War Doesn't Matter', pp.560-585.
[4] Samuel Huntington advanced one of the most famous arguments about the future of world politics following the Cold War, asserting that the fundamental source of conflict in the post-Cold War world would not be ideological or economic, but civilisational. Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*, (London: Simon and Schuster UK Ltd, 1997), see chapter one.
[5] Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy*, pp.1-28; Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, pp.ix-xiii; Stokes, *America's Other War*, pp.18-38; Stokes, 'Why the End of the Cold War Doesn't Matter', pp.560-585.
[6] Lawrence Shoup and William Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust: The Council on Foreign Relations and United States Foreign Policy*, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977), pp.117-177.

self-sufficient, and whether it required trade with other areas to maintain its prosperity, whether it was as self-contained as Europe, and how much of the world's resources the US would require to maintain power and prosperity.[7]

The Council's findings were presented to President Roosevelt in 1940, recommending that, because Britain was engaged with protecting the world from German penetration, the entire world outside of Continental Europe was open to the US, or as the Council advised the President, there was "a great residual area potentially available to us and upon the basis of which US foreign policy may be framed."[8] The Council pointed out that preservation of this kind would require "increased military expenditures and other risks."[9] The first step would be the integration of the Western Hemisphere with the Pacific region into a trading bloc, of which the US would be the greatest beneficiary through its exports of manufactured and agricultural goods and the import of numerous raw materials and food stuffs.[10] The Council concluded that a major component of this expansion of US access to global capital was:

> [the] coordination and cooperation of the US with other countries to secure the limitation of any exercise of sovereignty by foreign nations that constitutes a threat to the minimum world area essential for the security and economic prosperity of the US and the Western Hemisphere.[11]

This was to ensure the maintenance of US supremacy without requiring any internal changes to the US fiscal system, with the Grand Area becoming known among the planners as "elbow room."[12] Economic means were to play a key role in integrating the Grand Area, with the Council proposing the IMF and the World Bank as the international institutions that would create one world economy, which would be dominated by the US.[13] The loss by the former European imperial powers of their remaining colonies following World War II would further enable the US to penetrate the Grand Area to ensure its dominance of the international capitalist system. This was to shape US foreign policy throughout the Cold War, although much of the official rhetoric emphasised containing communism, rather than the expansion of US capital, as I will show in chapter four. Military assistance by the US in the South, as shown in subsequent chapters, was part of this process. A great deal of US military might was deployed to assist US capital expansion and to bring the South under the yoke of the US in economic terms, including by force. The Grand Area strategy clearly invokes the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and indeed extends them far beyond the Western Hemisphere.

---

[7] Ibid. p.125.
[8] Quoted in Ibid. p.129.
[9] Quoted in Ibid. p.129.
[10] Quoted in Ibid. p.127.
[11] Quoted in Ibid. p.130.
[12] Shoup and Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust*, pp.129 and 136.
[13] Ibid. pp.166-169.

The US and global capitalism

US foreign policy continues to be shaped by the drive to ensure US primacy and expand US capital. This contrasts with realist and liberal approaches to US foreign policy, discussed in chapter one, which assume the US to be driven purely by what is referred to as national security, or by a commitment to spreading democracy and liberal values. The US has found that extending and intensifying the capitalist system in the South, while conducive to the material interests of other states and their capitalist elites, has been an effective way of achieving its own goals. But these other states and capitalist elites are also agents of the spread and intensification of capitalism.[14] Globalisation, understood as processes of interconnection and mutual constitution on a worldwide scale,[15] has transformed the relations between states and capitalist elites, so that states and those elites are intertwined through a variety of relationships across state boundaries. Some of those relationships are cooperative and some competitive.[16] Since states and capitalist elites are interconnected in these ways, and have become increasingly internationalised, it logically follows that the actions of one of those states, or elites, may impact upon not just that state and its elite, but also on other states and their elites.

While US foreign policy will primarily be aimed at promoting the interests of the US state, its actions may also have positive outcomes for other agents within the global system. At times it may also have negative impacts for other agents. Any assessment of US foreign policy must, therefore, take into account the outcomes, whether intended or consequential, of foreign policy for the following agents: the US state; US capital; other states; and international capital by which I mean non-US capitalists, either working alone, or collectively, for example through the EU, sometimes in conjunction with US capital, to achieve their own or collective interests.[17] I distinguish between the US and other states because the US is the primary driver of the spread of capitalism, often acting unilaterally to

---

[14] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman refer to such elites as proxies of the US. See Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism: The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol. I,* (Boston: South End Press, 1979). I prefer not to use this term as it applies a lack of agency on the part of those agents, and instead refer to them as allies of the US. This is because, as this analysis will show, those allies demonstrate significant independent action and sometimes act at odds with the US, so are not simply US proxies.
[15] Tarak Barkawi, *Globalization and War*, (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2006), chapter one.
[16] For a convincing account of these relations within the context of globalisation, see Ibid. chapter one. Barkawi argues that globalisation is not the new phenomenon that it has often been assumed to be, but is a process that has been underway since the late 19th Century. Theorists who have explored the impact that these processes have had on the form and functions of the nation state include Nicos Poulantzas, see *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*, (London: New Left Books, 1975), and more recently, in light of debates on US imperialism, Bob Jessop, see 'Globalisation and the National State', Department of Sociology, University of Lancaster, 2003, <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Jessop-Globalization-and-the-National-State.pdf>
[17] These distinctions between the state and capital as agents is drawn from the Marxist conceptualisation of the state developed by Nicos Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, Translated by Timothy O'Hagan, (London: Verso, [1968] 1987), pp.53-56, 37-119 and 187.

achieve this end. Whereas other states, specifically the core capitalist states, also seek to spread of capitalism, they do not, individually, currently challenge US dominance of the international system, so they can only balance US dominance, as I will show, through collaborative action. I develop a framework below which accounts for the interconnections between these agents and potential beneficiaries in the process of spreading and intensifying capitalism in the South, and will show that the distinction between these agents will not always be a sharp one. This framework will make an important research contribution because it allows for a comprehensive account of the relationships between US foreign policy and the various agents and beneficiaries of capitalism.

The role that US foreign policy plays in the spread and intensification of capitalism in the South has been the subject of intense debate in recent years among a small number of revisionist IR scholars, all of whom accept the continuity thesis and argue that US foreign policy is driven by the impulse to secure and promote the interests of the US state, and to protect and promote US capital. It is the degree to which US foreign policy has also benefited international capital and other states, and specifically other core capitalists states, defined as powerful Northern democratic states such as the members of the G8, on which they differ. Contributors to this debate tend to focus on whether the US state, through its foreign policy, is the primary agent of global capital, with only minimal consideration given to the role of other agents and potential beneficiaries within this process, and the interrelations between those various agents. The approach I propose corrects this, by offering a framework which sees various agents as potential drivers and beneficiaries of the policies that are aimed at expanding capitalism, while recognising that the US state is the most influential of those agents. The approach enables primacy in terms of both agency and outcome to be attributed differently in different circumstances, but also allows for the identification of broad trends. I will first outline the three main approaches to the relationship between US foreign policy and the spread and intensification of capitalism. I call these the capitalism as imperialist approach, the US as agent of capital approach, and the dual logics approach. I will then put forward the approach that I propose, which I call the multiple agents approach, which allows for a more flexible account of the interrelations between the various agents.

Approaches to US global power projection

The capitalism as imperialist approach argues that capital itself is the driving force and instigator of the contemporary world order. This approach, developed by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, sees the capitalist project as bringing together economic and political power to realise a "properly capitalist order", or Empire. Empire, they argue, is a concept that is

characterised by a lack of boundaries. Its rule, they say, has no limits because it is a regime that rules over the entire world. Rather than being a historical regime, it is an order that effectively suspends history and fixes the existing state of affairs for eternity.[18] Thus it is capital that is seen as the primary agent of the expansion of global capitalism, as opposed to the US state, through its foreign policies. While my own approach allows for the agency of capital itself in the process of spreading capitalism, underplaying the US as a key agent of global capitalism is mistaken, as I will show.

The US as agent of capitalism approach, advanced by Peter Gowan, argues that the US state is the driving force for the spread of capitalism, in that the US has not simply been pursuing its own interests at the expense of its rivals, but has been "securing the general conditions for the expansion of capital as a system, in which they have an interest too."[19] Gowan argues that the international monetary regime, which he terms the Dollar-Wall Street Regime, has acted as a potential instrument of economic statecraft and power politics for the US.[20] The Dollar-Wall Street Regime is the new international monetary system, created in the 1970s. Following the cutting of the link between the dollar and gold in 1972, which shifted the world economy onto a "pure dollar standard", and which turned people towards Wall Street for finance.[21] This led to the strengthening of Wall Street in the international financial market, which in turn reinforced the dominance of the dollar.[22] Gowan argues that this new monetary and financial regime was the "deeply political result of political choices made by successive governments of one state: the US."[23] This new system, Gowan argues, is an immensely potent political instrument, and privileges the US within the system because the US Federal Reserve can largely dictate the levels of international interest rates through moving US domestic interest rates, thereby determining the costs of credit internationally; Washington can influence the levels of regulation and supervision of bank lending; the US can combine unregulated international banking and financial markets with minimal risk of the US banking and financial systems suffering a resulting collapse; and finally, through this system, state barriers can be broken down to further the interests of US capital. This occurs through redesigning the financial systems of target states, particularly in the South, to fit with the business strategies of Wall Street operators and their US clients, such as transnational corporations.[24] Gowan's account is important, because it helps to explain the reasons for US primacy within the international economic system, and I will demonstrate how the US state

[18] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*, (New York: Harvard University Press, 2000), p.9.
[19] Peter Gowan, 'A Calculus of Power', *New Left Review*, vol.16, (2002), <http://www.newleftreview.net/NLR25003.shtml>
[20] Peter Gowan, *The Global Gamble. Washington's Faustian Bid for World Dominance*, (London: Verso, 1999), p.4.
[21] Ibid. pp.19-25.
[22] Ibid. p.24.
[23] Ibid. p.4.
[24] Ibid. pp.26-30.

has driven such processes in the South in subsequent chapters. There is little discussion of the agency of other states and of international capital in Gowan's account, but the approach I propose addresses this.

Building on Gowan's approach, the dual logics approach developed by Stokes focuses not simply upon the US state as an agent of capitalism, but also on the way in which US efforts to expand capitalism will primarily benefit US capital, because of the structural power of the US economy within the world capitalist system.[25] For Stokes, the US "as the core hegemonic capitalist state" has played a dual role in the spread of capitalism.[26] On the one hand, it has been subject to a national logic which seeks to maximise US national interests, including those of the state and of US capital, and on the other, to a transnational logic, which has caused the US to play "a coordinating role that has sought to reproduce a global political economy conducive to other core capitalist states."[27] He shows that the US seeks to secure conditions that will lend themselves to the material interests of other capitalist states and international capital because such conditions will benefit, primarily, US capital. As Stokes puts it:

> Instead of arguing that the US state now acts to secure a transnational outcome for transnational capital, I would argue that when the US state acts it is because of the structural power of the US economy within world capitalism, with transnational outcomes primarily benefiting US capital through the USA's preponderance of global market power.[28]

Stokes illustrates his argument with the case of the neoliberalisation of Latin America, largely driven by multilateral agreements between the US and Latin American states. He argues that the US has dominated the international institutions that are implementing neoliberal reforms in Latin America, and that agreements such as the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), which link Latin American states into a single trade bloc, while opening the region up to global capital, will simultaneously strengthen the power of US capital, thanks to the preponderance of US market power.[29] Thus the US state is the primary agent, and the US state and capital are the primary beneficiaries in the system. Stokes acknowledges international capital as a potential, although lesser beneficiary of US policy, but the purpose of his dual logics approach is to consider the role of the US state in the spread of capitalism, and not to assess US capital, international capital or other states as agents in this process.

---

[25] Doug Stokes, 'The Heart of Empire? Theorising US Empire In An Era Of Transnational Globalisation', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, no.2, (2005), pp.217-236.
[26] Ibid. p.230.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid. p.228.
[29] Ibid. pp.228-229.

The multiple agents approach

I propose an approach that can be referred to as the multiple agents approach, which sees the US state, acting via its foreign policy according to its economic and political impulses, and according to the national and transnational logics referred to by Stokes, as just one of various agents and potential beneficiaries of the spread of capitalism. As Gowan and Stokes argue, in recent times, the most effective way in which to achieve this objective has been through the pursuit of conditions that lend themselves to the material interests of other capitalist states and international capital. I agree with Stokes that currently, the primary beneficiaries of the system are the US state and US capital because of the position of primacy that they occupy within it. This is evident in the repatriation of capital into the US financial system, referred to by Gowan with specific reference to the re-investment of petro-dollars into the US economy, and the ongoing use of the dollar as the favoured currency within international oil markets.[30] Interestingly, in 2000 Saddam Hussein opted to convert all of its US dollars in its UN Oil for Food account to euros, meaning that any trade in Iraqi oil would be in euros.[31] When Iraqi oil exports resumed following the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, it was announced that oil would be paid for in dollars only. At the same time the billions of euros in the Iraqi Oil for Food account, under UN Resolutions 1483, were transferred to the Development Fund for Iraq, a US-run dollar account.[32] One outcome of the US-led invasion and occupation of Iraq, therefore, is the re-establishment of the dollar as the currency for Iraqi trade in oil.

The conditions that have been established which lead to this disproportionate privileging of the US state and US capital have been established not just by the US, but also by other agents. Those other agents, as outlined above, are US capital, other states, and international capital. Even though I distinguish between the state and capital as agents of the spread and intensification of capitalism in the South, this is not to say that I see the state as being devoid of an economic function. Rather, the capitalist state has economic and political functions, and the foreign policy of the state, usually articulated in terms of the national interest, responds variously to political and material impulses. This means that the state will sometimes act for political reasons and sometime in the interests of capital. The state does not, therefore, always act in the material interests of capital. Indeed it may at times act in ways which are contrary to the material interests of capital, at least in the short-term.[33]

---

[30] Gowan, *The Global Gamble*, pp.21-22 and 35-36.
[31] Faisal Islam, 'Iraq Nets Handsome Profit by Dumping Dollar for Euro', *The Observer*, 16 February 2003, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/iraq/story/0,12239,896344,00.html>
[32] United Nations Security Council (UNSC), 'Resolution 1483', 22 May 2003, <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/368/53/PDF/N0336853.pdf?OpenElement>
[33] This is because, as Poulantzas argues, the capitalist state does not directly represent the dominant classes' economic interests but their political interests. A key function of the capitalist state is to ensure that dominated classes are politically disorganised so that they are unable to overcome their economic isolation and are therefore

Just as the US state is acting according to a national and a transnational logic, US capital is also acting according to two logics, in that it seeks to maximise its own interests in the form of profits, comparable to the national interest at state level, but it also seeks to reproduce the global political economy to further its own capacity to increase profits. This also happens to be conducive to the interests of other national capitals. For instance, the US-based oil company Exxon will try and maximise its own profits but will also push for transnational structures that will further this aim, such as conducive trade regulations, improved infrastructure, and trading rights. Other states, and particularly other core capitalist states are also agents of global capital and either work independently, as the US state does, through their own foreign policies to protect and promote their national interests, or corporately to secure their collective interests, for instance through the EU. International capital, meaning non-US capital, working alone or collectively, is also an agent of global capital. International capital is driven by the same two logics as US capital, maximizing its own profits and reproducing the global political economy to further its collective capacity to increase profits for itself, and thereby, other national capitals. Each of these agents then, can also be potential beneficiaries and losers from the actions of the others, so when the US state acts, the others might also gain or might lose out, to varying degrees at different times.

To some extent, the approach I propose echoes the work of William Robinson, who argues that we are witnessing the emergence of a transnational capitalist class and a transnational state.[34] Central to Robinson's thesis is the idea that "under globalisation a new class fractionation, or axis, is occurring between national and transnational fractions or classes."[35] It comprises the owners of transnational capital, i.e. the group that owns the leading worldwide means of production as embodied in the transnational corporations and private financial institutions.[36] The transnational capitalist class "works through identifiable institutions and is fairly coherent as a collective actor."[37] The emerging transnational institutions, established by the transnational capitalist class, constitute an incipient transnational state apparatus.[38] This apparatus is defined as an emerging network that is

---

unable to threaten the interests of the dominant classes. This is achieved through the state appearing as a "political unity of a society of divergent economic interests", which are articulated not as class interests but as the interests of private individuals. The state therefore appears to be neutral, an appearance which is in part ensured by the state sometimes acting in the economic interests of dominated classes, in the short-term, at the expense of capital, while always guaranteeing the long term political interests of the economic elite. See Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, pp.130-191.

[34] William Robinson, *A Theory of Global Capitalism. Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004). I am grateful to Eric Herring for suggesting the taxonomy which has resulted in the framework that I develop here.

[35] Ibid. p.37.

[36] Ibid. p.47.

[37] Ibid. p.86.

[38] Ibid. pp.87-88.

made up of transformed and externally integrated nation-states, together with the supranational economic and political forums such as the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO, the OECD and EU, among others, but, as Robinson argues, it has not yet acquired any centralised institutional form. It is therefore an *emergent* state.[39]

While I agree that there are increasing processes of transnationalisation at play, and that we might refer to this as an emergent transnational state, it is important not to overplay this for two main reasons. Firstly, while we have witnessed the transfer of some decision-making powers upwards to supra-national bodies, such as the EU, this has been accompanied, as Jessop argues, by attempts on the part of states to re-claim power by "managing the relationship among different scales of political and economic organisation."[40] This, he argues, has included governments becoming more involved in coordinating the self-organisation of partnerships, networks and governance regimes. In addition, states are also seeking to shape the development of international policy regimes in ways which will benefit their respective national elites.[41] Secondly, the US continues to be a dominant force within the process of the transnationalisation of capitalism. The US, as Stokes shows, continues to headquarter the majority of the world's transnational corporations, and of the world's richest members of the transnational capitalist class, the majority are US citizens, with eight out of the top ten holding US citizenship.[42] Politically too, the US is the dominant power within the system. For example, in terms of trade law, the US frequently uses section 201 of its 1974 Trade Act which authorises the US president "to take action when a particular product is being imported into the country in such large quantities as to cause injury or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry."[43] It was over the US' use of section 201 that the EU appealed to the WTO over high US tariffs on EU steel imports into the US. The WTO ruled against the US, arguing that US actions violated WTO rules. British Trade Minister, Mike O'Brien announced that if the US did not lift the tariffs the EU would impose retaliatory measures, including sanctions against US imports worth $2.2 billion per year.[44] Despite this, Ian Rodgers, director of UK Steel, warned:

> The US Department of Commerce is contemplating technical changes in the way that anti-dumping duties are calculated that would mean that even if the section 201 tariffs were withdrawn today they would continue to bite on many steel products for another two to three years, and if the section 201 tariffs are not withdrawn would double their real effect. It looks to us like the USA is preparing to cheat on its obligations. We are urging the Commission and the British government

---

[39] Ibid. p.88.
[40] Jessop, 'Globalisation and the National State', p.14.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Stokes, 'The Heart of Empire?', p.228.
[43] ITDS, 'Sections 201-204 of the Trade Act of 1974', International Trade Data System, 23 April 2004, <http://www.itds.treas.gov/sec201.htm>
[44] BBC, 'EU Scores Steel Victory Over US', *BBC Online*, 10 November 2003, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/3256197.stm>

> that if this proposal is enacted, then the EU must still proceed with its retaliation even if the section 201 tariffs are withdrawn.[45]

Thus, even in cases in which judgements are made that conflict with the interests of the US, for instance through the UN or the WTO, which Robinson includes within his emergent transnational state, the US has the power to exempt itself from such judgements, and uses its power to pursue its own interests regardless of international pressure.

In this sense it is difficult to make a strong case for referring to the apparatuses at the disposal of international capital as anything more developed than an emergent transnational state. We should also note that it is US-led. In this sense, we avoid merging the various agents I refer to, with their competing and cooperative relationships that each affect the other, into a single actor. We also avoid underplaying the dominant position that the US continues to occupy. This is not simply because of the power of the US to act outside of the rulings of international organisations, but also because there is no level playing field within the international institutions themselves. Even within those international institutions that Robinson refers to, core capitalist states, and their respective capitalist classes, and the US in particular, are still the ones that are able to wield the most power and influence. In this sense even the notion of a transnational capitalist class is not entirely accurate, given that the international owners of capital tend to be based in the core capitalist states, and the institutions of the emergent transnational state continue to be geared to respond to the interests of the capitalist classes of the most powerful states. There are, therefore, what might be referred to as class divisions even within the so-called transnational capitalist class.

For instance, within the International Monetary Fund, the core capitalist states, by virtue of the fact that they are obliged to contribute the greatest financial resources to the IMF, because of their economic position compared to other members, are granted a greater share in IMF votes, with the US having 17.1 percent of the total vote; Japan, 6.13 percent; Germany, 5.99 percent; the UK and France, 4.95 percent each; and China, 2.94 percent.[46] In addition, in order to change the constitution of the IMF, and the World Bank, 85 percent of the votes is required. Given that the US holds 17.1 percent of the vote, it can, in effect, veto any such effort.[47] And while at the WTO each member state has one vote, because of the resources that the core capitalist states have access to, they are in a much stronger position to ensure that negotiations go their way. This is exacerbated by the fact that certain agreements that

---

[45] UK Steel, 'UK Steel Welcomes WTO Ruling on Illegal Tariffs but Warns of New US Threat to Trade', UK Steel, 10 November 2003, <http://www.uksteel.org.uk/nw108.htm>
[46] International Monetary Fund (IMF, 'IMF Members' Quotas and Voting Power, and IMF Board of Governors', International Monetary Fund, 31 March 2006, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/memdir/members.htm>
[47] George Monbiot, 'The Rich World's Veto', *The Guardian*, 15 October 2002, <http://www.monbiot.com/dsp_article.cfm?article_id=538>

have been reached favour the producers that are predominantly headquartered in core capitalist states. For example, one of the key issues that the WTO deals with is intellectual property rights. These were strengthened under the Uruguay Round of Trade talks which took place between 1986 and 1993, and which brought the World Trade Organisation into being.

In a few instances periphery states have successfully challenged intellectual property rights. For example, Western pharmaceutical companies, under the agreements on intellectual property rights, could stop pharmaceutical companies from Brazil and India from "stealing" their intellectual property, which they argued they had done in developing generic drugs for the treatment of HIV and AIDS that were much cheaper than those produced by the Northern companies. Because of the outcry over this, the Northern companies were forced to back down. Yet the trade agreements, as Joseph Stiglitz, former chief economist at the World Bank, argues, still "overwhelmingly reflected the interests and perspectives of the producers, as opposed to the users, whether in developed or developing countries."[48] The foundations of the trade agreements therefore contribute to the unequal relationship between core and periphery states and capital. Furthermore, with a complete lack of transparency in the negotiations that lead to agreements, all of which take place behind closed doors, it is not possible to see the degree to which corporate and other special interests affect the outcomes of those negotiations. Given the number of agreements that favour transnational corporations headquartered in the core capitalist states over the interests of the poor in the global South, however, it is not difficult to see the leverage that such corporate groups have.[49]

This approach allows for a more nuanced conception of the relationship between the US state and the spread and intensification of capitalism that does not preclude other potential agents. It allows us to analyse the relationships between the US state, acting as a result of a variety of economic and political impulses, US capital, other states, and international capital, casting each of these as agents and beneficiaries in different measure in different circumstances. For the purposes of this research, the US state is central to the analysis, since I am concerned with US foreign policy strategy, so a key question will be the degree to which US foreign policy benefits primarily US political interests, as opposed to the interests of US capital, other states and international capital. The multiple agents approach provides a theoretical framework for exploring the role of the US state which does not preclude the other actors as agents in the process of reproducing the global capitalist system. The other states and international capital may not have been as successful as the US state in securing the privileged position that the US state and US capital have in the system, but this does not mean that the other states, as

[48] Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalisation and its Discontents*, (London: Penguin Books, 2002), pp.7-8.
[49] Ibid. p.227.

agents of global capital, should be absent from our analysis. Similarly, the primacy of the US state and US capital as beneficiaries of this process should not lead us to the conclusion that they are the only beneficiaries. Primacy is not synonymous with exclusion. Even though international capital and the other states may benefit less from US power projection, and indeed from their own efforts at power projection, both as individual states and national capitals and as states and national capitals collaborating through organisations such as the EU, they should not be absent from the analysis. There is also then scope for considering the ways in which these other agents might affect the nature of US foreign policy strategy, rather than simply precluding them from the analysis.

Distinguishing between the agents of capital

US foreign policy, then, will at the least be aimed at serving the interests of the US state and possibly US capital, but may also have the effect of serving the other states and international capital. It is also possible, although less likely, that it may be subordinated to the other states, particularly other core capitalist states, and international capital. It is important to note that the distinction between these various agents will not always be a sharp one, particularly at the level of the state and national capital. A key question is the degree to which it is possible to separate out these agents, as this has important implications for any discussion of the interests pursued and served by them. The nation state and national capital are likely to be the least distinguishable. This is because at a structural level, democracy as is practiced in the North is inextricably linked to the capitalist system. The success of the state itself is understood in terms of ensuring an increase in returns for national capital which helps to strengthen the national economy. Thus the impulse of the political system within Northern democratic states will be to work in tandem with capital. In this structural sense, therefore, state policy will be tied closely to ensuring the spread and maintenance of the capitalist system to ensure that this type of progress continues.

States and capital are deeply intertwined. The zone of ambiguity between them is likely to be greatest between the US state and US capital. This is because key figures within the state apparatus may simultaneously represent capital by having a financial interest in private companies, or by occupying executive roles, such as directors or board members, within them. There are, in fact, extremely close ties between members of the US state apparatus and US capital. Various members of the current Bush administration, for instance, have been owners and directors of capital, and are closely associated with various private corporations. Both Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, for example, had previously served as Secretary of Defence, Cheney under the administration of Bush Senior, and Rumsfeld under President

Ford, and have both been CEOs, directors and board members of major US corporations. Rumsfeld was chairman of the Gilead Pharmaceuticals Company until 2001, chairman and CEO of the General Instrument Corporation between 1990 and 1993, CEO, chairman and President of the pharmaceutical company G.D. Searle between 1977 and 1985, was involved in negotiations with Bechtel and Iraq during the 1980s for a pipeline project, and is a former director of Gulfstream Aerospace, Tribune Company, Metricom Incorporated, Sears Roebuck and Company and Asea Brown Boveri.[50] Dick Cheney was president and CEO of Halliburton between 1995 and 2000.[51] They both later took up office in the administration of George W. Bush, as did Condoleeza Rice, who had served as a Board member of Chevron, the Hewlett Foundation, the Transamerica Foundation, Hewlett Packard, and Charles Schwab, and as a board member and member of the International Advisory Board of JP Morgan.[52] Thus while there is an impulse within the Northern democratic political system itself to further capital, there are also obvious ties between individuals within the political system, responsible for making policy, who are themselves closely linked with capital. Given these linkages between the US state and US capital, it is likely that their interests will often be coterminous, and the distinction between these two agents will not always be clear. Indeed, this can be empirically tested in specific cases by assessing whether a particular foreign policy decision was taken in the interests simply of the US state or of US capital as well, by looking at the role of specific individuals that may be involved in a particular foreign policy action and their ties to capital that may also benefit. By looking at a range of such cases, we can then draw conclusions about the degree to which the US state and US capital can be distinguished in foreign policy decisions.

The distinction between the other states and the US state is likely to be sharper because, while the US state is one of the core capitalist states, through its position as a leading member of various transnational institutions it might make decisions that are shared by other states, particularly core capitalist states, but it also enjoys autonomous decision-making powers, as do each of the other states. It therefore may well act in its own interests which may conflict with those of other states. In specific cases, it might be that the decision of the US is completely in line with other states, so we would say that there was significant overlap between them. In others, it might be that the US state acts outside the wishes of the others, in which case there is a much more obvious distinction between them. The degree to which the US state and the other states overlap in general terms can be deduced by looking at cases in

---

[50] Michael Flynn, 'Profile: Donald Rumsfeld', Right Web, International Relations Centre, 2005, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1346>
[51] Michael Flynn, 'Profile: Richard "Dick" Bruce Cheney', Right Web, International Relations Centre, 2005, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1072>
[52] Tom Barry and Michael Flynn, 'Profile: Condoleeza Rice', Right Web, International Relations Centre, 2005, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1325>

which decisions by the US state and other states are complementary, and at cases in which they are at odds with each other, and assessing how often their decisions complement and conflict with each other.

The distinction between US capital, meaning corporations headquartered in the US and owned primarily by US nationals, and international capital, meaning corporations owned primarily by non-US nationals and headquartered in states other than the US, is also sharper than that between the US state and US capital. This is because, while these two groups share a number of objectives, such as opening up markets across the globe and ensuring that trade practices benefit their interests, they also act in competition with each other. The degree to which these two groups can be distinguished from each other can be deduced by looking at cases in which they cooperate and in which they compete with each other, and assessing how often their actions serve the interests of each other, and how often they conflict with each other.

Finally, the other states and international capital are also likely to overlap less than the US state and US capital do, although there are significant linkages between them, as Stiglitz, points out. At the IMF, he notes, it is the finance ministers and the central bank governors that represent each of the states, and at the WTO it is the trade ministers:

> Each of these ministers is closely aligned with particular constituencies within their countries. The trade ministers reflect the concerns of the business community – both exporters who want to see new markets opened up for their products and producers of goods which compete with new imports […] The finance ministers and central bank governors are typically closely tied to the financial community; they come from financial firms, and after their period of government service, that is where they return.[53]

Thus states will, to some extent be acting on behalf of their own, and potentially other national capitals, if they are collaborating, as the EU states did in the dispute over US steel tariffs, when they enter into negotiations at the international level. While the core capitalist states will often govern the conditions under which international capital operates, through institutions such as the WTO and the IMF, the ties between other states and international capital are not necessarily as tight as those between the US state and US capital. It could be that just as members of the US state apparatus have stakes in US capital, members of other states also have stakes in their national capitals, but also in foreign capitals. They might act at the transnational level in the interests of their national capital and of international capital. This can be measured by analysing cases in which states act on behalf of international capital as a whole and on behalf of specific national capitals against others.

---

[53] Stiglitz, *Globalisation and its Discontents*, p.19.

The purpose of the thesis is not to assess the degree to which these various agents and potential beneficiaries and losers within the international system can be distinguished. However, understanding that they do overlap, and being aware of how this can be tested is significant in any assessment of the role of US training of military forces from the South within the context of the relationships between US foreign policy and these agents in the spread of capitalism. It also helps answer two important questions. The first of these is the extent to which the training serves the interests of the US state, US capital, other states and international capital. Because of the ways in which these groups overlap, it is possible that the training serves not just the US state, but also US capital, other states, and international capital. The second of these questions is the extent to which these groups shape the form that the training takes. It may be that the overlapping relationships between the groups has an impact on that training, in terms of its nature, its purposes, and its focus.

The case of the protection of oil pipelines in Colombia is instructive here, in that the foreign policy decision taken by the US state in this case does not simply serve the interests of the US state, but also, to varying degrees, those of US capital, other states, particularly Colombia, and international capital. The US General Accountability Office reported in 2005 that since 2002 the US has provided $99 million in equipment and training to the Colombian army to minimize attacks along the first 110 miles of the Caño Limón-Coveñas oil pipeline, which is operated by US based petroleum company, Occidental and Colombian Ecopetrol. This has included training by US Special Forces for 1,600 Colombian military personnel.[54] The US state is the agent of capital in this sense, and the outcome of its actions benefit both the US state, and US capital and international capital. It benefits the US state because of the strategic benefits that this brings, which include influence over the Colombian military and potential for arms transactions and ongoing provision of parts and of training as a result of the relationships established through the training. It also benefits US capital, specifically the Occidental company, and international capital, specifically the Colombian Ecopetrol company.

International capital, and particularly British capital, have also been agents, as well as beneficiaries, in the reproduction of the global capitalist system in Colombia. British Petroleum, and Canadian companies Transcanada and IPL Enterprises and the French oil company Total, which are all shareholders in the Ocensa Consortium which runs Colombia's largest pipeline, all benefit from the actions of BP, which employed an Anglo-American security company, Defence Systems Limited (DSL), to protect the Ocensa pipeline in the late

[54] US General Accounting Office, 'Security Assistance: Efforts to Secure Colombia's Caño Limón-Coveñas Oil Pipeline Have Reduced Attacks, but Challenges Remain', US General Accountability Office, September 2005, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05971.pdf>

1990s. London-based DSL sends former SAS forces to undertake these security operations. In addition BP has a secret agreement with the Colombian government to provide protection by counter-guerrilla brigades based near the pipeline.[55] In this case, British capital, as opposed to the British state, has operated to further the interests of British and transnational capital. The primary beneficiaries of this are British capital, specifically BP and DSL, but also international capital, specifically Transcanada, IPL Enterprises and Total, and also, to some extent, US capital, through the sale of equipment to the Colombian military brigades, including 60 pairs of restricted night-vision goggles to the 14th Brigade for its operations at the pipeline, following the grant of a US export licence in 1997.[56] It is also possible that the US state may have been an agent in this process if training it had given to Colombian military forces in any way impacted upon the activities of the brigades employed by the Colombian state on behalf of BP. Finally, this whole process benefits other states because it strengthens the ties that bind them through their multilateral engagements and involvements in supranational organisations, such as the WTO, IMF and the OECD. In these cases, then, we can ascertain the degree to which the different groups benefit from the US' decision to offer training to protect pipelines in Colombia. What is more ambiguous in these cases is whether the US state was intentionally acting on behalf of any of the other agents or whether the benefits were consequential because of the overlap in the interests of each of these groups. What this case shows is that there are cross cutting connections between each of the groups within the global capitalist system. Each of them have the capacity to be agents of global capital, and they are all potential beneficiaries of the actions of any of the others. The multiple agents approach allows for different assignments of primacy to the different groups in different contexts.

This multiple agents approach therefore allows us to make general observations about the relationship between US global power projection and the global capitalist project, with specific reference to the likely agents and beneficiaries, and the hierarchy of those agents and beneficiaries. It also allows us to examine specific phenomenon, such as training, and allows us to develop more nuanced accounts of how those agents/beneficiaries benefit in relation to each other in specific circumstances. In other words, this lends itself to empirical application, at both general and specific levels of analysis, from which we can then draw more informed conclusions about the broader trends, than the other approaches permit.

Conclusion

[55] Michael Gillard; Ignacio Gomez; and Melissa Jones, 'BP Hands "Tarred in Pipeline Dirty War"', 17 October 1998,<http://www.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,3504,740184,00.html>
[56] Ibid.

US foreign policy in the South has been driven for the last two hundred years by continuities, namely ensuring US national security, US primacy and the protection and promotion of US capital. While orthodox scholars have argued that the end of the Cold War marked a break in US foreign policy, revisionist scholars have shown that these objectives have consistently shaped US foreign policy, and continue to do so. Ensuring that these goals are met has involved securing large parts of the South for the expansion of US capital, including through the exploitation of resources in the South, often through the use of armed coercion. As the subsequent chapters show, this has frequently been at great cost to human rights.

In recent times the US has found that an effective way of ensuring US primacy and the promotion of US capital has been through expanding and intensifying capitalism in the South. In this chapter I have developed a framework for understanding the complex relationships and interconnections between various agents and potential beneficiaries of the spread of capitalism. These are the US state, US capital, other states, and particularly other core capitalist states, and international capital. I have shown that while the US state and US capital have benefited the most from the spread of capitalism in the South, the agency of these other actors should not be underplayed, as alone and collectively, their actions can have both positive and negative effects for the US state and US capital, just as the actions of the US state and US capital affect the other agents positively and negatively. This approach enables us to account for the complex relationships between these agents, and allows us to make general observations about the hierarchy of these agents, but also allows us to assign primacy to the different agents in different sets of circumstances.

The framework developed in this chapter to account for the relationships between the various agents in the spread of capitalism in the South will help determine the degree to which US training of military forces from the South has been a key tool of US foreign policy, and whether it has contributed to US efforts to spread capitalism in the South. It will also help us to determine the degree to which the training has benefited US capital, other states, and international capital, as well as whether those agents have in any way shaped the form that the training takes. This is important in assessing whether the training reflects broader US foreign policy objectives, outlined in this chapter as being continuous, and prioritising US national security, US primacy and the promotion of US capital. It is to US foreign policy strategies that I turn in chapter three, showing that while US foreign policy objectives have been characterised by continuities, the strategies that the US has used to achieve its objectives have been characterised by discontinuities, with significant shifts during three periods since the end of World War II.

CHAPTER THREE: US FOREIGN POLICY MEANS

While US foreign policy objectives have been shaped by continuities, as shown in chapter two, the strategies the US uses to achieve its foreign policy objectives have shifted. In this chapter I argue that there are two main strategies in US foreign policy. The first is the use of repression. The second is legitimation, which involves establishing democracy and seeking to secure popular endorsement for neoliberalism, although passive acquiescence will suffice, in order to ensure access to resources and markets in the South, primarily for US elites.[1]

These two strategies – repression and legitimation – are drawn from Gramscian conceptions of state power.[2] For Gramsci, two major superstructural levels exist within the state, referred to as civil society, which constitutes the collection of "organisms commonly called 'private'", such as political parties, trade unions, political groups, social groups, and the media, and political society, that which constitutes the state apparatus, referred to conventionally as "the state".[3] In order for a class or group to dominate the state, it must have control over both levels. This is achieved, according to Gramsci, when "'spontaneous' consent [is] given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group".[4] This is the result of the prestige which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function within capitalist production. Control over the state apparatus is also needed because it is this "which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent'", through coercion.[5] Consensual domination does not mean the absence of coercion, because dominance, or hegemony, in Gramsci's words, is consensus protected by the armour of coercion. Even in democratic societies therefore, political systems will always combine coercive and consensual elements.[6]

This concept can also be applied to international relations, particularly relations between the North and South. Transnational dominant classes and the groups and state apparatuses that they manage have maintained dominance over populations in the South through coercion, such as colonial control, or more commonly in the case of US elites, through invasions, coups and support for authoritarian regimes.[7] But they have also maintained control through

---

[1] Eric Herring and Glen Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments: The Occupation and its Legacy*, (London: C. Hurst and Co, 2006).
[2] As William Robinson argues, these can also be applied to international relations. See William Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention and Hegemony*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p.23.
[3] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), p.12.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, p.22.
[7] Ibid. p.24.

foreign policy initiatives intended to bring about spontaneous consent through the political and ideological incorporation of subordinate groups - legitimation.[8] These strategies are not mutually exclusive, but intertwined, just as they are within the state. I argue below that US foreign policy has been dominated by one or other of these strategies at different times, but this is not to say that they operate independently. Indeed, whereas US strategy in Western Europe since the end of World War II has tended to be characterised by legitimation, US policy in the South has been dominated by repressive strategies. Nevertheless, even where repressive strategies have dominated, they are accompanied by legitimation efforts, particularly securing consensus among local populations for US activities.

The notion that foreign and domestic policy strategies are characterised by repression and legitimation is accepted by revisionist scholars, who argue that US foreign policy objectives have been characterised by continuities.[9] Yet there has been little research to assess the use of these two strategies in light of the continuity thesis. A periodisation of US foreign policy strategy consisting of three phases is outlined in this chapter: the Cold War; the years following the Cold War and up until 9/11; and the years since 9/11. This periodisation accounts for the use of repression and legitimation in US foreign policy across the South since World War II.

During the Cold War, US foreign policy strategy in the South was characterised predominantly by support for and use of repression. This has included the use of state terrorism and torture, which can itself be used as a tool of state terrorism. In chapter four I show quantitatively the degree to which support for repression dominated US Cold War foreign policy strategy in the South. This provides the framework for assessing the impacts of US training of military forces from the South on repression and human rights during the Cold War in chapter five.

In the years following the Cold War and up until 9/11, US foreign policy in the South was characterised by legitimation. As discussed, this involves establishing democracy and seeking to secure popular endorsement for neoliberalism, in order to ensure access to resources and markets in the South. By neoliberalism I mean the practice of dismantling the

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Historical materialists who have discussed the use of consensus and coercion as strategies includeGramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, pp.12-13; Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, pp.138-141. Revisionist scholars who have discussed consensus and coercion in US foreign policy strategy include Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin, in 'The Unique American Empire'; Simon Bromley, in 'The Logic of American Power in the International Capitalist Order'; Richard Saull, in 'Reactionary Blowback: the Uneven Ends of the Cold War and the Origins of Contemporary Conflict in World Politics'; Michael Cox, in 'The Imperial Republic Revisted: the US in the Era of Bush'; and Peter Gowan, in 'The Bush Turn and the Drive for Primacy', all in Alex Colas and Richard Saull (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War* ,(London: Routledge, 2006), pp.24-43, 65-90, 114-130, and 131-154.

apparatus of mercantilist protection, usually operated at state level, and the opening up of previously closed economies to the forces of economic competition. This is based on traditional liberal economics and "laissez-faire" principles, and shaped the activities of the international financial institutions in the South during the 1980s and 1990s.[10] Establishing democracy in the South was deemed by decision-makers an effective way for the US to spread global capitalism in order to ensure its continued dominance, and to protect and promote US capital. Since 9/11, there has been an intensification of legitimation efforts, but there has also been a resurgence in support for repressive means, including torture.

It is not yet clear whether the post-9/11 period will be characterised primarily by repression or legitimation in the service of US objectives, as currently, both strategies appear to be given equal importance by the US. In chapter six I provide a detailed account of the ways in which the dominant strategy in US foreign policy was legitimation in the South following the Cold War, with some recourse to repressive means, but not to the same extent as during the Cold War, but also outline the ways in which legitimation has been accompanied by a resurgence in the use of repression since 9/11. This periodisation enables me to establish the extent to which the training reflects US foreign policy objectives and strategy more broadly during these three phases. I will then be able to draw conclusions about the degree to which the training is one of the tools that the US uses to ensure the reproduction of the global political economy in the South.

This chapter begins with a brief outline of the periodisation of US foreign policy strategy. In the second part of the chapter the use of repression by the US in the South is contextualised. This is important because repression has been an ongoing feature of US foreign policy strategy, including state terrorism, which is a form of repression, as discussed below. Yet it remains largely absent from mainstream terrorism studies within IR, and from most mainstream research on US politics and foreign policy more generally. The degree to which repression is a component of US training of military forces from the South is then assessed in the remaining chapters.

Discontinuities in US foreign policy strategy

As outlined in chapter two, US foreign policy objectives are characterised by continuity, and have involved the coordination of the reproduction of the global political economy transnationally, which would benefit other states and international capital, but which, because of the powerful position that the US occupies within the global political economy, would

[10] Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey Underhill, *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, Second Edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.53.

primarily benefit the US state and US capital. However, the strategies for achieving US foreign policy objectives in the South have changed in emphasis. At times those strategies have been characterised by repression and at others they have been characterised by legitimation.

The periodisation of US foreign policy strategy outlined here, and developed in more detail in subsequent chapters differs from recent accounts of the use of repression by the US in the South, which have tended to argue that US foreign policy strategy has been characterised either primarily by repression or primarily by legitimation. For instance, some scholars such as Peter Gowan, Michael Cox and Richard Saull argue that US foreign policy strategy has been, and continues to be, characterised by violent means, while scholars such as Simon Bromley, Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin suggest that the end of the Cold War opened up the possibility for more peaceful approaches to US foreign policy, including the pursuit of multilateral mechanisms. They show empirically that Washington's preference is for legitimation.[11] While I agree with this, there has also been a resurgence of support for repressive means since 9/11. Therefore, the periodisation I develop accounts for the shifts between repression and legitimation strategies for achieving US objectives, and shows that since 9/11 these have operated side-by-side.

During the Cold War, US foreign policy strategies towards what was then referred to as the "Third World" were characterised predominantly by support for repression. In chapter four I provide a detailed account of the use of repression in the South during the Cold War, which was extensive, particularly in Latin America and Indochina.

US foreign policy underwent a significant shift which coincided with the thawing of the Cold War, to an approach in which legitimation was emphasised in order to secure popular endorsement for neoliberalism, often by promoting democracy, in order to ensure US access to resources and markets in the South. Democracy as promoted by the US is variously referred to by its critics as "liberal democracy", including the neo-liberal form which comprises the minimal tax state with minimal social welfare; "market democracy;" "low-intensity democracy;" and "polyarchy."[12] Each of these terms refer to one aspect of the form of democracy that exists in states such as the US and UK. "Market democracy" for instance, evokes the notion that the democratic systems in the North are tied closely to neoliberal

---

[11] Colas and Saull (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*. Colas and Saull offer a helpful account of the commonalities and differences between the positions of these authors on this question in their introductory chapter, pp.1-23.

[12] On low-intensity democracy see Barry Gills; Joel Rocamora; and Richard Wilson (eds.), *Low Intensity Democracy: Political Power in the New World Order*, (London: Pluto, 1993), pp.3-34. On market democracy see Noam Chomsky, 'Market Democracy in a Neoliberal Order: Doctrines and Reality', University of Cape Town, 1997, <http://www.bigeye.com/chomsky.htm> On polyarchy see Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, chapter one.

economics. "Low-intensity democracy" problematises the degree to which contemporary democratic systems in the North offer significant levels of participation and breadth of choice in the practice of democracy. The term "polyarchy" invokes the notion that such systems of democracy tend to favour the interests of an elite, rather than the majority of the population. Each of these terms are problematic in that they only capture one aspect of contemporary democratic systems in the North. Equally, they are all in some way pejorative towards the democratic systems in the North. I prefer, therefore, to refer simply to democracy promotion, but with the caveat that the form of democracy being promoted, offers only limited choices, and that significant efforts are made to ensure that elite interests are protected, just as democratic systems in the North offer only limited choices and are geared towards protecting elites. For all these flaws, Northern democracy is still rooted, to a degree, in liberal principles of democratic participation and freedom of choice. Such principles are not met for all citizens in the states of the North, and policies enacted by elites sometimes curtail the liberties that citizens of democratic states are supposed to enjoy. Yet what is on offer in democratic states in the North is still preferable to authoritarian, anti-democratic regimes in other states because legal systems and democratic institutions are in place that offer a level of protection from state repression.

This impulse to establish democracy across the globe has been especially favoured by US neo-conservatives, who have been present in US politics since the 1960s, many of whom have been advisors and members of previous Republican governments, and now hold office in or act as advisors to the Bush administration. The origins of neoconservatism are disputed, with some scholars attributing it to a group of largely Trotskyite, Jewish intellectuals that attended City College of New York in the mid-1930s and early 1940s.[13] Other scholars argue

[13] See for example, Francis Fukuyama, 'After Neoconservatism', *New York Times*, 19 February 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html?ex=1298005200&en=4126fa38fefd80de&ei=5090> He argues that they sympathised with the social and economic aims of Communism, but rejecting existing socialism and the horrors it entailed in Stalinist Russia. They founded the neoconservative journal *The Public Interest*, and were united by the theme of the limits of social engineering, and specifically, that efforts to seek social justice often left societies worse off than before because of the massive state intervention required and the disruption this brought to existing social relations. The turn from these roots to the current position of the American neoconservatives – that the root cause of terrorism lies in the lack of democracy in the Middle East, and that the US has the ability and wisdom to correct this – relates, according to Francis Fukuyama, to the way in which the Cold War ended. He argues that despite being ridiculed for its hard-line against the Soviet Union during the Cold War, particularly the view that the US could win, a total victory is exactly what occurred in 1989-91. This significantly shaped the thinking of the younger generation of neoconservatives, in that it created the expectation that all authoritarian regimes were hollow at the core and would crumble with a small push from outside, and that democracy was the default position that states would revert to once a coercive regime was removed. He argues that two further streams have fed into contemporary neoconservatism, according to Fukuyama. The first stems from students of the German Jewish political theorist, Leo Strauss, who was concerned with the "crisis of modernity" brought on by the relativism of Neitzsche and Heidegger, in addition to the view that neither the claims of religion nor the deeply held opinions about the nature of the good life could be removed from politics, as Enlightenment thinkers had hoped they would be. The second came from Albert Wohlstetter, a Rand Corporation strategist who taught Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz, along with Zalmay Khalizad, currently US ambassador to Iraq. Wohlstetter was particularly concerned with the problem of nuclear proliferation and the loopholes in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which, he argued, states like Iran and Iraq could walk through.

that contemporary neoconservativism has its roots primarily in realist conceptions of the pursuit of the national interest. Herring and Rangwala, along with scholars such as David Harvey, Alex Callinicos and Roger Burbach and Jim Tarbell, for instance, describe the influence of what they refer to as assertive nationalism, which, "draws upon classical realist conceptions of the pursuit of the national interest through the use of military force, and in which deterrence, containment and the balance of power stand as key concepts."[14] They argue that neo-conservatism, for the most part opposes these ideas, but that it does share with assertive nationalism a commitment to unilateral action, military primacy, and prioritising the military sphere over economic and social issues.[15] It was under the direction of Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, Vice President and Defence Secretary respectively during the Reagan administration, and leading assertive nationalists aligned with Bush in his 2000 election campaign, that the neo-conservatives were brought into the Bush administration or taken seriously as political advisors.[16]

Neo-conservatives are entirely committed to the US using unilateral force, where efforts to establish democracy and neoliberalism through legitimation fail. This is evident in the proclamations of numerous contributors to the Project for the New American Century (PNAC). Garry Schmitt and Tom Donnelly, for instance, issued a statement on the PNAC website praising George Bush in 2002 for his commitment to "active American global leadership", "regime change", and "promoting liberal democratic principles".[17] They argue that Bush has correctly embraced the notion that "peace and security is to be won and preserved by asserting both US military strength and American political principles", by which they mean the democratic principles of "liberty, law and justice."[18] They see no contradiction in using regime change policies, including armed coercion, to achieve their ultimate end of establishing democracy in the South. This commitment to promoting democracy and neoliberalism has dominated US foreign policy strategy under the Bush administration.

Since 9/11, US legitimation efforts have intensified, but there has also been a resurgence of support for repression in US foreign policy strategies towards the South, as I will show in chapter six. This has included backing coups in Venezuela and Haiti; the invasion and

---

[14] Herring and Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments*, chapter 1, p.5. See also Roger Burbach and Jim Tarbell, *Imperial Overstretch: George Bush and the Hubris of Empire,* (London: Zed Books, 2004); Alex Callinicos, *The New Mandarins of American Power,* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003); and David Harvey, *The New Imperialism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid. They included Paul Wolfowitz as Deputy Secretary of Defence, Douglas Feith as Under Secretary of Defence Policy, John Bolton as an Under Secretary at the Department of State and Elliott Abrams as Special Advisor to the President. Richard Perle and Eliot Cohen sat on the Defence Policy Board which advises the Secretary of Defence
[17] Garry Schmitt and Tom Donnelly, 'The Bush Doctrine', Project for the New American Century, 30 January 2002, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/defense-20020130.htm>
[18] Ibid.

occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq; attempts to re-define torture; the detention of terror suspects in facilities such as Abu Ghraib and Guantánamo Bay, where alleged abuses have occurred; the detention of suspects in secret prisons; and the policy of extraordinary rendition which involves transferring suspects to third party countries where torture of detainees is commonplace.[19] Support for and use of armed coercion since 9/11 is more intense than during the years immediately following the Cold War, but it does not yet compare with the Cold War, which was characterised by the extensive use of armed coercion, as I will show in chapter four.

State Terrorism in context

The US has used a range of repressive strategies in its foreign policy in the South. This has included covert military interventions, support for coups d'état, the use of torture, and the use of state terrorism. The use of such forms of repression was particularly intense during the Cold War, and we are now seeing a resurgence of its use in the "War on Terror." State terrorism, which can also include torture, is defined as threats or acts of violence carried out by representatives of the state against civilians to instil fear for political purposes. Despite this, state terrorism generally, and US state terrorism specifically, is largely absent from definitions of and debate about terrorism. According to dominant views in mainstream policy, media and academic circles, terrorism constitutes the targeting of democratic states largely located in the North by fanatical groups which are supplied and controlled by "rogue" states or elements, usually located in the South. This is only partially accurate. It is the case that groups have carried out attacks against the people and property of Northern democracies, and the attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon on 9/11 by Al Qa'ida were the most devastating attacks against Northern targets by a non-state group. It is also the case that such groups have enjoyed varying levels of backing from some governments. The condemnation of such attacks and of state support for such attacks is appropriate and necessary. But no act of terror should escape condemnation. The above definition of terrorism does not tell the full story about the perpetrators of terror, meaning many acts of terror occur with impunity. The

[19] On attempts to redefine torture see Jay Bybee, 'Memorandum for Alberto R Gonzales, Counsel to the President. Re: Standards of Conduct for Interrogation under 18 USC 2340-2340A (US Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel)', in Karen Greenberg and Joshua Dratel (eds.), *The Torture Papers. The Road to Abu Ghraib*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1 August 2002), pp.172-214. On access by the ICRC to facilities such as Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib see Seymour Hersh, *Chain of Command. The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*, (London: Penguin Books, 2004), and on secret prisons see Dana Priest, 'CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons,' *The Washington Post*, 2 November 2005, p.A01,<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644_pf.html> On the policy of extraordinary rendition see Jane Mayer, 'Outsourcing Torture. The Secret History of America's 'Extraordinary Rendition' Programme', 2005, <http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050214fa_fact6>; Dana Priest, 'Jet is an Open Secret in Terror War', Washington Post, 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27826-2004Dec26.html>

reality is that Northern democracies, and the US in particular, have condoned and used terrorism against thousands of citizens from other states, as I will show in chapter four.

There are two reasons for this absence of state terrorism from mainstream policy, media and academic circles. The first has to do with the way in which terrorism is defined, and the second, which I will discuss in relation to the functions served by the use of torture, has to do with the state-centric logic of most IR scholarship. The absence of state terrorism from debate is correctly attributed by Alexander George to the way in which "the term 'terrorism' has been virtually appropriated by mainstream political discussion to signify atrocities targeting the West."[20] George accurately noted at the end of the Cold War that, "on any reasonable definition of terrorism, taken literally, the United States and its friends are the major supporters, sponsors, and perpetrators of terrorist incidents in the world today," an assertion that the remaining chapters of my research will verify.[21]

A "reasonable definition of terrorism" is offered by one of Britain's leading terrorism experts, Paul Wilkinson, co-editor of the journal *Terrorism and Political Violence,* and chair of the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence (CSTPV) at St Andrew's University. He argues that terrorism, which he defines as a "special form of political violence" has five major characteristics:

> It is premeditated and aims to create a climate of extreme fear or terror; it is directed at a wider audience or target than the immediate victims of the violence; it inherently involves attacks on random and symbolic targets, including civilians; the acts of violence committed are seen by the society in which they occur as extra-normal, in the literal sense that they breach the social norms, thus causing a sense of outrage; and terrorism is used to try to influence political behaviour in some way.[22]

In the remainder of his analysis, Wilkinson's only discussion of state terrorism is by Marxist-Leninist regimes and their client insurgencies.[23] He makes no mention of the terrorism used by the governments of states who sought to repress the supposed communist insurgents across Latin America, often with US backing, during the Cold War, to be discussed in subsequent chapters. Underpinning Wilkinson's work is the assumption that Northern democracies are the victims not the perpetrators of terrorism. The content of Wilkinson's definition certainly does not preclude state terrorism by Northern democracies. All of the acts that he refers to could feasibly be carried out by a Northern democracy. But it is through the application of his definition that state-sponsored terrorism is precluded from debate.

---

[20] Alexander George, *Western State Terrorism,* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p.1.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Paul Wilkinson, 'International Terrorism: New Risks to World Order', in John Baylis and Nick Rengger (eds.), *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World,* (London: Clarenden Press, 1992), pp.228-229.
[23] Ibid. p.232.

The CSTPV worked with the RAND Corporation to develop a database of international terrorism incidents between 1968 and 1997, which is widely recognised as the most authoritative source of data on international terrorism.[24] The RAND Corporation is a non-profit making research foundation with close links to the Pentagon. It was founded by the US Army Air Force in 1945 as Project RAND, but became independent in 1948. It is the largest private research centre in the world, with an estimated annual budget of $160 million, and has close ties to figures in the current US administration. Condoleeza Rice and Donald Rumsfeld are former RAND administrators.[25] The RAND-St Andrew's dataset defines international terrorism as "incidents in which the perpetrators go abroad to strike their targets, select domestic targets associated with a foreign state, or create an international incident by attacking airline passengers or equipment."[26] From 1998, the dataset was extended to include acts of domestic terrorism, which it defines as "incidents perpetrated by local nationals against a purely domestic target."[27] Under both these definitions, the assumption is that the perpetrators will not be the state itself, but subnational individuals or groups acting against foreign or local interests. This, as Jonny Burnett and Dave Whyte argue, is a crucial flaw. Explicitly excluded are acts of state terror committed by governments against their own citizens or acts of violence in warlike situations. In addition, incidents involving Northern armies of occupation and businesses are included in the dataset only where they are the victims rather than the perpetrators of violence.[28] Consequently, all premeditated acts or threats of violence against civilians that were intended to create a climate of extreme fear, or to influence the political behaviour of those citizens, carried out by governments against their own citizens, are not counted as acts of terror within the world's leading dataset on terrorist incidents, even though such acts fit Wilkinson's definition.

In a document released by the State Department's Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, terrorism is defined in accordance with title 22 of the United States Code, Section 2656F, and reads, "The term 'terrorism' means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience."[29] This means that rather than taking what Noam Chomsky refers to as a literal approach to the study of terrorism, by which we determine what constitutes terrorism and then seek instances of the phenomenon –

---

[24] For details of the project see RAND, 'Terrorism Database Project', RAND Corporation, <http://www.rand.org/ise/projects/terrorismdatabase/index.html>, accessed 23 March 2006, and for a critique, see Jonny Burnett and Dave Whyte, 'Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism', *Journal for Crime Conflict and the Media*, vol.1, no.4, (2005), pp.1-18.
[25] Burnett and Whyte, 'Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism', p.8.
[26] RAND, 'Terrorism Database Project'.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Burnett and Whyte, 'Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism', p.10.
[29] US Department of State, 'Patterns of Global Terrorism', Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, US Department of State, 30 April 2001, <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/pgtrpt/2000/2419.htm>

concentrating on the major examples – to try and determine causes and remedies, the US state takes a propagandistic approach:

> The propagandistic approach dictates a different course. We begin with the thesis that terrorism is the responsibility of some officially designated enemy. We then designate terrorist acts as "terrorist" just in the cases where they can be attributed (whether plausible or not) to the required source; otherwise they are to be ignored, suppressed, or termed "retaliation" or "self-defence."[30]

This is precisely what has happened with the RAND-St Andrew's database. The designated enemies are those non-state "rogue" groups that seek to target foreign or domestic interests, and terrorist acts are those perpetrated by such groups against those targets. Indeed, the label "terrorism" and "terrorist" tend to be used as a political tool, especially by states, to delegitimise one's enemies. It is therefore extremely important that in IR scholarship the term is carefully applied as an analytical rather than a political device.

The absence of terrorism by Northern democratic states, particularly the US, from most terrorism studies should come as no surprise when we consider the close connections between firstly, the RAND corporation and the current US administration, discussed above, and secondly, between the RAND corporation and supposedly independent academic experts on terrorism, including Wilkinson. Other leading academics associated with both RAND and the CSTPV are Bruce Hoffman, who temporarily left the RAND Corporation in 1993 to found the CSTPV at St Andrew's, and who remains an honorary senior researcher of the CSTPV, and Brian Jenkins, a senior analyst with RAND, who is also a member of the CSTPV's advisory council.[31] These connections have a significant effect upon terrorism studies. As Burnett and Whyte point out, individuals associated with the CSTPV and RAND retain key editorial positions in the two most prominent English language journals in the field of terrorism and political violence: Wilkinson as co-editor of *Terrorism and Political Violence*; Hoffman and Jenkins as members of its editorial Board; and Hoffman as editor in chief of *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, a journal originally founded and editorially managed by RAND.[32] Burnett and Whyte correctly note that this means "peer reviewed publications are dominated by academics connected with this nexus of influence," and while they are not in any way suggesting that the system of peer review is corrupt or less rigorous than it is in other publications, "if we consider that two of the key journals are dominated by scholars from the RAND-St Andrew's nexus, then this does say something about their ability to impose their influence upon the field."[33] This helps explain why there is so little scholarly literature published in the key journals that discusses the use of state terrorism by Northern

---

[30] Noam Chomsky, 'International Terrorism: Image and Reality', in Alexander George (ed.) *Western State Terrorism*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p.12.
[31] Burnett and Whyte, 'Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism', p.8.
[32] Ibid. p.9.
[33] Ibid.

democracies. It simply does not fit within the frame of reference of dominant scholarship in the area of terrorism and political violence.

Torture

Just as state terrorism is absent from debate, so too is the use and sponsorship of torture by the US and other Northern Great Powers, both as a form of repression and when it is used as a tool of state terrorism, i.e. to instil fear in a wider population rather than simply as a means of intimidating and harming an individual.[34] Numerous Great Powers have used and sponsored torture, either covertly against small numbers of individuals, or as a way of deterring political opposition, by using it widely and making it known that it was being used.

In the case of Britain, the army used torture as part of its interrogation of suspected terrorists in Northern Ireland, as documented by AI in 1972, which concluded that the British government had violated national and international law in relation to its treatment of 14 Northern Irish men in 1972.[35] These men were subjected to beatings with batons and kicking often until they passed out, hooding, stripping, sensory assault, including being subject for a whole week to constant noise at various levels of intensity, food, water and sleep deprivation, and prolonged stress positions.[36] Evidence has recently emerged showing that the British army also used torture against suspected communists in internment camps in Germany following World War II.[37]

The French have also been responsible for torture, not simply of small numbers of individuals, but against large sectors of the Algerian population, as a form of state terrorism. Throughout the war between France and Algeria, the use of torture by the French was commonplace, both by military and police personnel in Algeria, and among police forces in France.[38] Various people, and General Jacques Massu in particular, Commander of the Tenth Parachute Division which was responsible for police powers in Algiers from 1957, justified the use of torture on the grounds that the circumstances demanded its use and military necessity dictated it.[39] This was in the context of a CI war which saw French troops interning thousands of Algerians and extreme police control of the population through

---

[34] The sponsorship of torture is defined and referred to henceforth simply as torture on the grounds that if a state sponsors torture elsewhere, that state is using it indirectly, and is therefore complicit in its use.
[35] Amnesty International, *Report of an Inquiry Into Allegations of ill-Treatment in Northern Ireland*, 1972, cited in John Conroy, *Unspeakable Acts, Ordinary People: The Dynamics of Torture*, (London: Vision Paperbacks, 2001), p.242.
[36] Testimony of this treatment was collated through interviews by Conroy, *Unspeakable Acts*, pp.5-11.
[37] Ian Cobain, 'The Postwar Photographs that British Authorities Tried to Keep Hidden', *The Guardian*, 3 April 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/germany/article/0,,1745662,00.html>
[38] Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Torture: Cancer of Democracy*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963), pp.40-44.
[39] Jacques Massu, *La Vraie Bataille d'Alger,* (Paris, 1971), cited in Edward Peters, *Torture*, (New York: Basil Blackwell Inc, 1985), p.177.

intelligence gathering on all Algerians.[40] Torture was used not simply to secure intelligence about imminent threats to French forces, although this was the justification used by General Massu and his associates, but in the main to attempt to identify the leaders of the Algerian insurgency.

The record of the US is equally poor and its impacts far-reaching. In recent years evidence has emerged of the US using torture against prisoners in the "War on Terror". This is discussed in more detail below and in subsequent chapters, but has involved the torture of prisoners at the Abu Ghraib prisoner, in Guantanamo Bay, and in other US detention facilities around the world, and has also involved the policy of extraordinary rendition – the transfer of detainees to other states whether torture is known to be routinely practiced by police, military and prison authorities. As the remainder of the thesis will show, the US has also regularly condoned and sponsored torture on a massive scale in states in the South, particularly Latin America in order to deter political opposition to its objectives.

By accounting for the functions that are served by torture, we can better understand its use and sponsorship by the US as, both as a repressive tool of foreign policy, and as a tool of state terrorism, in the past and currently. This is particularly important in light of evidence that the US advocated torture in its training of military forces from the South. I therefore develop a framework here that accounts for its functions, when used by both authoritarian and democratic states, either directly, or through allies.

While its use in the "War on Terror" has attracted attention recently, torture is under-explored, and existing theories are inadequate for explaining its functions.[41] Previous research has tended to focus on why individuals become torturers or on why authoritarian states have used it.[42] A few scholars have assessed the use of torture by Northern Great

---

[40] Vidal-Naquet, *Torture: Cancer of Democracy*, pp.40-44.

[41] Alex Bellamy, 'No Pain, No Gain? Torture and Ethics in the War on Terror', *International Affairs*, vol.82, no.1, (2006), pp.121-148; Alan Dershowitz, 'Is There a Torturous Road to Justice?' *Los Angeles Times*, 8 November 2001, p.19; Sanford Levinson (ed.), *Torture. A Collection*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Neil MacMaster, 'Torture: From Algiers to Abu Ghraib', *Race and Class*, vol.46, no.2, (2004), pp.1-21; Alfred McCoy, *A Question of Torture. CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror*, (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006); and Maureen Ramsey, 'Can the Torture of Terrorist Suspects be Justified?' *The International Journal of Human Rights*, vol.10, no.2, (2006), pp.103-119.

[42] On the role of the individual: Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial. Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001); and Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority*, (London: Tavistock Publications, 1974). On torture for punishment: Cesare Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*, Translated by Richard Davies, Edited by Richard Bellamy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1764] 1995); and Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, Translated by Alan Sheridan, (London: Penguin Books, 1977). On torture in authoritarian states: Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966); Edward Peters, Torture, (New York: Basil Blackwell Inc, 1985); Rejali, 'How Not to Talk About Torture', pp.127-144.

Powers, for example by the French in Algeria, and by the US during the Cold War.[43] The framework I develop helps to account for torture by authoritarian and liberal states. The framework consists of three models. These are predicated on the assumption that key functions of the state are to ensure security, stability and legitimacy, primarily in the interests of elite groups, often transnationally.[44] Torture is intended to serve these functions.

The security model reflects the dominant claims made about torture by authoritarian and democratic Great Powers alike – that its function is to obtain intelligence to defeat security threats. The stability model accounts for torture when it is used in authoritarian states, but often sponsored by Northern Powers, as a method to instil fear in order to deter potential and actual political opposition among the population. It is in these cases that torture is being used as a tool of state terrorism. This is intended to help protect the interests of elite groups. The legitimacy model accounts for the ways in which state officials, usually from Northern Powers, seek, on the one hand, to secure the right to torture, based on the way in which they define and portray themselves – as legitimate – and of those against whom they wish to use torture – as illegitimate. On the other hand, claiming the right to use torture is intended to further entrench those notions of themselves as legitimate and their enemies as illegitimate. The models are addressed individually here because each helps to account for different functions that are served by torture, but as I will show, there is significant overlap between them. They should not therefore be seen as mutually exclusive, but mutually constitutive. A key question is whether there is any difference between Northern democratic Powers and authoritarian states with regard to torture. This is because the public discourse of those Powers is generally one of opposition to torture, on the basis that liberal norms, enshrined in domestic and international law, prohibit its use.[45] Authoritarian states that use torture tend

---

[43] Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Torture: Cancer of Democracy*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963); *La Torture Dans la République*, (Paris: Editions François Maspero, 1972); Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism: The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol I*, (Boston: South End Press, 1979); *After the Cataclysm. Postwar Indochina and the reconstruction of imperial ideology. The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol II*, (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1979); John Conroy, *Unspeakable Acts, Ordinary People. The Dynamics of Torture*, (London: Vision Paperbacks, 2001), which covers the use of torture by the British against IRA suspects; George, *State Terrorism and the United States*; Edward Herman, *The Real Terror Network*, Second Edition, (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1985); Martha Huggins, *Political Policing. The United States and Latin America*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); Martha Huggins et al, *Violence Workers. Police Torturers and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); and Douglas Valentine, *The Phoenix Program*, Second Edition, (Lincoln: Authors Guild BackinPrint.Com, 2000).

[44] This draws on functional conceptions of the state, whereby the state is defined by its consequences, not simply its organization, and on Marxist conceptions of the state apparatus as being geared towards the political interests of capitalist elites. See Patrick Dunleavy and Brendan O'Leary, *Theories of the State. The Politics of Liberal Democracy*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1987), pp.3-4 and 203-270; and Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, pp.130-191.

[45] In the UK, articles of the Council of Europe's 'Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms' including the prohibition of torture, have been written into the Human Rights Act 1998, See 'Human Rights Act,' UK Parliament, 1998, <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts1998/19980042.htm> In the US, under Section 2340A of Title 18 of the US Code torture is prohibited, see 'US Code, 2000 Edition: Title 18 - Crimes and Criminal Procedure, Part I, Crimes: Chapter 113C, Torture, Section 2340A', US Congress, 6 January 2003, <http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=browse_usc&docid=Cite:+18USC2340A>

not to claim to oppose it. When they admit its use, they justify it in relation to security. When Great Powers from the North do advocate torture, or when they redefine it as something other than torture, they too justify it on security grounds, unless it has been used without the sanction of the state. In such cases its perpetrators are labelled "bad apples", in need of better training. This was precisely the conclusion of the initial investigation into torture by US military and intelligence personnel at Abu Ghraib.[46] Similarly, following the massacre of Iraqis by US troops in Haditha in June 2006, US troops were ordered to take a crash course in battlefield ethics.[47]

I first of all set out why torture is assumed to be effective. The three models are then developed. This entails analysing who uses torture in each case and for what purposes, and assessing the degree to which torture effectively serves the intended purposes. In the conclusion of the thesis, I will return to the question of torture as a foreign policy tool.

Why is torture considered effective?

The horribleness of torture is what makes it appear to lend itself to the acquisition of intelligence, the deterring of potential and actual political opposition, and the securing of legitimacy. All manner of torture methods are currently used, including beatings, electric shock, rape, acts which resemble drowning and suffocation, burning with fire and chemicals, sensory deprivation, the witness of the torture of others, especially loved ones, and threats of the same, and sham executions.[48] Those who justify torture for intelligence assume it works because of its effects on victims. It is believed victims will respond to torture because they would rather speak up than suffer the physical and psychological torment involved. Who would be able to withstand it rather than give the interrogators the information they seek?

International laws include 'Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms as amended by Protocol No. 11', Council of Europe, 1 November 1998, <http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/005.htm>; ICRC, 'Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.' International Committee of the Red Cross, 12 August 1949, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/6fef854a3517b75ac125641e004a9e68>; ICRC, 'Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I).' International Committee of the Red Cross, 8 June 1977, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/f6c8b9fee14a77fdc125641e0052b079?OpenDocument>; ICRC, 'Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II)', International Committee of the Red Cross, 8 June 1977, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/d67c3971bcff1c10c125641e0052b545?OpenDocument>; UN, 'Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment', United Nations, 1985, <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cat.html>

[46] Major General Antonio Taguba, *Article 15-6 Investigation of the 800th Military Police Brigade,* (Washington DC: US Department of Defence, 2004), p.37.

[47] Julian Borger, 'US Troops Ordered to Undergo Ethical Training after Killing of Iraqi Civilians', *The Guardian*, 2 June 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,329495232-103550,00.html>

[48] For a full account of modern torture see Peters, *Torture*, pp.165-175. His work continues to be one of the most comprehensive accounts.

Similarly, when used to maintain stability in the interests of elites it is the characteristics of torture that result in the assumption that it will work. Who would be able to continue to oppose the authorities when faced with torture? Torture against specific political opponents serves an important exemplary function, and is considered effective because of the fear it instils in others. Likewise, when it is used indiscriminately, it is intended to instil fear and curtail political opposition among victims and the rest of society. Torture is assumed to work for both security and stability reasons because people are assumed to have limited thresholds for enduring this kind of abuse – even the toughest of characters will eventually crack, because what is inflicted is so terrible.

Torture also appears to lend itself as a tool for securing legitimacy because its horribleness makes it aberrant. In Northern democracies, therefore, special circumstances have to attend its use. Firstly, the state determines when certain exceptional conditions are met in which torture can be used. Outside of those conditions the torture would be deemed illegitimate. The ability to determine that such conditions are met depends on securing the legitimacy of the state, based on its supposedly liberal credentials, and on the threats that it deems are posed by illiberal actors. Secondly, only specific individuals sanctioned by the state can carry out the torture, again because of its exceptional nature. Those who torture without such sanction are considered "bad apples". It is the fact that torture is exceptional, therefore, because of its horribleness, that torture is seen to lend itself to processes of legitimisation.

In developing each of the models that account for torture, I will show in more detail how those who justify torture base their arguments on the above assumptions about its effectiveness for each of the purposes it is intended to serve. Beginning with the security model, I will outline who uses torture in the name of security, and the arguments that are used to justify its use, before discussing the degree to which torture is effective to this end.

The security model

Who uses torture for reasons of security?

The dominant model sees torture as a tool that may increase security against threats. The classic argument is that if the arrested terrorist does not talk, hundreds of innocent people will die when the ticking bomb goes off – the ticking bomb argument. For instance, in 1988 an Israeli delegation appeared before the UN Committee Against Torture, which charged Israel with violating the UN Convention Against Torture through its use of what the Israelis refer to as "moderate pressure" against Palestinians. The delegation defended its tactics, stating:

> No one will ever know where and when the next suicide bomb is going to strike, and sometimes we're in special situations where we need to get vital information from a terrorist or a potential terrorist in order to prevent a further act of terror.[49]

Similar arguments are made to justify torture in the "War on Terror", to obtain intelligence about imminent threats and the activities of other terrorists, as I will show in more detail in chapter six. The argument is that if the detained terrorist does not talk, another terrorist will plant or explode another bomb, which I refer to as the ticking terrorist argument. As I will later show, President Bush has had this in mind when he has spoken of the "War on Terror."

Officials in the US and UK have claimed that torture may have played a role in securing intelligence in relation to terrorism. Republican Senator Kit Bond, a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, stated that "enhanced interrogation techniques" had worked with at least one captured Al Qa'ida operative, Khalid Shaikh Mommaded, to thwart an unspecified plot.[50] Eliza Manningham-Buller, head of MI5, claimed that intelligence acquired from detainees overseas is used by British security and police forces, and that the information obtained "can be accurate and may enable lives to be saved."[51] To support her argument, she referred to the case of Mohammed Meguerba who was interrogated by Algerian security personnel, known to regularly use torture, as the US State Department's annual human rights report for 2004 indicates.[52] Manningham-Buller stated that the Algerian liaison passed on information obtained from Maguerba when under interrogation at the hands of Algerian security personnel, which detailed "a plot to use a fatal poison in London within the next few days."[53] One of those behind these supposed attempts to produce explosives and poisons, Bourgass, was convicted for murdering a police officer in a raid, and for "conspiracy to cause public nuisance", but the jury was dismissed after failing to reach a verdict on the second count against Bourgass: conspiracy to commit murder. The Crown Prosecution Service abandoned plans to re-try Bourgass on the latter charge.[54] Manningham-Buller asserts that no inquiries were made into the circumstances that attended Algerian questioning of Meguerba, but argues that acting on this intelligence was justified given the need to protect life.[55] The

---

[49] BBC, 'Israel Defends Torture in Interrogation Methods', BBC, 15 May 1998, <http://users.westnet.gr/~cgian/israelto.htm>
[50] AFP, 'White House Declines to Totally Rule Out Torture', Agence France-Presse, 13 November 2005, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/usattackstorture>
[51] Eliza Manningham-Buller, 'Statement of Eliza Manningham-Buller on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in the House of Lords on Appeal from Her Majesty's Court of Appeal in the case of Mohammed Meguerba', The Security Service, Thames House, obtained by Channel 4 News, 2005, <http://www.channel4.com/news/media/2005/10/week_3/20_mi5.pdf>
[52] US Department of State, 'Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2004: Algeria', US Department of State, 2005, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41718.htm>
[53] Eliza Manningham-Buller, 'Statement of Eliza Manningham-Buller on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in the House of Lords on Appeal from Her Majesty's Court of Appeal in the case of Mohammed Meguerba', The Security Service, Thames House, obtained by Channel 4 News, 2005, <http://www.channel4.com/news/media/2005/10/week_3/20_mi5.pdf>
[54] BBC, 'The Ricin Case Timeline', BBC, 13 April 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4433459.stm>
[55] Manningham-Buller, 'Statement'.

level of threat posed is called into question by the failure of the jury to determine whether Bourgass did conspire to commit murder, and by the Crown Prosecution Service's decision not to re-try him on this count.

Does torture for security work?

The assumption that torture is effective for gathering intelligence underpins arguments to legalise torture. Alan Dershowitz, a Harvard law professor, recently deployed the ticking bomb argument in an opinion piece in the *Los Angeles Times*, posing the question, "Would torturing one guilty terrorist to prevent the deaths of a thousand innocent civilians shock the conscience of all decent people?" He states, "if an actual ticking bomb situation were to arise, our law enforcement authorities would torture" and on this basis, "The real debate is whether such torture should take place outside of our legal system or within it." His response is, "If we are to have torture, it should be authorized by the law."[56] He thus calls for legislation which would permit torture in specific security-related scenarios.

While it is plausible that torture may yield credible intelligence, we cannot conclude with any confidence that this is the usual outcome. Similarly, we should not assume that torture is effective to this end just because those with a specific interest in justifying torture claim that it works. For instance, the Israeli Defence Forces have frequently claimed that torture is effective, including in the case of Nachshon Waxman, an Israeli corporal kidnapped by Palestinians in 1994. The Israelis captured the driver of the car used in the kidnapping, and Yitzhak Rabin, then prime minister, later admitted they had tortured beyond the guidelines for coercive interrogation, but that the driver talked, the information was accurate and Waxman was found.[57] Joseph Lelyveld, a *New York Times* journalist investigating torture, was repeatedly told by Israeli officials, that "coercive interrogation had effectively thwarted missions of would-be suicide bombers, saving lives."[58] Similarly, in the "War on Terror", CIA sources recently stated that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, a high profile detainee in the "War on Terror", was subjected to water boarding, a technique similar to drowning, and was able to last two and a half minutes before begging to confess to being the architect behind the

[56] Alan Dershowitz, 'Is There a Torturous Road to Justice?' *Los Angeles Times*, 8 November 2001, p.19.
[57] Charles Krauthammer, 'The Truth About Torture', *The Weekly Standard*, 5 December 2005, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/006/400rhqav.asp>
[58] Joseph Lelyveld, 'Interrogating Ourselves', *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, 12 June 2005, <http://www.refuseandresist.org/detentions/art.php?aid=2059>; Agence France-Presse, 'White House Declines to Totally Rule Out Torture'.

9/11 attacks, and providing information on an unspecified terrorist plot.[59] In each of these cases it may be true that torture did lead to credible intelligence, but we cannot be confident this was the case, nor whether this is frequently the case. Neither can we be confident that torture was the only means by which the information could have been acquired. There is certainly no strong evidence that points to the widespread utility of torture for this purpose. Furthermore, officials that claim torture has worked in this way never mention cases in which torture has resulted in false confessions or fabricated intelligence, even though there is ample evidence to show that victims of torture will say anything to halt the torture.

Information or confessions secured under torture are likely to be unreliable, as victims will say or do anything to make the torture stop. This was the argument made by liberals in the 1760s and 1770s as they tried to end the use of torture which had been practised widely in pre-Enlightenment Europe as a tool for securing confessions. As Cesare Beccaria, an Italian political philosopher argued:

> [T]he impression made by pain may grow to such an extent that having filled the whole of the sensory field, it leaves the torture victim no freedom to do anything but choose the quickest route to relieving himself of the immediate pain.[60]

US Senator John McCain confirms that in his own experience of torture in Vietnam, he "provided them with false information" which he thought would be "sufficient to suspend the abuse."[61] Similarly, in testimony gathered by HRW, an Israeli sergeant spoke of his reserve duty in 1989 with the Israeli Defence Force at the interrogation unit of the Al-Fara'a detention centre. He described the torture, stating that it included beating which led to the breaking of bones and pouring acid onto the Palestinian detainees. When asked whether the confessions signed were false, he stated, "I don't really know, I don't speak Arabic. But believe me, they would sign anything towards the end, no matter whether they did it or not. Anything."[62] While it is plausible that torture might result in credible intelligence, it is far more likely to result in false confessions and false intelligence, because victims, faced with the horror of torture, are likely to say anything that will make the torture stop.

Indeed, torture is highly effective for securing false information, as interrogators testify. Experienced US army interrogators have condemned the use of torture in light of efforts by the US government to legitimise it in the "War on Terror". Retired Air Force Colonel John

---

[59] Krauthammer, 'The Truth About Torture'.
[60] Cesare Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*, Translated by Richard Davies, Richard Bellamy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1764] 1995), p.41.
[61] John McCain, 'Torture's Terrible Toll: Abusive Interrogation Tactics Produce Bad Intel, and Undermine the Values We Hold Dear. Why We Must, As A Nation, Do Better', *Newsweek*, November 2005, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10019179/site/newsweek/>
[62] HRW, *Torture and Ill-Treatment: Israel's Interrogation of Palestinians from the Occupied Territories*, (New York: HRW, 1994), Appendix F, Testimony of Sergeant A.M, pp.305-311.

Rothrock, for example, when interviewed in 2005 by the *Washington Post*, spoke of his experiences as the captain of a combat interrogation team in Vietnam. He said that he did not use physical abuse, relying instead on psychological methods. Occasionally, he stated, younger officers would push him to move faster. He said he would say to them, "if I take a Bunsen burner to the guy's genitals, he's going to tell you just about anything, which would be pointless."[63] Similarly, Army Colonel Stuart Herrington, a military intelligence specialist who operated in Vietnam, Panama, and Iraq in 1991, stated that torture "is simply not a good way to get information." He argued that nine out of ten people can be persuaded to talk without the use of "stress methods" let alone cruel and unusual ones. He was then asked if the same could be said for religiously motivated fanatics. He responded, "the 'batting average' might be lower: perhaps six out of ten", and when asked what would happen if you were to beat up the remaining four, he replied, "They'll just tell you anything to get you to stop."[64] Despite this, justifications for torture have been made on the basis of its presumed utility for acquiring accurate intelligence, as in the case of Dershowitz, who argues for torture warrants that would permit its use in specific circumstances.[65]

To justify torture on security grounds one has to make three highly dubious assumptions. The first of these is that torture is effective for securing intelligence, which is far from proven. Indeed there are good grounds for believing the opposite to be true, namely, that torture is likely to result in the acquisition of false confessions and intelligence. Secondly, if torture is permitted in order to secure intelligence, torture is somehow legitimate, even though its victims may well be innocent. Finally, the primary function of torture is to defeat security threats. As I will now show, most torture has little to do with protecting populations from imminent security threats, and far more to do with overcoming threats to the interests of transnational elite groups.

The stability model

Who uses torture for reasons of stability?

The stability model sees torture as a tool of state terror to discipline the population and suppress potential or actual political opposition that would pose a threat to the interests of elites.[66] Such opposition includes revolutionary and insurgent movements, but frequently

---

[63] Quoted by Anne Applebaum, 'The Torture Myth', *The Washington Post*, 12 January 2005, < http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A2302-2005Jan11.html>
[64] Ibid.
[65] Dershowitz, 'Is There a Torturous Road to Justice?'
[66] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism: The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol I*, (Boston: South End Press, 1979), pp.1-40; Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*,

also includes opposition parties, trade unions, groups calling for democracy or for political freedoms, in other words, entirely legitimate organisations, as well as anyone suspected of potentially being associated with such groups, either now or in the future.[67] Frequently torture starts out as a tool to be used against specific individuals or groups in order to make an example of those who dare to challenge the regime, and to instil in others compliance, out of fear. The torture is publicised through state-controlled media coverage, otherwise it would fail to serve a deterrent purpose.[68] For example, AI reported that in Guatemala during the 1980s, newspapers were permitted to publish photographs of dead torture victims:

> Guatemalan counterinsurgency operations in the early 1980s […] included the terrorisation of targeted rural populations in an effort to ensure that they did not provide support for guerrillas. Tortured, dying villagers were displayed to relatives and neighbours who were prevented from helping them. Newspapers in urban areas during this period were allowed to publish photographs of mutilated bodies, ostensibly as an aid to families seeking their missing relatives, but also as a warning to all citizens not to oppose the government.[69]

Rarely does torture remain a tool to be used against specific individuals and opposition groups, however. It tends to spiral out of control, so that the torture becomes widespread and indiscriminate. This is because while torture may initially be intended for use against overt political opponents, those in control of torture regimes tend to be poor at finding such opponents, and at distinguishing between those and others that pose little or no threat. One tactic deployed is to detain and torture the associates of known opponents, initially close friends and family, but before long large networks of people who have had only fleeting contact with suspected opponents. Simultaneously, notions of what constitutes political opponents are widely interpreted, so that before long, all kinds of people are considered a threat. For example, teachers who may not be at all interested in political processes are considered a threat because they are classified as individuals who may be interested in politics and may at some point get involved in opposition groups, and because they may yield influence over others. Similarly, students may be considered a threat because they spend time thinking and engaging with others and are in a good position to organise. They too may therefore face threat of torture.

Once torture reaches such levels, it is usually accompanied by mass murder and detention. Again, this is intended to instil fear across the whole of society to deter opposition, and is intended to literally eliminate potential and actual opposition. Torture of this kind occurred under the "Reign of Terror" during the French Revolution; in Stalinist Russia; under the Nazis; in Communist China; under the US-backed military governments embroiled in

---

pp.3-16; Stokes, *America's Other War*, pp.18-34; Stokes, 'Why the End of the Cold War Doesn't Matter', pp.560-585.

[67] Some revolutionary and insurgent movements may also be considered legitimate if their cause is to overthrow illegitimate, repressive regimes.

[68] Rejali, 'How Not to Talk About Torture', p.129.

[69] AI, *Briefing, Guatemala*, (London: Amnesty International, 1976), pp.5-6, 11-16.

coercive counterinsurgency campaigns across Latin America during the Cold War;[70] under the Phoenix Programme led by US military and intelligence services in Vietnam;[71] and now in Iraq under the Shia milita-controlled Ministry of the Interior.[72]

In the Latin American cases torture was at first used against specific political opponents. In Colombia in the 1960s and in Argentina and Chile in the 1970s and 1980s, torture was routinely practised under the military governments against political prisoners at multiple detention centres, as many as 60 of which were in operation in Argentina and 33 in Colombia.[73] Before long the torture spread and was used indiscriminately across society. For example, initially the victims of the military government in Chile which had overthrown Salvador Allende in 1973 were Allende's supporters, who were arrested, tortured and assassinated. Within a year of the coup up to 30,000 people were murdered, and many of those tortured.[74] Within the first two years of the coup, over 40,000 people had been detained for periods longer than 24 hours, some for weeks or months, and approximately 140,000 were held briefly for intimidation purposes.[75] Three years into the regime most people considered to be adversaries, whether Allende supporters or not, were the victims of torture or assassination, or were in exile.[76]

Those who advocate torture on security grounds tend not to engage with the realities of its use – that it is for the most part a tool for deterring potential and actual opposition. They even assume that it can be controlled. Dershowitz, for example, assumes that by regulating torture in the US for security purposes, we can avoid "expand[ing] its use".[77] Securing the right to use torture and regulating its use within Northern democracies, as Dershowitz proposes, will have little effect on torture when it is used to ensure stability for elites within authoritarian states. Neither will it affect torture as practised by transnational networks of elites, including those from Northern democracies that collaborate in its use, as I will show. Indeed, as the above cases indicate, and as AI point out, in all the decades that they have researched torture, it always expands from a few isolated cases to being widespread and fairly indiscriminate:

---

[70] Edward Herman, *The Real Terror Network*, Second Edition (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1985),
[71] Valentine, The Phoenix Program.
[72] HRW, 'The New Iraq? Torture and Ill-Treatment of Detainees in Iraqi Custody', January 2005, <http://hrw.org/reports/2005/iraq0105/index.htm>
[73] Herman, *The Real Terror Network*, pp.2, 112-114.
[74] Cynthia Brown, *With Friends Like These: The Americas Watch Report on Human Rights and US Policy in Latin America*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p.54.
[75] UN, *Ad Hoc Working Group on Human Rights in Chile, Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/10285)*, (New York: United Nations, 1975), p.74.
[76] Brown, *With Friends Like These*, p.47.
[77] Dershowitz, 'Is There a Torturous Road to Justice?'

> We have not found a single state which tortures "only once", or only in a few extreme cases. Whenever and wherever torture and cruelty are accepted as legitimate tools of government "in extreme circumstances" they become widespread -- the means used become increasingly extreme and the circumstances in which they are used increasingly less so. Moreover, those states which use torture and ill-treatment against political opponents do not stop at these acts, but resort also to other violent and repressive measures, such as "disappearances" and extrajudicial executions, not only against detainees, but also against a wider population associated with the "enemy".[78]

Thus regulating torture within the confines of Northern democracies, as Dershowitz proposes for the US, will have no effect upon the torture that is used by authoritarian states, and by transnational elites, including from Northern democracies, against thousands to curtail threats to elite interests.

It tends to be assumed that only authoritarian states engage in the widespread use of torture to ensure stability for the elite, and that Northern democracies do not. The reality is that torture tends not to be used domestically in liberal states for stability purposes, but their use of torture is usually located in the South. Elites from Northern Great Powers have colluded with elites in the South in the institution of networks to deter political opposition through repression, including torture, and to quash movements that pose a threat to elite interests. The distinction between Northern democracies and authoritarian states in relation to torture is diminished when we understand the interconnections between them with reference to an emergent international state, dominated since World War II by the US. As discussed in chapter two, since the Second World War a hierarchy, with the US at the apex, has come into being through the proliferation of transnational institutions and arrangements that are primarily intended to serve the interests of the US state and its capitalist elites, but which also serves the interests of other core capitalists states, and global capitalist elites.[79] As I will show, one such arrangement established between the US and various allies in the Cold War consisted of a network in which torture was widespread and was intended to thwart movements that posed a threat to local and US elite interests in the South.

Before commenting on those networks that existed in the Cold War, which are explored in more detail in the remaining chapters, I will first explain why Northern democracies tend not to use torture domestically to ensure stability for elites. The aim of elites in Northern democracies is to establish consent through the political and ideological incorporation of subordinate groups within civil society.[80] Democracy as practised in Northern democracies constitutes a system in which a small group rules and mass participation in decision-making is confined to a leadership choice in elections, carefully managed by competing elites,

---

[78] Amnesty International, 'Torture and Ill-Treatment: The Arguments', 2006, <http://web.amnesty.org/pages/stoptorture-arguments-eng>

[79] Barkawi and Laffey, 'Retrieving the Imperial,' pp.124-125; Gowan, 'A Calculus of Power'; Gowan, *The Global Gamble*, p.4.; Stokes, 'The Heart of Empire?' pp.217-236; and Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, p.24.

[80] Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, p.24.

although not always successfully.[81] So, while democracy is preferable to authoritarian systems of government, it should be noted that it is deliberately intended to serve the interests of elites. This is achieved through the establishment of a system stable for those elites, because subordinate classes are granted some freedoms and choices, but only to the point that the system itself remains intact, and that ultimately will benefit elites, as I will show in more detail in chapter six.[82] Because of this, Northern democracies do not generally need to resort to torture at home.

In contrast, in authoritarian states, political opposition is managed through the curtailment of freedoms. The work by Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett is instructive here.[83] They argue:

> International action in a democratic political system requires the mobilisation of both general public opinion and of a variety of institutions that make up the system of government, such as the legislature, the political bureaucracies, and key interest groups […] On the other hand, in nondemocratic societies, once the support of the key legitimising groups is secured, the government can launch its policy with little regard for public opinion or for due political process.[84]

The use of torture would similarly require the mobilisation of public opinion and of various institutions, particularly as this would be a derogation from liberal norms. This helps explain the lengths that US officials have gone to in the "War on Terror" to legitimise torture, although they do not call it torture and insist that it is not torture. In authoritarian states, public opinion and due political process do not feature in the same way in decision-making. Other methods are used to ensure cooperation of subordinate groups, including torture.

The distinction between Northern democracies and authoritarian states with regard to torture, however, is less sharp than it might at first appear. Elites from democratic Great Powers have used torture in collaboration with elites in the South as part of transnational terror networks. One example is the collaboration between the US and various Latin American states during the Cold War, explored in more detail in chapters four and five. The notion that repression including torture would help bring about stability underpinned US rationale for supporting torturing regimes in the Third World. The US argued that curtailing political opposition in this way would, in the long run, result in the establishment of democracy. Jeanne Kirkpatrick, US Ambassador to the UN in the Reagan administration, acknowledged that authoritarian regimes "sometimes invoked martial law to arrest, imprison, exile, and occasionally, it was alleged, torture their opponents."[85] She argued, however, that it might be necessary to support them: "Since many traditional autocracies permit limited contestation

---

[81] Ibid. p.49.
[82] Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, pp.130-191.
[83] Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, 'Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986', *American Political Science Review*, vol.87, no.3, (1993), pp.624-638.
[84] Ibid. p.626.
[85] Jeanne Kirkpatrick, 'Dictators and Double Standards', *Commentary*, vol.68, no.5, (1979), pp.34-35.

and participation, it is not impossible that US policy could effectively encourage this process of liberalisation and democratisation."[86]

States in Latin America where the US sponsored torture during the Cold War are now democracies. However, while Kirkpatrick was correct about the outcome, her reasons for that outcome were incorrect as I will show. Kirkpatrick distinguished between authoritarian regimes which she saw as potentially attentive to processes of liberalisation and democratisation, and what she referred to as revolutionary Communist regimes:

> Generally speaking, traditional autocrats tolerate social inequalities, brutality and poverty, while revolutionary autocracies create them. Traditional autocrats leave in place existing allocations of wealth, power, status … they do not disturb habitual rhythms of work and leisure, habitual places of residence, habitual patterns of family and personal relationships … Precisely the opposite is true of revolutionary Communist regimes.[87]

Revolutionary communist governments do have a history of brutality, but the idea that autocratic regimes "tolerate" rather than "create" it is simply untrue. As the case of Chile shows, traditional autocrats such as Pinochet did create thousands of exiles because of the repression he unleashed. Pinochet also returned properties that had previously been expropriated by the social democratic government of Allende to their former owners. This included US corporations, all of which reclaimed their investments.[88] Thus existing allocations of wealth and power were disturbed by Pinochet, the traditional autocrat. It just happens that this was in the interests of US elites. Furthermore, whereas Kirkpatrick referred specifically to revolutionary communist regimes, US policies stemming from her arguments consisted not simply of acting against brutal revolutionary communist regimes, but advocating repression against entirely legitimate groups on the left.

US support for counterinsurgency efforts against left-wing movements in Latin America included military training which advocated repression, including torture, not simply against brutal revolutionary communists, but indiscriminately across society, as I will show in more detail in chapter five.[89] Complicity in and advocacy of repression, including torture, was not limited to US training of Latin American military personnel. The intelligence agencies and militaries of the US and various Latin American states cooperated in gathering and sharing

---

[86] Ibid. p.44.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, p.165.
[89] Central Intelligence Agency, *Kubark Counterintelligence Interrogation* (Washington DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 1963, Manual acquired by National Security Archives, under the Freedom of Information Act); US Department of Defence, *Field Manual 30-5: Combat Intelligence*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defence: Army, 1973); US Department of Defence, *Handling Sources, School of the Americas Training Manual*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defence, 1989), <http://www.soaw.org> For an analysis of the manuals see Lisa Haugaard, 'Declassified Army and Central Intelligence Agency Manuals Used in Latin America: An Analysis of their Content', Latin American Working Group, 18 February 1997, <http://www.lawg.org/pages/new%20pages/Misc/Publications-manuals.htm>

information about people involved in legitimate social organisations across the whole of society, not simply those involved in insurgencies. Throughout the period, the US was involved with the Chilean secret police (DINA), and security agencies of other Southern Cone states, including Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, in a programme known as Operation Condor. This was operative by 1975 and built on pre-existing arrangements for sharing intelligence and close cooperation between the US and Latin American allies, all of which were already embroiled in repression before the US came on board with them.[90] As I will show in chapter four, through Operation Condor, the US sanctioned the assassination of political opponents abroad, to accompany the ongoing human rights abuses that the Chilean and other Latin American governments were committing at home.

Does torture for stability work?

On the one hand, torture does instil fear within the population and can deter political opposition. This may be because torture is rarely restricted to specific political opponents, but tends to become widespread and fairly indiscriminate. In such circumstances everyone fears that they may be next, which may cause them to avoid any kind of political activity, or associating with others who are politically active, although such avoidance may not be enough to protect them. The fear is compounded when the torture is accompanied by disappearances and murders. In such circumstances, as the case of Chile shows, potential and actual opponents are literally eliminated, either because they are killed or because they flee.

Furthermore, certainly in the medium term, US support for repression, for the purposes of curtailing political opposition to US objectives, was highly successful. Left-leaning governments were kept out of power in many Latin American states throughout the Cold War, through US support for authoritarian regimes, as in Chile and Argentina, and through US backing of the right in protracted civil wars between the left and the right in countries such as El Salvador and Guatemala. The US successfully prevented revolutionary movements from taking hold, it reversed the revolution in Nicaragua, it undermined left-wing political parties, and it succeeding in implementing neoliberalism across the continent, all thanks to its backing of repression. It is only recently that the left has come to power in Latin America again, with swings to the left in Venezuela, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and Ecuador in the last few years.

---

[90] Michael McClintock, 'The United States and Operation Condor: Military Doctrine in an Unconventional War' (paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association Conference, Washington DC, September 2001), p.9

Nevertheless, torture itself leads to resistance and increased opposition against the regime. General Jacques Massu, advocate of torture during the French-Algerian war, admitted years later that the torture had served no useful or necessary intelligence purpose in overcoming terrorism, but had turned most of the Algerian population against the French, pushing them into the arms of the Front de Libération National.[91] Likewise, countries across Latin America were forced to make the transition from authoritarianism to democracy towards the end of the Cold War. In Chile, for instance, after seven years Pinochet's regime was forced to establish democracy again, largely as a consequence of mounting unrest within Chile and campaigning abroad, the demise of military regimes in other Latin American states, and a subsequent shift in US support from Pinochet's regime to the elite opposition.[92] Kirkpatrick's forecast about the outcome of supporting authoritarian regimes was correct in the case of Chile, and other Latin American states: eventually those authoritarian regimes were replaced by democracy. Her explanation was incorrect, however. They withered not because US support for terror brought about democracy, but because such terror generates sufficient resistance to bring about the overthrow of such regimes.

Where the torture can to some degree be controlled and contained, often by assigning it to a specific ethnic group such as the Kurds under Saddam Hussein, or the Palestinians by the Israelis, however, the regime may be able to sustain its use in the long term, as has been the case with the torture of Palestinians arrested and held by the Israeli Defence Force. It is by no means clear in that case, however, that the use of torture is contributing to the stability of the Israeli government. It may indeed be contributing to increased resistance from Palestinian and other resistance groups in the region. Nevertheless, it may be that the Israeli authorities have succeeded in continuing to use torture because they effectively invoke security arguments to justify their actions. Also, their legitimacy, in light of their use of torture, has not been adequately challenged internationally, partly because of their close relationships with leading Northern states including the US and EU members, which affords them legitimacy. Such appeals to legitimacy are similar to the efforts that individuals within the US are making as they claim the right to torture, on the basis of the legitimacy they enjoy as a democratic state.

The legitimacy model

Who uses torture for reasons of legitimacy?

---

[91] Neil MacMaster, 'Torture: From Algiers to Abu Ghraib', *Race and Class*, vol.46, no.2, (2004), pp.167-168.
[92] Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, pp.167-168.

The legitimacy model accounts for the ways in which the right to torture is claimed on the basis of the way in which the actors involved are defined and portrayed, and how securing the right to torture is also intended to entrench such notions of oneself and one's enemies. It tends to be Great Power elites that seek to secure the right to torture and the way in which they and their enemies are seen. This is because their claim to the right to use torture, and their efforts to establish particular notions of themselves and their enemies are based on appeals to legitimacy because of their supposedly liberal credentials. These portrayals provide the basis for their arguments that torture is justified, and that they, or more specifically, individuals especially sanctioned by them, are legitimate to use it. On the one hand, therefore, the claim is made that they are legitimate so they can use torture, and on the other hand, by claiming the right to torture they can present themselves as legitimate because they have secured that right.

In the "War on Terror", supposed and actual terrorists are presented as evil enemies, and the US state, its allies, and their security and intelligence forces, as upholders of freedom and peace. Particularly in the US, such rhetoric is permeated with images of good and evil. In his address to the nation following the 9/11 attacks, President Bush declared:

> America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining […] Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America […] with the caring for strangers and neighbours […] We go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.[93]

Since 9/11, declarations from Bush have echoed the same sentiments, with actual and suspected terrorists being cast as evil, and the US and its allies as upholders of justice, freedom and peace. In January 2002, Bush stated:

> Our cause is just and it continues […] Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spreading throughout the world like ticking bombs, set to go off without warning […] My hope is that all nations will heed our call, and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries or our own.[94]

Similar statements have been made by Tony Blair in response to the terrorist attacks on London in July 2005:

> It's important however that those engaged in terrorism realise that our determination to defend our values and our way of life is greater than their determination to cause death and destruction to innocent people in a desire to impose extremism on the world.[95]

---

[93] President George Bush, 'Address to the Nation', The Oval Office, 11 September 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>
[94] President George Bush, 'State of the Union Address', 29 January 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129%2D11.html>
[95] Prime Minister Tony Blair, 'Statement From Gleneagles Following the 7 July Bombings', 7 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4659953.stm>

These images of (potential) terrorists as ticking bombs posing an imminent threat to freedom lend themselves to the appeals for legitimacy of those fighting the "War on Terror".

Presenting the various actors in this way provides the basis for efforts by individuals within the Bush administration to secure the right for US agencies to torture. The American upholders of freedom are deemed trustworthy to torture, on the grounds that it is a necessary action on the part of those fighting for freedom, justice and peace against the evil, murdering, parasitical enemy. Those engaging in such efforts to justify torture are trying to establish among society the notion that supposed terrorists are evil, and therefore deserving of torture on the basis of their evilness. This is intended to legitimise the use of torture and entrust its use to the state, to be used as it sees fit. Torture will thereby be considered to be safe in their hands, because the prospects of terrorists threatening freedom are presented as far worse.

Just as those notions of the different actors underpin the claim to legitimacy which then permits the use of torture in specific circumstances, the torture, and the claim to the right to use it, is intended to further entrench notions of its advocates in relation to other actors. Whether torture works as a means of acquiring accurate intelligence against threats is therefore entirely irrelevant. The purpose is to secure the right to use torture and in so doing to reinforce particular notions of the various actors involved. Because the right to torture has been secured, those that have secured that right are therefore legitimate. Torture is a special practice to be used only by especially appointed individuals in special circumstances. Therefore, if the right to use it can be secured, the notions about those seeking to secure that right are also secured, as are those of the individuals against whom the torture will be used.

Senior officials have called for support for specific groups within the US to be deemed trustworthy to torture. Jamie Wilson reported in 2005 that the White House "wants the CIA to be exempted from a proposed ban on the abusive treatment of terrorism suspects being held in US custody."[96] Wilson describes how, following the passing of legislation by the Senate three weeks previously that would outlaw the cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of anyone held by the US, anonymous officials informed the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* that Dick Cheney, vice-president, "proposed a change so that the law would not apply to counter-terror operations abroad or to operations conducted by 'an element' of the US government other than the defence department."[97] To have reached the stage where such requests are being made requires that specific identities of the actors involved are recognised and accepted by society.

---

[96] Jamie Wilson, 'Bush Seeks CIA Exaemption from Ban on Cruelty to Terror Suspects', *The Guardian,* 26 October, 2005, p.16.
[97] Wilson, 'Bush Seeks CIA Exemption', p.16.

Does torture for legitimacy work?

There is evidence to suggest that efforts by Great Power democracies to secure the right to torture may be working, at least among the American population. Associated Press and IPSOS polling carried out in 2005 in nine countries – the US and eight of its allies – found that almost two thirds of Americans support secret interrogations of terror suspects.[98] Nevertheless, nearly three quarters of Americans polled by *Newsweek* believed that America's image abroad had been tarnished by allegations of torture in US detention facilities.[99] There is therefore an acknowledgement of the fact that complicity in torture does undermine a state's legitimacy internationally, although this does not appear to have affected the dominant view among Americas that torture may be permissible.

While US elites may be succeeding in securing the right to torture at home, their legitimacy is being undermined abroad. This matters because US efforts to secure the right to torture do not merely affect the American population. Rather, because of the collaboration between the US and transnational elites in a network of terror, most obviously manifested by the policy of extraordinary rendition, populations all over the world are affected, and are resisting. Indeed, other populations are, through their opposition to torture, challenging not only US legitimacy, but also the legitimacy of the elites in their own and other states that are implicated in transnational networks that use repression. Challenges to the legitimacy of the US are born out in polls among other populations. Associated Press and IPSOS found that two thirds living in Canada, Mexico, South Korea and Spain would oppose allowing the US to secretly interrogate terror suspects. Almost two thirds in Britain, France, Germany and Italy would also oppose it. And whereas only 36 percent of the Americans polled thought torture could never be justified, half of the British, Canadians, Germans and Spanish thought it could never be justified. Strongest opposition to torture was found among the Italian respondents, 60 percent of whom said torture could never be justified.[100] Given that a number of these states are implicated in the US-led extraordinary rendition programme, their own legitimacy is also challenged by the majority in those states who oppose secret interrogation and torture.

Beyond the US there has also been significant criticism of other US policies which violate human rights. Recent surveys show public opinion for the US falling, with Europeans in

---

[98] Will Lester, 'Poll Shows Divide on Question of Torture', Associated Press, 6 December 2005, <http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=1376448&page=1>
[99] Evan Thomas and Michael Hirsh, 'The Debate Over Torture', Newsweek, 21 November 2005, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10020629/site/newsweek/>
[100] Lester, 'Poll Shows Divide'.

particular labelling the US the biggest threat to global security. This fall is linked to unpopular US policies, particularly the US-led invasion and occupation of Iraq, but it may be that evidence of torture at the hands of US intelligence and military personnel, as well as evidence of efforts on the part of the US to justify torture, has played some part in the de-legitimisation of the US state.[101]

The legitimacy of the US and its allies has not only been undermined among the public of its allies, but also among the Iraqi population, for the most part because of its invasion and disastrous occupation of Iraq. Revelations that torture occurred at Abu Ghraib, and that torture may have been used at other US detention facilities is likely to have contributed further to the de-legitimisation of the US among Iraqis. The Bush administration's response to Abu Ghraib was one of condemnation, with Bush stating that Abu Ghraib "became a symbol of disgraceful conduct by a few American troops who dishonoured our country and disregarded our values."[102] Nevertheless, it is clear that the administration has been involved in advocating torture, and this did create confusion among US military and intelligence personnel about what was permitted and what was not. Several US Department of Defense personnel indicated in interviews that there was confusion about what was appropriate with regard to interrogation, following the issue of the various memos by the President, the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense itself.[103] So whereas the administration condemned the Abu Ghraib torture, it cannot deny responsibility for the attitudes that developed as a consequence of efforts to redefine torture. Abu Ghraib was a symptom of a wider set of practices that the US has been using and seeking to use in the "War on Terror", including secret detention, denying legal representation for detainees, and extraordinary rendition, in collaboration with its elite allies as part of a transnational network of terror.

Thus on the one hand, while efforts to secure the right to use torture may, to some extent, have the desired effect of affording its advocates with legitimacy, its use, and efforts to justify its use, also have the effect of de-legitimising the elites seeking to use it, particularly among populations targeted by these tactics. It may also further legitimise the cause of the enemies of those that seek to use torture.

Disjuncture between the intended and actual outcomes of torture

---

[101] Howard LaFranchi, 'US Effort to Rehab Image Falls Short', *The Christian Science Monitor*, 21 June 2006, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/062106K.shtml>
[102] President George Bush, 'Remarks by the President on Iraq and the War on Terror (Transcript)', The White House, 24 May 2004, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/05/20040524-10.html>
[103] Interviews undertaken between June and September 2004 at the Pentagon and Fort Benning, Georgia.

The models developed above show that torture, because of its horribleness, does, to some extent, lend itself to the intended functions of its use. Nevertheless, there is often a disjuncture between the intended functions and actual outcomes of torture. The disjuncture uncovered by the security model is that while it is claimed that torture is intended to secure credible intelligence, on the basis of some cases where it may have yielded results, there is no evidence of its widespread utility for this purpose. Nevertheless arguments are made to legalise and regulate torture for these purposes. Arguments of this kind fail to take into account that the majority of torture has little to do with intelligence.

The stability model uncovers the disjuncture between the intended and actual outcomes of torture for the purpose of stability. Torture can be effective, at least in the short-term, for ensuring the stability of the regime. In the long term, however, resistance does emerge, often as a consequence of campaigning by exiles which can result in international pressure. On the other hand, in rare cases where the torture is controlled and contained, regimes engaging in its use may enjoy longevity because fewer people are affected, fewer people flee, and external pressure is not sufficient, or because the regime in question enjoys legitimacy afforded through its good relations with dominant liberal states that choose not to challenge them.

The disjuncture uncovered by the legitimacy model is that while creating more terrorists is not the intention of such a policy, it may well be the outcome, because of the way in which the legitimacy of torture's proponents is undermined. Indeed the terrorists are nevertheless needed in order that the right to use torture is secured and in order to ensure acceptance of particular notions of oneself in relation to one's enemies.

As well as the mismatch between the intended and actual outcomes of torture, further sometimes unintended consequences of torture are worthy of note. Torture, as well as inflicting immediate physical trauma, has long term effects on its victims, both physical and psychological. It also affects its perpetrators and society as a whole.

Physically, torture victims have been shown to suffer many long term physical and psychological effects that may not have been foreseen.[104] The long term effects of torture are complex, with few victims suffering from just one of the physical, psychological and social

[104] These include gastro-intestinal disorders; rectal lesions; skin lesions; dermatological disorders; difficulty in walking; joint pains; bran atrophy and organic brain damage; cardio-pulmonary disorders; hypertension; dental disorders; residual trauma; gynaecological symptoms; hearing impairment; lowered pain threshold and stress. Psychologically, victims may suffer the following for many years to come: anxiety and depression; psychosis; instability; concentration difficulties; lethargy; restlessness; diminished control of expression and emotion; communication disabilities; memory loss; loss of sense of locality; insomnia; impaired memory; headaches; hallucinations; visual disturbance; alcohol intolerance; paraesthesia; vertigo; and sexual disturbances. Long term social effects include impairment of social personality; inability to work; inability to participate in recreation; destruction of self-image; stress place upon the family and inability to socialise. See Peters, *Torture*, pp.174-175.

effects, and treatment is extremely difficult. Conventional therapy which involves intensive questioning, medical examination and physical therapy can all resemble the experience of torture, so is not always helpful in treating the victims of torture.[105]

As well as having profound ogical effects on its victims, torture also has significant effects on the perpetrators. For instance, a former French career soldier, subsequently a priest, Père Gilbert, indicated that the use of torture by French soldiers against Algeria had disturbing affects on their mental health:

> I have received enough confidences in Algeria and in France to know into what injuries, perhaps irreparable, torture can lead the human conscience. Many young men have 'taken up the game' and have thereby passed from mental health and stability into terrifying states of decay, from which some will never recover.[106]

Gilbert's claims are corroborated by Marie-Odile Godard, who estimated that some 350,000 French ex-combatants still suffer from psychiatric disorders and trauma including nightmares, hallucinations, flashbacks, depression and suicidal impulses.[107] These findings are suggestive of long-term damage to perpetrators. Further research in this area is called for in order to help us better understand political violence.

The use of torture also has a profound effect on society. It requires the complicity of various state institutions which can result in its legitimisation by large sectors of society. As Pierre Vidal-Naquet argues, in the course of the Algerian war, the French military, police, judicial system and ultimately society as a whole, were caught up in and were complicit in the spread of torture:

> When a body which is part of the machinery of the state is involved in a crime like that of torture, it is the whole state system which is in the dock and it is the whole machinery of the state which becomes an accomplice of the crime if it tries to cover up the truth.[108]

When liberal democratic states are implicated in torture, as France was at home and in Algeria, the supposed foundations of those states – a commitment to protecting human rights – are undermined.

Torture, then, has been used widely and despite claims relating to security, has, for the most part, been used in an attempt to thwart political opposition and protect the interests of elites. This includes protecting the interests of elites from Northern democracies who condone and sponsor torture. By seeking the right to use torture, they also seek to secure particular notions of themselves and their enemies. However, torture rarely serves its intended functions, as I

---

[105] Ibid. pp.174-175.
[106] Père Gilbert, quoted in Ibid. pp.178-179.
[107] Marie-Odile Godarad cited in Peters, *Torture,* p.9.
[108] Vidal-Naquet, *Torture: Cancer of Democracy,* pp.40-44.

have shown, and its effects are devastating, not just for its victims, but for perpetrators and for society more broadly. Despite its widespread use as a tool of repression by Northern elites, it is largely absent from mainstream debate. In subsequent chapters I will explore the condoning of torture in US training of military forces from the South.

Conclusion

The continuity thesis provides an accurate account of US foreign policy objectives but it tells us little about the strategies that have been used to achieve those objectives. Repression and legitimation have both featured in US foreign policy strategy since World War II. The periodisation developed in this chapter, and expanded in the remainder of the thesis, is intended to show the degree to which those two strategies have dominated US foreign policy at different times. Repression characterised US foreign policy strategy in the South during the Cold War, and as chapters four and five will show, this was at great cost to human rights. In the years following the Cold War, and up until 9/11, US foreign policy strategy in the South was characterised primarily by legitimation in order to secure popular endorsement for neoliberalism, often through democracy promotion. This was nevertheless underpinned by coercive means, which were used when legitimation strategies were not deemed the most effective to ensure US objectives were achieved. Since 9/11 legitimation has continued to be an important means by which the US achieves its foreign policy objectives in the South, and indeed is preferred among neo-conservatives. However, partly because of their willingness to use any means to spread democracy and neoliberalism, including by force and regime change, the use of repressive means has intensified, and has included the use of torture since 9/11.

This periodisation of US foreign policy shows that various forms of repression, including state terrorism and torture, which itself can be a tool of state terrorism, have been key features of US foreign policy strategy, particularly during the Cold War. It is only recently that achieving legitimation has been the favoured strategy of US decision-makers, but repression continues to operate alongside legitimation. As subsequent chapters show, where legitimation fails, the US resorts to repression in the South. Despite the covert and overt use of state terrorism as one of a number of tools of repression by the US since the end of World War II, it is largely absent from mainstream terrorism studies within IR. This can be explained by the embedded nature of academic work on terrorism, and by the ways in which terrorism is defined, precluding the use and sponsorship of terrorism by Northern democracies from working definitions.

Similarly, torture as used by Great Power democracies, and the US specifically, tends to be excluded from IR scholarship. The framework developed here to account for torture shows that torture, because of its horribleness, does to some extent lend itself to the intended functions of its use, namely, to defeat security threats, to ensure stability and to establish legitimacy, including among liberal states. Nevertheless, a key finding of this research is that there is often a disjuncture between the intended functions and actual outcomes of torture, and often the security, the stability and the legitimacy of those advocating torture is undermined by its use. Despite this, as the remaining chapters show, torture has been a tool of US foreign policy in the South, and has been advocated as part of the training given by the US to forces from the South, often at great cost to human rights. In the final chapter I will discuss whether, in light of the paradoxes of the theory and practice of torture, it is an appropriate foreign policy tool. In the next chapter I will provide an overview of US foreign policy strategy in the South during the Cold War, which I will show was characterised by repression and involved the widespread condoning of torture.

PART II

CHAPTER FOUR: US FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY DURING THE COLD WAR

During the Cold War, US foreign policy strategy in the South, or what was then referred to as the Third World, was characterised primarily by support for repression. This chapter shows that the US collaborated with elites in the South, in order to suppress political movements that might threaten US elite interests and challenge US global dominance. The US was able to achieve its objectives in the South, either through direct US military action, or more often through the actions of its Southern allies. This chapter charts the use and sponsorship of repression by the US in the South, and shows that much US activity during the Cold War was focused on the South, despite the notion of the Cold War as an East-West conflict. The rhetoric surrounding US interventions in the South was dominated by claims that communism was a real and present danger and must be contained. As I will show, with reference to many declassified documents, US activity was as much to do with protecting US strategic and material interests in the South.

The overview of US-led repression in the South in this chapter provides the context for an assessment of the relationship between US training of military forces from the South and repression, in chapter five. The US was involved in repression in almost every Latin American state throughout the Cold War, either directly, or through its allies, and was therefore behind extensive state terrorism in Latin America. As is well-documented, US support for repression was not limited to the Western Hemisphere. In Indochina millions were victims of human rights violations at the hands of the US and its clients during the Cold War, including as a result of the US advocating repression and torture through the training its military and intelligence personnel gave to its allies in that region, as I will show. I will first outline the use and support of repression by the US in Latin America. I will then discuss the use of repression by the US in Indochina in order to show that this was a global phenomena that was intended to serve US global objectives, and that much of what occurred in Latin America built on and developed strategies used by the US in Indochina earlier on in the Cold War.

Repression in Latin America

While dominant terrorism experts, discussed in chapter three, do not assess the use of state terrorism by Northern democratic states, there is ample evidence to show that sponsorship of state terrorism dominated US foreign policy strategy throughout the Cold War. It was the protection and promotion of the US state and US capitalist elite interests that drove US

activities in the South, starting in Latin America. As discussed in chapter two, ever since President Monroe announced his Doctrine in 1823, Latin America has been designated a key sphere of US influence by successive administrations, essential to the US for strategic, political, military and material purposes. Indeed, when interviewed, even José Alvarez, the former commandant of the School of the Americas, conceded, "US policy towards Latin America has been one of benign neglect at best in terms of politics. Historically it has been a corporate land-grab, a fiefdom of US corporations."[1] This came to shape not just US-Latin American relations, but, throughout the Cold War, US relations with states across the South. As implied in the advice given by the Council on Foreign Relations to President Roosevelt, discussed in chapter two, all efforts would be taken to prevent political movements that posed a threat to US interests from gaining ground. As I will show, they were to be met either by direct US intervention, or more frequently, by repression on the part of US-sponsored allies, often collaborating in regional networks headed by the US. The sponsorship of such allies took on various forms, including financial assistance, military training, provision of weapons, and sharing of intelligence.

Direct US intervention

On a number of occasions the US intervened directly in Latin American states during the Cold War in order to thwart political movements that challenged US interests. Such interventions included US-orchestrated coups d'état and direct military invasions. The US was behind coups in Guatemala and Brazil during the Cold War, both of which resulted in the establishment of military regimes that acted with impunity as they carried out extensive campaigns of state terrorism against their own people, with ongoing US support.

Guatemala

In Guatemala, the interests of the US state and US capital were under threat, following the ousting of the Guatemalan military government in 1944. Juan José Arévalo was elected President, and a decade of reform began. Guatemala's first labour unions were established, and a Labour Code was introduced. In 1953, the new, democratically elected president, Jacobo Arbenz, continued with these reforms, and as part of a policy of redistributing land to the Guatemalan peasantry, expropriated 40 percent of the land owned by US-based United Fruit Company. This amounted to 234,000 acres.[2] Both John Foster Dulles, then American

[1] Interview with José Alvarez, Former Commandant of US Army School of the Americas (February 1993 – March 1995), The Pentagon, Washington DC, 8 June 2004.
[2] Nicholas Cullather, 'Operation PBSUCCESS. The United States and Guatemala, 1953-1954', Centre for the Study of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency, 1994 (Cullather worked on contract for the CIA for one year,

Secretary of State and his brother, Allen, then CIA director, owned stock in the company.[3] John Foster Dulles was also closely connected to United Fruit's management as the executive partner of the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, which was employed by United Fruit. His brother was also a Sullivan and Cromwell attorney.[4] The US administration began to plot Arbenz's overthrow, ostensibly because of communist tendencies, following a meeting between the US ambassador and Arbenz. Ambassador John Peurifoy reported to the State Department, "if the President [Arbenz] is not a Communist he will certainly do until one comes along."[5] The CIA was then assigned the task of organising, arming and training the Arbenz government's military opposition in Honduras, with a view to overthrowing the government.[6]

The CIA-backed coup in 1954 followed CIA training of 37 Guatemalan sabotage trainees, 30 leadership trainees, and communications trainees.[7] Documents obtained by the National Security Archive indicate that the CIA had also been involved in planning the assassination of enemies of the new regime, should the coup be a success.[8] Decades of violence ensued, led by the Guatemalan state and right-wing paramilitary groups that claimed the lives of thousands, many during the US-sponsored counterinsurgency (CI) campaign in the mid-1960s. CI doctrine emphasises overcoming insurgencies, not simply through military means, but also through political, economic, psychological and civic actions. A central element of CI is to secure support from the public for the counterinsurgency campaign, and to deter them from lending support to or joining the insurgency. Tactics include spreading anti-insurgent propaganda and gathering intelligence about the insurgents in order to pre-empt and thwart their activities, but also putting in place infrastructure development.[9] It is therefore not inherently or necessarily repressive. CI as advocated by the US during the Cold War,

---

where he was given access to thousands of agency records and secret operational files to produce an overview of the CIA's involvement in the coup. This account was itself declassified and released to the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and is document 5 of 5 documents compiled by the Guatemala Documentation Project, NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 4), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/cia-guatemala5_a.html>

[3] Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States*, (London and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998), p.338.

[4] Ibid. p.338

[5] Cited by Schoultz, *Beneath the US*, See note 25, p.452.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Cullather, 'Operation PBSUCCESS'; Schoultz, *Beneath the United States*, chapter 5.

[8] Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), 'Memorandum to all Staff Officers. Subject: Selection of Individuals for Disposal by Junta Group', 31 March 1954 (Memorandum obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and is document 3 of 5 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 4), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/cia-guatemala3_1.html>; and 'Memorandum to Chief of Staff. Subject: Guatemalan Communist Personnel to be disposed of during Military Operations of Calligeris', Origin and Date Deleted (Memorandum obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and document 4 of 5 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, in NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 4), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/cia-guatemala4_1.html>

[9] US Department of Defense, 'Counterinsurgency Operations (Field Manual-Interim FMI 3-07.22)', US Department of Defense, Army, 2004, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-07-22/index.html>

however, encouraged the widespread use of repression, including torture, as I will show in the remainder of the thesis.[10] The Commission for Historical Clarification, established in 1994 through the Oslo Accords, estimated that over 200,000 people were killed or disappeared between the 1950s and 1994.[11] The report states:

> A high proportion of the human rights violations known to the CEH [Commission for Historical Clarification] and committed by the Army or security forces were perpetrated publicly and with extreme brutality, especially in the Mayan communities of the country's interior.[12]

Despite extensive repression, particularly against the Mayan communities, US support for CI campaigns persisted throughout the 1960s, a key element of which was the ongoing military training of Guatemala's military, paramilitary and police forces. Key roles were played by the Inter-American Police Academy in the Panama Canal Zone, the Department of Defense's Special Forces for paramilitary training, and joint Department of Defense and CIA programmes, which included the inappropriately named Public Safety Programme. This was engaged in activities that were completely contrary to ensuring public safety, including the use of torture by US and overseas personnel.[13] These programmes provided training for military, paramilitary and police forces, not just from Guatemala, but across the South, including Korea, Cambodia, the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Colombia, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Panama and El Salvador.[14] Between 1950 and 1975, 3,030 Guatemalan soldiers of the 5,000-strong Guatemalan army, received US training.[15] AI estimated that between 1966 and 1976, the number of victims of secretly sanctioned murders and disappearances in Guatemala numbered over 20,000.[16] The Commission for Historical Clarification attributed 93 per cent of these to the Guatemalan state, predominantly the army.[17]

---

[10] Current US doctrine emphasises that preferred CI methods are not coercive, but involve "assistance and development programs", and leaders are encouraged to "consider the roles of military, intelligence, diplomatic, law enforcement, information, finance, and economic elements in counterinsurgency." See US Department of Defense, 'Counterinsurgency Operations (Field Manual-Interim FMI 3-07.22)', US Department of Defense, Army, 2004, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-07-22/index.html>

[11] Christian Tomuschat; Otilia Lux-de-Cotí; and Alfredo Balsells-Tojo, 'Guatemala: Memory of Silence, Report of the Commission for Historical Clarification', 26 February 1999, <http://shr.aaas.org/guatemala/ceh/report/english/>chapter 7.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Michael McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992).

[14] Ibid. The formal brief of the Public Safety Programme provided for grants of security equipment, training overseas and in the US, and for stationing Public Safety advisors overseas to organise training programmes and provide advice and technical assistance to foreign counterparts. Its emphasis was on CI doctrine, and as a consequence, it became known, according to McClintock, as a conduit for CIA training, assistance and operational advice to foreign political police, "and for linking the US to the jailers, torturers, and murderers of the most repressive of 'free world' regimes."

[15] North American Congress for Latin America, The US Military Apparatus: Defence Department Organisation; the Intelligence Establishment; US Bases and Forces Abroad; Military Police Aid; Arms Sales, (Berkeley, California: North American Congress for Latin America, 1972).

[16] AI, *Guatemala*, (London: AIBriefing Papers, No.8, 1976), chapter 7.

[17] Tomuschat; Lux-de-Coti; and Balsells-Tojo, 'Guatemala: Memory of Silence', see 'Conclusions'.

Declassified documents illustrate that the US military was complicit in these human rights abuses through its ongoing support of the Guatemalan state, and continued CI training. Indeed, one of the documents constitutes an extraordinary indictment of US policy in Guatemala, sent by Viron Vacky, US Deputy Chief of the Guatemalan Mission, to the Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, Covey Oliver at the Department of State's Policy Planning Council, arguing:

> The Guatemalan government's use of counter-terror is indiscriminate and brutal, and has impeded modernisation and institution building within the country […] This is not only because we have concluded that we cannot do anything about it, for we have never really tried. Rather we suspect that maybe it is a good tactic, and that as long as communists are being killed it is alright. Murder, torture and mutilation are alright if our side is doing it and the victims are communists [...] Counter-terror is, in short, very wrong morally, ethically, politically from the point of view of Guatemala's own interest and practically from our own foreign policy point of view.[18]

Yet support for such operations continued, and a further declassified document, sent by the US embassy in Guatemala to the Department of State's Fascell Sub-Committee Hearings on the Guatemala Public Safety Programme reads:

> 1) The U.S. government is aware of the tactics being used by the government of Guatemala (GOG) to combat urban and rural terrorism. The GOG for the most part uses orthodox police methods to rid Guatemala of the communist-inspired terrorism, but on occasion has engaged in illegal detention and elimination of individuals. President Arana is troubled by these operations. 2) The advent of a communist government considerably more repressive than the present one would have a serious and adverse effect on U.S. security. 3) The U.S. Public Safety Program is not involved in assistance to or cooperation with terrorist operations of any kind. 4) Contrary to the misleading information put forth by members of the U.S. and international press the Public Safety Program is not associated by Guatemalans with terrorist tactics.[19]

The US continued to lend support to the Guatemalan government, and to insist that US training programmes were in no way involved in repression. Yet the Commission for Historical Clarification concluded that US military assistance had a "significant bearing on human rights violations during the armed confrontation."[20] The Public Safety Programme was investigated in the 1970s because of allegations that its Latin American programmes had encouraged torture, and because of the role that it played in establishing the Phoenix Programme in Vietnam, which involved the widespread use of torture.[21]

Brazil

---

[18] Viron Vaky, 'Memorandum. Subject: Guatemala and Counter-Terror, Sent to Covey Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs', US Department of State, 29 March 1968, (Memorandum obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and document 5 of 32 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, in NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 11), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB11/docs/05-01.htm>

[19] US Department of State, 'Secret Cable. Subject: Fascell Sub-Committee Hearings on Guatemala Public Safety Programme, from the US Embassy in Guatemala to the US Department of State', 2 September 1971, (Cable obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and document 7 of 32 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, in NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 11), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB11/docs/07-01.htm>

[20] Tomuschat; Lux-de-Cotí; and Balsells-Tojo, 'Guatemala: Memory of Silence'.

[21] McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*, chapter 7.

Declassified documents show that the US was also implicated in the coup in Brazil in 1964 which overthrew President Goulart and led to the establishment of a military regime. Goulart had been involved in land reform programmes, and lent his support to left wing dissenters in the Army. An audiotape of a conversation between President Johnson and his Undersecretary of State, George Ball, and Assistant Secretary for Latin America, Thomas Mann, on 31 March 1963, shows that Johnson gave the green light for active US support of the coup. Ball had informed the President that Goulart was a leftist, closely associated with the Brazilian communist party, and feared that Brazil "would be another China." Johnson responded, "I think we ought to take every step that we can, be prepared to do everything that we need to do."[22] Subsequent exchanges between the CIA, the State Department and the White House reveal that the US lent military support to the coup.

Ambassador Lincoln Gordon sent a secret memorandum to the White House on 27 March 1964, urging the US to make a "clandestine delivery of arms" to the leaders of the coup, as well as a shipment of gas and oil to help the coup forces succeed. He also suggested such support be supplemented by CIA covert operations.[23] On 31 March, Gordon was sent a cable by Secretary of State Dean Rusk confirming that the plans were in place to support the coup. It states that decisions had been taken by the White House "in order [to] be in a position to render assistance at appropriate time to anti-Goulart forces if it is decided this should be done," including sending US naval tankers loaded with petrol, oil and lubricants, assembling 110 tonnes of ammunition and other equipment for pro-coup forces, and the dispatch of a naval brigade including an aircraft carrier, several destroyers and escorts to be positioned off the coast of Brazil.[24] Following the coup, the military government launched a "cleanup" operation, which over the coming ten years, as documented by Martha Huggins, would see thousands of Brazilian citizens involved in a whole range of political parties, interest groups, labour unions, religious groups, students organisations and activist organisations disappeared and tortured at the hands of a brutal police force.[25] The US continued to provide training for military and police personnel.[26]

---

[22] The White House, 'White House Audio Tape: President Lyndon Johnson discussing the impending coup in Brazil with Undersecretary of State George Ball', 31 March 1964, (Declassified audiotape, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 118), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB118/index.htm#2>

[23] Lincoln Gordon, 'Secret Cable from Ambassador Gordon to the State Department', US Department of State, 27 March 1964, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 2 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 118), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB118/bz03.pdf>

[24] Dean Rusk, 'Outgoing Telegram from the Department of State to Ambassador Gordon', US Department of State, 31 March 1964, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 5 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 118), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB118/bz05.pdf>

[25] Martha Huggins, *Political Policing. The United States and Latin America*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp.119-160; and Martha Huggins; Mika Haritos-Fatouros; and Philip Zimbardo, *Violence Workers. Police*

The Dominican Republic

As well as organising coups in Latin America, the US used its military and intelligence personnel to directly invade two Latin American states during the Cold War. These were the Dominican Republic and Panama. The coup in the Dominican Republic which overthrew the reformist Juan Bosh in 1963, a novelist and scholar who enjoyed popular support and was the country's first democratically elected president, was to be followed by an invasion by some 22,000 US marines. This was intended to prevent the labour and land reforms proposed by Bosch from taking hold, as they would pose a threat to US national and capitalist interests.[27] Well before and following this invasion, the US had been training Dominican military and police personnel, 3,705 in total between 1950 and 1975, and had also been providing millions of dollars worth of military aid to successive Dominican governments.[28] This was despite evidence from AI that many assassinations were being carried out by death squads, with open support from the Dominican state, and the allegation by AI that in 1970 there was one death or disappearance every 34 hours in that country.[29]

Panama

Much later on, in 1989, the US invaded Panama, this time to oust General Manuel Antonio Noriega, Panama's dictator, who had previously enjoyed US support and had for a long time supplied intelligence to the CIA.[30] The administration's justifications for this were, according to the State Department, "to protect US lives and property, to fulfil US treaty responsibilities to operate and defend the Canal, to assist the Panamanian people in restoring democracy, and to bring Noriega to justice."[31] A priority of the US administration was to single out Noriega, and not apportion blame for human rights abuses to the Panamanian Defence Forces (PDF), even though they had been behind numerous acts of repression, as HRW demonstrated:

Torturers and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), pp.77-79 and 236-240.

[26] Huggins, *Political Policing*, p.136.

[27] James Cockcroft, *Latin America. History, Politics and US Policy*, (Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1989), p.346.

[28] NACLA, *US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel*, pp.24-32.

[29] Amnesty International, *Report on Torture*, (Washington DC: Amnesty International, 1975), pp.211-212.

[30] National Security Archive (NSA), 'The Oliver North File: His Diaries, E-mail and Memos on the Kerry Report, Contras and Drugs', 26 February 2004, (Declassified documents, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Electronic Briefing Book 113), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB113/index.htm>

[31] US Department of State, 'Background Note: Panama', January 2006, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2030.htm>

> The PDF crackdown on the civic opposition movement which sprouted in June 1987 included beating, jailing and deporting of opposition leaders […] When opposition forces appeared to have won the May 1989 general elections, the PDF and allied paramilitary groups launched an even tougher response, arresting dozens of oppositionists, killing a foreign cleric and an opposition bodyguard, and badly beating the opposition candidates for president and vice president.[32]

The HRW reports highlights the efforts by the US administration to distance the PDF from Noriega, holding him singly responsible, despite the PDF's involvement in the abuses:

> In a May 11 statement issued one day after Panama annulled the elections apparently won by the opposition, President Bush affirmed his conviction that "[a] professional Panamanian Defense Force can have an important role to play in Panama's democratic future." […] More to the point, President Bush said on May 13: "The problem is Noriega. If Noriega were to leave, we'd have good relations with the Panamanian people and the PDF."[33]

Ensuring immunity for the PDF was consistent with the strategy of maintaining allied forces in the South, to be discussed in detail below, that could act on behalf of the US in pursuit of its interests. As well as showing little commitment to human rights through efforts to ensure immunity for the PDF, the US also showed little regard for the safety of civilians during the invasion. A joint delegation of the Central American Human Rights Commission (CODEHUCA) and the Panamanian Human Rights Commission (CONADEHUPA) published a report in 1990, based on interviews. It concluded that the human costs of the invasion are substantially higher than the official U.S. figures, and that "conservative estimates indicate that civilian fatalities were at least 10 times greater than the US figure of 220."[34] It adds:

> The actual death toll has been obscured through US military practices including: incineration of corpses prior to identification; burial of remains in common graves prior to identification; and US military control of administrative offices of hospitals and morgues, permitting the removal of all registries to US military bases.[35]

CODEHUCA also reported that the US, according to its own military sources, had detained and interrogated almost 6,000 Panamanians, civilian and military, and that hundreds of Panamanians were arbitrarily captured and detained on the basis of anonymous denunciations. This is standard practice for the US, and is entirely consistent with US activity in Iraq since the 2003 invasion and occupation.[36] The CODEHUCA report states, "many of these arrests are spurred merely by antipathy or personal grudges within the Panamanian population but others are clearly attempts to crack down on opposition protest," and adds that "union leaders have been detained in order to pressure their support for the

---

[32] Human Rights Watch, 'Human Rights Watch World Report, 1989: Panama', 1989, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1989/WR89/Panama.htm#TopOfPage>
[33] Ibid.
[34] CODEHUCA, 'Report of Joint CODEHUCA and CONADEHUPA Delegation, January - February 1990', February 1990, <http://www.skepticfiles.org/socialis/panama39.htm>
[35] Ibid.
[36] Eric Herring and Glen Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments: The Occupation and its Legacy*, (London: C. Hurst and Co, 2006), chapter four.

puppet government."[37] Thus the US itself perpetrated human rights violations as well as rewarding with immunity the Panamanian security forces for its involvement.

US allies and the Latin American repression

The preference of the US was for local elites to carry out its objectives in Latin America. This was particularly the case following the failure of the US in the Vietnam War, after which the American public had little sympathy for further US activities overseas.[38] The US was therefore involved in providing covert military and intelligence assistance to elites from a further thirteen Latin American states during the Cold War. Much of this involved support for CI operations and training. While this was frequently bilateral, it also involved training exercises in which military and intelligence personnel from states across Latin America took part. The US was therefore facilitating possibilities for collaboration between its allied forces. The US also actively encouraged and led the elite forces and military personnel of numerous Latin American states in specific collaborative operations, resulting in widespread repression.

Cuba

The case of US sponsorship of the failed invasion of Cuba's Bay of Pigs in 1961 demonstrates the ends to which the US went to overthrow a regime that was at odds with its designs on the region, and in that particular case, the limits of the intervention. Rather than directly invading Cuba, CIA and US Special Forces covertly trained members of the 1,400 strong task force of Cuban nationals who had been selected for the job. The planned invasion also involved the provision of 17 B-26 bombers, a fleet of naval vessels and five M14 tanks.[39] This was one of the earliest engagements in which the US would train or offer assistance to allied armies to carry out its objectives in the region. While this failed, subsequent arrangements between the US and elites in the South were much more successful for the US, but resulted in extensive abuses of human rights in the region.

Haiti

---

[37] CODEHUCA, 'Report of Joint CODEHUCA and CONADEHUPA Delegation'.
[38] Michael Klare, 'Subterranean Alliances: America's Global Proxy Network', *Journal of International Affairs*, vol.43, no.1, (1989), p.97.
[39] McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*, chapter 5.

François Duvalier came to power in 1957 with the support of the army and secret US backing. He also declared himself president for life.[40] This was followed by decades of authoritarian rule by the Duvalier dynasty. Duvalier's regime was characterised by "upward mobility for a chosen few, and the systematic, mass repression of the popular majority."[41] Between 1957 and 1985, 50,000 people are reported to have been executed by the Duvaliers, and hundreds of thousands detained, tortured or disappeared. A further 1.5 million were driven into voluntary or forced exile.[42] Throughout that period the US trained and armed Haiti's counterinsurgency forces, with $3.2 million dollars worth of Military Assistance Programme training being given between 1945 and 1975 alone. Unknown numbers of forces received CIA training during that period.[43]

Chile

The election of a reformist socialist government in Chile in the 1970s concerned the US government. A de-classified memorandum obtained by the National Security Archive showed that Henry Kissinger urged President Nixon to take action to undermine President Salvador Allende's government in Chile, just two days after Allende was inaugurated. This was to include covert support for military action against Allende:

> The election of Allende as president of Chile poses for us one of the most serious challenges ever faced in this hemisphere […] The consolidation of Allende in power in Chile, therefore, would pose some very serious threats to our interests and position in the hemisphere, and would affect developments and our relations to them elsewhere in the world: US investments (totalling some one billion dollars) may be lost […] Chile would probably become a leader of the opposition to us in the inter-American system, a source of disruption in the hemisphere and a focal point of support for subversion in the rest of Latin America. [44]

As with Guatemala, fears for US state interests and for the future of US capitalist investments dictated policy. The memo goes on to outline the difficulties involved, emphasising particularly the fact that Allende was democratically elected and therefore has "legitimacy in the eyes of the Chileans."[45] An audio tape of a telephone conversation between Nixon and Ron Zeigler, the White House Press Secretary on 23 March 1972 shows that the White House had instructed US Ambassador Edward Korry "to do everything short of a Dominican

---

[40] Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, pp.267-268.
[41] Ibid. p.268.
[42] Ibid.
[43] John Cope, 'International Military Education and Training: An Assessment', Institute for National Strategic Studies, *McNair Papers*, no.44, (1995), <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/macnair/mcnair44/m44cont.html>; Defense Security Cooperation Agency, 'Summary of Students Trained Under IMET', 30 September 2001, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20Students.xls>HRW, 'Human Rights Watch World Report, 1989: Panama', Human Rights Watch, 1989, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1989/WR89/Panama.htm#TopOfPage>
[44] Henry Kissinger, 'Memorandum for the President, from National Security Council Meeting, 6 November, Chile', The White House, 6 November 1970, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 2 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 110), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB110/chile02.pdf>
[45] Ibid.

Republic-type action" to stop Allende.[46] Behind the scenes the CIA had been plotting the coup which was to overthrow Allende since 1970. This included deploying a team of covert operatives working individually within Chile to undertake propaganda operations that were intended to push the then Chilean president, Eduardo Frei, to support a military coup which would prevent Allende from taking office.[47]

There are no documents available that determine the degree to which the US was implicated in the coup on 11 September 1973 which overthrew Allende, although one document indicates that the US Naval attaché, Patrick Ryan, was extremely pleased with the success of Pinochet's coup, which, he stated, "was close to perfect."[48] The years that followed would see Chile's population suffer greatly at the hands of Pinochet's military government, throughout which the US was involved in providing Chile with military assistance and covert support for clandestine intelligence and CI activity. The Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation found that during and in the years following the coup, 2,279 people were killed. Of those, 815 were victims of execution and death by torture, 957 disappeared following arrest, and the remainder were killed either as a result of war tribunals, during political protests, alleged escape attempts, or gun battles.[49]

Venezuela

Extensive CI training was also given to Venezuelan forces during the 1960s and 1970s, under the US Army's "Operation Hammer and Anvil" which was intended to route out political opponents of the Armed Forces of National Liberation.[50] This was an extension of the already existing CIA efforts, under the auspices of the "Special Group". The Special Group dealt with CI operations, and had been established by the CIA in 1962 with the purpose of assuring, as a memorandum to the Special Group shows, "the use of US resources with maximum effectiveness in preventing and resisting subversive insurgency in friendly

---

[46] Richard Nixon and Ron Zeigler, 'White House Audio Tape, President Richard Nixon and White House Press Secretary Ron Zeigler', 23 March 1972, (Declassified audio tape, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 110), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB110/index.htm>

[47] CIA, 'Report on CIA and Chilean Task Force Activities, 15 September to 3 November 1970', 18 November 1970, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 8), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB8/nsaebb8.htm>

[48] Patrick Ryan, 'Navy Section, United States Military Group, Chile, Situation Report Number 2', US Department of Defense, 1 October 1973, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 8), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB8/nsaebb8.htm>

[49] Chilean National Committee for Truth and Reconciliation, 'Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation', February 1991, <http://www.usip.org/library/tc/doc/reports/chile/chile_1993_toc.html>

[50] Cockcroft, *Latin America*, p.391.

countries."[51] At the time, more than half of all US oil imports came from Latin America, with Venezuela supplying 46.5 percent of the US' total oil imports in 1960, 34.9 percent in 1965 and 20.3 percent in 1970.[52] It is no surprise that the US was keen to prevent a shift in politics in Venezuela that might threaten its material interests in that state.

Mexico

The Díaz Ordaz regime in Mexico also enjoyed US support, even following the massacre of hundreds of students demonstrating at Tlatelolco, Mexico City, by the Army, under instructions from the government on 2 October 1968. Rather than condemn the Mexican government for the massacre, Covey Oliver of the State Department, in a confidential memorandum, stated, "We believe it important to avoid any indication that we lack confidence in the Government of Mexico's ability to control the situation."[53] A key reason for US support is outlined in a report from the US Embassy in Mexico, dated 17 February 1969, to the State Department. In a list of priorities for US policy in Mexico, which include preservation of national security, strengthening of special bilateral relationships, and a more helpful Mexican international role, it ranks "promotion of common economic interests" as second only to US national security. The report reads:

> Healthy economic development in Mexico is essential not only to social progress and political stability but also to the preservation of substantial and growing US economic interests in the country, which in turn contribute to its development.[54]

The same approach to human rights abuses continued throughout the 1970s, as further declassified documents show. For instance, on 24 March 1976, the US Embassy in Mexico sent a telegram to the Department of State reporting that "a pattern of human rights violations in Mexico exists […] but we do not feel that the patterns of violations that do occur should place it among those countries where a consistent pattern of gross violations exists."[55] Mexico's National Commission on Human Rights documented 350 cases of disappearances

---

[51] Memorandum to the Members of the Special Group: Subject: Establishment of the Special Group (Counter-Insurgency), 2 January 1962, NSAM 124. Carrollton Press (1974-900C), cited in McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*, chapter 6.
[52] American Petroleum Institute, *Basic Petroleum Data Book: Petroleum Industry Statistics*, (Washington DC: American Petroleum Institute, May 1986), Section IX, Table 4, cited in Lars Schoultz, *National Security and US Policy toward Latin America*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987), p.155.
[53] Covey Oliver, 'Confidential Information Memorandum to the Acting Secretary of State: Mexican Situation', US Department of State, 3 October 1968, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 37 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 99), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB99/Doc37.pdf>
[54] US Embassy, Mexico City, 'Financial Year 1971 Country Analysis and Strategy Paper for Mexico, to the US Department of State', American Embassy, Mexico City, 17 February 1969, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 5 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 92), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB92/mexelect_5.pdf>
[55] US Department of State, 'Airgram from US Embassy in Mexico to US Department of State: Human Rights in Mexico', 24 March 1976, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 6 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 89), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB89/mexhr06.pdf>

at the hands of the Mexican government during the period 1974-1978.[56] AI reported in detail on allegations of torture by the Mexican authorities.[57] Yet the telegram to the State Department indicates that there was more concern that US security assistance to Mexico be defended than with challenging the Mexican government over its human rights abuses: "US security assistance should not reasonably be related to human rights violations in Mexico […] We expect that our position can be defended against accusations that our assistance can be associated with human rights violations."[58] Thus the Mexican government was afforded legitimacy by the US state, and continued to receive military assistance despite its involvement in human rights violations.

Nicaragua

In July 1979 the Sandinista Front of National Liberation (FSLN) were finally able to establish a government in Nicaragua following years of struggle against military governments originally established by General Somoza, when he seized power in 1936. Although elections had operated throughout that period, they had been routinely manipulated by the Somoza regime.[59] The aim of the FSLN was to build a socialist society in Nicaragua, but from day one the US was intent on delegitimising the FSLN. Initially the US accused the FSLN of supplying Salvadoran guerrillas with arms. When this could not be proven, the US labelled Nicaragua a threat to its neighbours and to the US, and to democracy, referring to it as a totalitarian regime. This was despite reports from groups including Americas Watch which upheld Nicaragua as a democratic state, and condemned the Reagan administration for distorting the situation as a means to justify military intervention. Americas Watch stated in 1985 that, "Such misuse of human rights to justify military interference is in US-Latin American relations an unprecedented debasement of the human rights cause," and "Of particular concern is the Administration's constant – and inaccurate – use of the term 'totalitarian' to characterise Nicaragua."[60] When Reagan came to office, he almost immediately sanctioned a covert CIA paramilitary war in Nicaragua against the Sandinistas, as a declassified document, signed by the President on 1 December 1981, shows:

> I hereby find that the following activities are important to the national security of the United States, and direct the Director of Central Intelligence, or his designee, to report this finding to the Intelligence Committees of the Congress […] Nicaragua: in cooperation with other governments,

---

[56] Comisión Nacional de Derechos Humanos, 'Informe Especial Sobre las Quejas en Materia de Desapariciones Forzadas Ocurridas en la Decada de los 70 y Principios de los 80', see Anexo I, "Gráficas," no.10, <http://www.cndh.org.mx/lacndh/informes/espec/espec.htm>, accessed 9 February 2006.
[57] Amnesty International, *Annual Report on Human Rights* (London: Amnesty International, 1974-1975), pp.74-75.
[58] US Department of State, 'Airgram from US Embassy in Mexico to US Department of State: Human Rights in Mexico'.
[59] Hazel Smith, *Nicaragua: Self-Determination and Survival*, (London: Pluto Press, 1993), pp.131-132.
[60] Americas Watch, quoted in Ibid.

> provide support, equipment and training assistance to Nicaraguan paramilitary resistance groups as a means to induce the Sandinistas and Cubans and their allies to cease their support for insurgencies in the region; to hamper Cuban/Nicaraguan arms trafficking; to divert Nicaragua's resources and energies from support to Central American guerrilla movements; and to bring the Sandinistas into meaningful negotiations and constructive, verifiable agreement with their neighbours on peace in the region.[61]

Further declassified documents show that senior US officials drew up plans to secure funds from other states to sustain the campaign, should Congress refuse to provide further funding. This included deals with Saudi Arabia, Honduras and Panama, negotiated by Oliver North, a member of the National Security Council.[62] It also included using funds raised through arms sales to Iran to fund the Contras in Nicaragua, which Reagan finally confessed had taken place at a press briefing on 25 November 1986.

In 1986, the International Court of Justice found the US guilty on 15 counts of international law for acts of aggression in Nicaragua, which were part of the administration's policy of supporting the Contras. The Court judged:

> [T]he United States of America, by training, arming, equipping and supplying the contra forces or otherwise encouraging, supporting and aiding military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua, has acted, against the Republic of Nicaragua, in breach of its obligation under customary international law not to intervene in the affairs of another state.[63]

The Court also found the US guilty of disseminating a CI manual, compiled in 1983, entitled *Operaciones sicológicas en guerra de guerrillas*,[64] among contra forces, stating that this had encouraged actions by the contras which were "contrary to the principles of humanitarian law."[65]

Argentina

In Argentina, despite ongoing human rights abuses by the government, US security assistance was given, and US forces were themselves implicated in abuses. The coup in Argentina

---

[61] Reagan, Ronald (President), 'Presidential Finding on Covert Operations in Nicaragua, (with attached scope note)' The White House, 19 September 1983, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 1 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 210), < http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/1-Reagan%20Finding%209-19-83%20(IC%2000203).pdf>

[62] North, Oliver, 'National Security Memorandum from Oliver North to Robert McFarlane: Fallback Plan for the Nicaraguan Resistance', 16 March 1985, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 1 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 210), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/4-North%20Fallback%20memo%203-16-85%20(IC%2000952).pdf>
North, Oliver, 'Notebook Entries on Manuel Noriega', National Security Council, 24 August and 22 September 1986, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 1 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 210), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/9-North%20notes%208-24-86.pdf>

[63] International Court of Justice, *Case Concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States of America),* (The Hague: International Court of Justice, 1986), pp136-140.

[64] Psychological Operations in Guerrilla Warfare.

[65] International Court of Justice, *Case Concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua*, pp.136-140.

which saw Isabel Peron imprisoned by the military, and the establishment of a military dictatorship from 1976 to 1982, unleashed widespread, largely indiscriminate repression, particularly among the middle and lower classes, in what became known as the "Guerra Sucia" or Dirty War. Just two days after the coup, then secretary of state Henry Kissinger had expressed his approval of the economic benefits that could ensue for the US, in a meeting with his staff members. In that meeting William Rogers informed Kissinger that "we're going to look for a considerable effort to involve the US – particularly in the financial field," and Kissinger replied, "Yes, but that's in our interest."[66] Estimates of the numbers of people that were killed or disappeared under the military dictatorship range from 9,000 to 30,000, many of whom were also tortured in Argentina's secret detention centres.[67] The US Embassy in Argentina had itself compiled documentation of nearly 10,000 human rights violations, most of them disappearances by 1979, which it sent to the State Department "for the Department's permanent records and use."[68] Kissinger, rather than condemn these abuses, urged the junta to at least be quick about it, when he spoke with the Argentine Foreign Minister, and in a meeting on 7 October 1976, promised US support:

> Look, our basic attitude is that we would like you to succeed. I have an old-fashioned view that friends ought to be supported […] The quicker you succeed the better. The human rights problem is a growing one […] If you can finish before Congress gets back, the better. Whatever freedoms you could restore would help.[69]

Meanwhile, the military dictatorship was also enjoying ongoing assistance from the US. Viron Vaky, then Assistant Secretary for Interamerican Affairs, in a memorandum to the State Department argued:

> The Argentines remain dubious about the sincerity of US human rights demarches. Many in the government may have believed that US protests were largely perfunctory, a temporary outburst of moral fervour reflecting pressure from a few misguided human rights zealots in the Congress and non-governmental organisations and Argentina would be protected for the duration or its "dirty war" by friends in the US executive and Congress and / or the Pentagon.[70]

---

[66] Henry Kissinger, 'Staff Meeting Transcripts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger', US Department of State, 26 March 1976, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document , NSA Electronic Briefing Book 185), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB185/index.htm>

[67] Amnesty International, 'Argentina Feature: Cleaning Up the Dirty War', 2003, <http://news.amnesty.org/index/ENGAMR1312122003>

[68] US Department of State, 'Airgram from US Embassy in Argentina to the US Department of State: Human Rights Case Reports', 19 June 1979, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 8 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 73, Part One), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB73/790619dos1.pdf>

[69] US Department of State, 'Memorandum of Conversation: Secretary's Meeting with Argentine Foreign Minister Guzzetti', 7 October 1976, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 6 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 104), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB104/Doc6%20761007.pdf>

[70] Viron Vaky, 'Memorandum to State Department: Evolution of US Human Rights Policy in Argentina', US Department of State, 11 September 1978, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 13 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 73, Part Two), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB73/780911.pdf>

Given ongoing encouragement of CI doctrine provided by the US to the Argentine military, it is hardly surprising that the Argentine top brass considered the US to be giving a green light to their actions.

The Argentine-Honduran connection

During the 1980s, some of the Argentine army intelligence officers who had played a role in human rights violations during the Dirty War, went on to assist the US in its CI operations in Central America. Argentine officers oversaw a training programme for the Honduran Army and the Nicaraguan contras. They trained 3-16 Battalion, a Honduran death squad responsible for numerous disappearances, and former members of the Somoza National Guard, in their new role as contra leaders.[71] The CIA had helped the Honduran armed forces establish Battalion 3-16, which was behind the murders of at least 184 people, most of whom were disappeared, as the CIA's Inspector General's Secret Report into the Battalion, dated 27 August 1997, shows. The report indicates that the CIA failed to follow up on the then CIA director's 1986 commitment to investigate Battalion 3-16, following allegations of disappearances.[72] As a result the Honduran military was able to continue Battalion 3-16 operations, and transferred some of these to other units.[73]

El Salvador

El Salvador's repressive military government also enjoyed extensive US military assistance. Following a coup in 1979, an alliance was formed between the opposition group, the Democratic Revolutionary Front, and the guerrilla organisation, the FMLN. With the election of Ronald Reagan, the FMLN expected massive security assistance from the US for the Salvadoran military government, so, as Americas Watch report, it launched a final offensive against the government. It failed, but was met with widespread repression from the government, with the Catholic archdiocese of San Salvador documenting 2,644 murders of civilian non-combatants by the armed forces and paramilitary groups associated with them.[74] The aid from the Reagan administration did indeed arrive. It rose from $5.9 million dollars in

[71] HRW, 'Argentina: Reluctant Partner. The Argentine Government's Failure to Back Trials of Human Rights Violators (Chapter XI: The Role of the US)', December 2001, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/argentina/>
[72] CIA, 'Report of Investigation: Selected Issues Relating to CIA Activities in Honduras in the 1980s, and Related Documents', CIA Inspector General, 27 August 1977, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 4 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 27), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB27/index.html>
[73] Ibid.
[74] Cynthia Brown, *With Friends Like These: The Americas Watch Report on Human Rights and US Policy in Latin America*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), pp.115-118.

1980 to $35.5 million in 1981, and to $82 million in 1982.[75] The support included the provision of military training for large sections of the Salvadoran armed forces, including CI training.[76] The Truth Commission for El Salvador concluded that "counter-insurgency military operations affected the non-combatant civilian population, causing a high death toll and the emergence of a new phenomenon - displaced persons."[77] During the conflict around 75,000 people were killed, and many were tortured.[78] As I show in chapter five, some US materials used in training of El Salvadoran military forces advocated serious violations of International Humanitarian Law.

Peru

The situation in 1980s Peru was not dissimilar to that of El Salvador. In its efforts to overcome the terrorist activity of Sendero Luminoso, the Peruvian government deployed its own terror tactics through a far-reaching CI campaign. Ayacucho, and a number of other provinces where Sendero Luminoso were active, were militarised, and civilian functions were placed under the authority of political military commanders.[79] One of Ayachuco's CI experts told Marlise Simons of the *New York Times* that the security forces purposely left bodies on public display, because "this raises doubt about who did it and dissuades people. The idea is to reduce the terrorists to their hard core by using greater terror."[80] Americas Watch reported that this campaign included disappearances:

> In scenes reminiscent of Argentina's mothers of the desaparecidos [disappeared], every day there are long lines of women, in this case Quechua Indian women, outside the offices of the police and the public prosecutor's office in Ayacucho seeking news of relatives who have not been heard from since they were arrested. Along the roads outside Ayacucho, rotting bodies can be found as well as mass graves.[81]

The US, rather than condemn the government for these actions, continued to lend military support to Peru, increasing its military aid to $10.7 million in 1984, from $4.6 million the year before.[82] In a testimony to US Embassy staff in Lima, a former Peruvian military officer provided details of extensive human rights abuses committed by the Peruvian military, as the Embassy reported to the Secretary of State in a secret cable on 30 June 1994:

---

[75] US Department of State, *Country Reports on Human Rights*, (Washington DC: US Department of State, 1980, 1981, 1982), cited in Brown, *With Friends Like These*, p.119 and 252.
[76] Joseph Leuer, 'A Half Century of Professionalism: The US Army School of the Americas', *Adelante, Historical Edition*, (2000), p.17.
[77] United Nations Security Council, 'From Madness to Hope: the 12-year War in El Salvador: Report of the Commission on the Truth for El Salvador', 1993, <http://www.usip.org/library/tc/doc/reports/el_salvador/tc_es_03151993_V.html>
[78] Thomas Buergenthal, 'The United Nations Truth Commission for El Salvador', *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol.27, no.3, (1994), p.502.
[79] Brown, *With Friends Like These*, p.216.
[80] Marlise Simons, 'Peru Adopts Severe Tactics to Combat Guerrillas', *The New York Times*, 18 August 1984, p.1. Cited in Brown, *With Friends Like These*, p.216.
[81] Brown, *With Friends Like These*, pp.216-217.
[82] Ibid. p.219.

> A former army officer provided a detailed account of what he claims was his direct involvement as a member of army commando and intelligence units that engaged in systematic and officially-sanctioned assassination and torture of suspected terrorists and opponents. These included the 1984 killing of a mayor; five letter bombs in 1991 that killed two persons and maimed two, and many other murders, rapes and torture of suspects during assignments outside of Lima.[83]

This cable shows that the US political elite was acutely aware of the human rights abuses occurring in Latin America.

Colombia

Throughout the last 50 years Colombia has been an ongoing recipient of high levels of US military assistance, officially for combating terrorist activities of left-wing guerrillas, and fighting the "war on drugs." Doug Stokes shows that ongoing military assistance to successive Colombian governments, all of which have been involved in human rights violations against thousands of civilians, has been for the purposes of protecting the interests of the US state and US capital.[84] Between 1958 and 1974, the two major political parties in Colombia alternated control of the Presidency. This arrangement was known as the National Front. Colombia received a total of $1.4 billion in military aid during the National Front period.[85] This was intended to assist the Colombian government's CI campaign against the terrorist activities of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), and was implemented through Plan Lazo in 1962, designed to destroy the armed groups in Colombia's rural areas. Stokes shows, however, that it was "principally targeted at the peasant agriculturalists found in Colombia's south."[86] Even when the peace process between the guerrilla movements and the government began in 1982, the US continued to back the Colombian military and paramilitary groups which increased their CI offensives against the guerrilla groups and Colombian civilians throughout the 1980s.[87] Disappearances and torture were ongoing, as were murders. A number of new paramilitary groups, involved with drug cartels, were also formed during this period, and were responsible for kidnappings, murders and mass killings, all with the assistance of the Colombian military, which provided intelligence on the identities and locations of some of the targets.[88] Yet the US did not condemn the activities of the Colombian military, and in 1984, sent $50 million of arms to

---

[83] US Department of State, 'Cable from US Embassy in Lima to the Secretary of State: Systematic Human Rights Violations Under Fujimori', June 1994, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 27 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 96), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB96/940630.pdf>
[84] See Doug Stokes, *America's Other War*, (London: Zed Books, 2005).
[85] Brown, *With Friends Like These*, p.223.
[86] Stokes, *America's Other War*, p.72.
[87] Ibid. p.75.
[88] Ibid. pp.75-76.

Colombia's military and police forces.[89] Such aid would continue, and by the end of the Cold War, would be granted in the name of counter-drug as well as CI operations.

Operation Condor: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Paraguay

US arrangements with military and intelligence forces in Latin American states were not simply bilateral. Operation Condor and the involvement of Argentine intelligence officers in training of forces also connected to the CIA in Honduras and Nicaragua, discussed above, show that the US-led CI operations were part of a system of hemispheric cooperation which would connect military and intelligence forces from numerous states in pursuit of US interests in the region.

Uruguay, as indicated above, was party to Operation Condor, and was linked not just to the US, but to the Argentine and Brazilian security forces. The US was also involved in transforming the police intelligence component of Uruguay's security forces into a national security agency, the *Dirección Nacional de Información e Inteligencia* (DNII).[90] De-classified documents show that in 1971, the US, Argentina, Brazil and the US all shared concerns that a shift to the left was imminent in Uruguay in the upcoming elections of November 1971, where it was feared that the left-wing Frente Amplio would take office, and that military personnel from all three states were collaborating closely on how to handle the situation.[91] The Embassy in Montevideo, on 25 August, recommended in a report to the US Department of State that the US "collaborate overtly and covertly with those media elements which compete with those of the Frente" and that where training of Uruguayans was taking place as part of US military assistance and the DNII programme, "special emphasis should be made to keep such training at a maximum level."[92] The Embassy stated, "It is especially desirable that such neighbouring countries as Argentina and Brazil collaborate effectively with the Uruguayan security forces and where possible we should encourage such participation," and that, "To improve the capability of services to successfully detain, interrogate and imprison suspected terrorists, we should consider advisability of providing

[89] Ibid. p.77.
[90] US Department of State, 'Transmission of a Preliminary Analysis and Strategy Paper - Uruguay, from the US Embassy in Montevideo to the US Department of State', 25 August 1971, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 2 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 71), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB71/doc2.pdf>; and Carlos Osorio, 'Nixon: "Brazil Helped Rig the Uruguayan Elections," 1971', National Security Archive, 20 June 2002, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB71/>
[91] Osorio, 'Nixon: "Brazil Helped Rig the Uruguayan Elections," 1971'.
[92] US Department of State, 'Transmission of a Preliminary Analysis and Strategy Paper - Uruguay'.

expert advice […] on effective detention procedures."[93] It also indicated that a Public Safety Programme had been implemented.[94]

The Uruguayan generals had wiped out, as Americas Watch report, the Tumpamaros, the largest terrorist group affiliated to Frente Amplio, by early 1973, either by killing or imprisoning their leaders, which had led to the organisation being dismantled.[95] But this was not considered adequate. In 1973 the generals forced the government to suspend constitutional rights. AI estimated that between 1973 and 1979, one in every five Uruguayans was imprisoned for political reasons and one in fifty was detained for interrogation, including torture.[96] The Carter administration ordered that no new military assistance be given to Uruguay, as information about human rights abuses dripped out, but existing assistance arrangements remained in place.[97] This was part of Carter's agenda to push human rights as part of US foreign policy. In his first year in office he gave a speech in which he outlined his vision for foreign policy in which he criticised past actions:

> For too many years, we've been willing to adopt the flawed and erroneous principles and tactics of our adversaries, sometimes abandoning our own values for theirs. […] we have reaffirmed America's commitment to human rights as a fundamental tenet of our foreign policy.[98]

But Carter's allusions to human rights were largely rhetorical, since he also engaged in strategies that were broadly repressive, as I will later show in relation to East Timor. Indeed, the existing assistance arrangements for military assistance to Uruguay remained in place, so Uruguay continued to receive assistance that had already been contracted, it simply did not receive any additional support.[99] By 1981, Reagan had resumed military sales, and by 1983 the Reagan administration had also restored military training, under the International Military Education and Training (IMET) programme, for Uruguayans.[100]

The details of Paraguay's involvement in Operation Condor were uncovered in 1992 when an archive of documents detailing the kidnapping and torture of hundreds of Latin Americans by security personnel was discovered. One of these documents, for example, consists of a letter from Paraguayan Police Director, Alberto Cantero, to Pastor Coronel, Paraguay's Chief of Police and chief torturer under the government of Alfredo Stroessner, detailing the transfer of five detainees from the Paraguayan police to José Montenegro and Juan Manuel Berret of

---

[93] Ibid.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Brown, *With Friends Like These*, p.74.
[96] Ibid. p.76.
[97] Ibid. pp.86-87.
[98] President Jimmy Carter, *Human Rights and Foreign Policy. Speech given at Notre Dame University, June 1977*, (Washington DC: US National Archives, Public Papers of the Presidents of the US, Jimmy Carter, vol 1, 1977), <http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/55.htm>
[99] Brown, *With Friends Like These*, pp.86-87.
[100] Ibid. p.88.

Argentina's Secretariat of State Intelligence (SIDE). None of the five were ever heard from again, and are presumed to have been killed by Argentine security forces. The letter became the basis for legal proceedings by families of two of the victims against the police and intelligence services in Paraguay in 1993.[101] In terms of US involvement, the documents indicated that the source of much of the intelligence gathered by the Paraguayan intelligence personnel, which was then used to detain victims, was the CIA.[102]

This overview of US support for repression in Latin America indicates that the Grand Area Planning strategy developed during World War II was central to US policy in Latin America. While much of the rhetoric used to justify US actions centred on containing the communist threat, it is clear that those actions were geared towards preventing the spread of political movements that would threaten US state and elite interests. Nearly every country in Latin America experienced some sort of US-led repression, which served to exacerbate human rights abuses and constituted US support for state terrorism in the region.

Beyond Latin America

The Grand Area Planning strategy was not limited to Latin America, but also involved securing the Pacific region and the former European colonies to secure and maintain US dominance of the global system. As has already been indicated, the CIA was involved in operations all over the world through its notorious Public Safety Programmes.[103] In addition, the US was involved in military CI training and invasions across the South. The Cold War period also saw the US engage in extensive wars and military occupations in Indochina. Military assistance and US wars contributed to widespread repression well beyond Latin America. I will briefly outline the role of US military and intelligence operations in Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan and Indonesia, before describing the ways in which the US advocated torture in the Vietnam war. It is clear that the CI programmes developed in Latin America borrowed from US activity in Indochina in the 1950s and 1960s. I will show that US repression was not limited to Indochina and Latin America, with reference to the Congo.

South Korea

The war which took place between North Korea, backed by the communist People's Republic of China, and South Korea, backed by UN forces primarily from the US, between 1950 and 1953, involved atrocities on all sides. As well as being responsible for the deaths of 1 million

[101] Keith Slack, 'Operation Condor and Human Rights: A Report from Paraguay's Archive of Terror', *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol.18, no.2, (1996), pp.503-504.
[102] Ibid. p.498.
[103] McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*, chapter seven.

North Koreans,[104] the US killed thousands of South Koreans as part of its efforts to wipe out supposed insurgents, as historian Bruce Cumings shows:

> From early November 1950 onward, MacArthur ordered that a wasteland be created between the fighting front and the Chinese border, destroying from the air every 'installation, factory, city and village over thousands of square miles of North Korean territory.[105]

Cumings has compiled important evidence consisting of eye witness testimony, US Military Advisory Group files and news reports on US atrocities against the population in areas of the South.[106] Charles Grutzner from the *New York Times*, stated that early on the in the war, "fear of infiltrators led to the slaughter of hundreds of South Korean civilians, women as well as men, by some US troops and police of the Republic." Grutzner went on to quote a high-ranking US officer who stated that out of panic in July of the first year of the war, an American regiment shot "many civilians".[107] US military documents show that the US carried out indiscriminate aerial bombardments in South Korea against suspected insurgents, using napalm. On 6 August, for example, a request was made by the Air Force to have the towns of Chimbo, Kusu-dong and Chongsong "obliterated". Within five days, five groups of B-29's "hit a rectangular area near the front, full of towns and villages, creating an ocean of fire with hundreds of tonnes of napalm." Twenty days later a further request was made, and 11 villages were fired in the same way.[108] A total of 866,914 gallons of napalm was dropped between June to late October alone.[109] Over three millions North Koreans, one million South Koreans, and nearly one million Chinese were killed as part of MacArthur's policy.[110]

The Philippines

Concern on the part of the US over the communist Huk rebellion in the Philippines in the 1950s led to a US presidential order to rapidly expand and reorganise Philippine combat forces, which was funded by the diversion of $9.3 million from other Cold War military aid allocations. Much of this aid was used to equip and train 16 Battalion Combat Teams in CI techniques. The army and navy increased significantly in size thanks to further provision from the US.[111] From late 1951 the US supplied the Philippines with napalm which was used

---

[104] Bruce Cumings, *North Korea*, (New York: The New Press, 2004), p.40.
[105] Cumings, *North Korea*, p.19.
[106] Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War, Volume II: The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990), p.701. He notes that obtaining evidence was difficult, since US officials tended to deny that repression occurred, and that given the Cold War climate, many reporters were afraid to print what they witnessed. He notes, nevertheless, that the British made representation to the US about human rights abuses, by South Koreans and the US, and the comparison by Prime Minister Nehru to a UN official of the relative moderation exercised by the North Koreans as compared with the South
[107] Charles Grutzner, cited in Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War*, p.705.
[108] Cumings, The Origins of the Korean War, p.706.
[109] Ibid. p.707.
[110] Cumings, *North Korea*, p.40.
[111] McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*,chapter 4.

both for crop destruction and antipersonnel purposes. The US also helped develop a record system for Philippine military intelligence, which traced all known supporters of the wartime Huk resistance movement, and was used in screening operations that resulted in some 15,000 arrests in the first six months of 1951.[112] Over the course of the next ten years the US continued to assist the Philippine armed forces, largely under the direction of Colonel Ed Lansdale. The Philippine CI campaign, under US guidance, emphasised the use of terror. In 1961, for instance, Philippine intelligence officer, Major Medardo Justiniano, gave a seminar on Philippine CI at Fort Bragg. He cited an operation in San Luis, as an example of counterterror which involved mock killing:

> We gathered together the civilians of the region . . . and took them to the bank of the river.... On the other side, 100 to 200 yards away, were my troops in uniform. In the presence of the townspeople these troops. . . began to kill about a dozen "Huk[s].". . . [O]ur troops began to bring out the "Huks" blindfolded . . . and began to bayonet them one by one. While we were killing them some were shouting out the name of the Mayor [and] the names of their principal suppliers. Seeing the Huks killed before their eyes, hearing themselves named . . . these civilians naturally expected to be next on the death lists.[113]

He went on to explain that the villagers were then screened and told that if they confessed they would not be treated as the Huks had been. He stated that lots of them came forward. He then claimed to those assembled at Fort Bragg that no one had been killed, and that they had staged the deaths using pigs' blood, but that such psychological operations really paid off. As McClintock points out, however, "the implied lesson was that real atrocities could be even more effective."[114]

Taiwan

Following World War II, successive US administrations also backed the repressive, dictatorial regimes of Chiang Kai-shek and his son Chiang Ching-kuo in Taiwan, up until the 1980s when the Carter administration broke off relations. This coincided with Taiwan's transition to democracy.[115] Taiwan was expelled from the UN in 1971, following two decades of repression which, according to Peter Huang, President of Taiwan's Association for Human Rights, included "Operation Cleaning the Countryside", peaking in 1955, and intended to rid Taiwan of any remaining communist insurgents. This resulted in the deaths of several thousand and the detention and terrorising of hundreds of thousands more.[116] US

---

[112] Ibid.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Chalmers Johnson, *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*, (London: Little, Brown and Company, 2000), p.26.
[116] Peter Huang, 'The Paradox of Taiwan's Human Rights Conditions', International Conference on National Human Rights Commissions and Protecting and Promoting Human Rights, 2 January 2000, <http://www.tahr.org.tw/site/committee/2001.01Commissions/peter.htm>

backing for the regime included arms sales and a commitment to back Taiwan should war break out with the mainland.[117]

Indonesia

The case of Indonesia reveals the extent to which the US state prioritised its strategic and material interests over the human rights of hundreds of thousands of Indonesians. In October 1965, a small group of left-wing army officers assassinated six Indonesian generals. This provided the Indonesian military with a reason to set out to destroy its rival – the Indonesia Communist Party (PKI).[118] The PKI was opposed to corruption within the Indonesian military-dominated bureaucratic system and its close ties to the US through US provision of military hardware and training. As discussed above, the CIA had established a Public Safety Programme in Indonesia in 1955, which included CI training.[119] The army was quick to establish itself in power following this attempted coup and there followed a four-month period of violence. Estimates of those killed range from 500,000 to 1 million, and many cases of torture and rape, including of girls under the age of 13, were reported to Amnesty International.[120]

Meanwhile, US educational foundations had been working to establish ties with Indonesian social scientists that themselves had connections with the Indonesian army. As research by Inderjeet Parmar shows, the Ford Foundation expended significant resources in establishing a modernising elite in Indonesia during the 1950s and 1960s, or in the words of the Ford Foundation's John Howard, the Foundation was "training the guys who would lead the country when Sukarno got out."[121] After receiving training at Berkeley, various Indonesian scholars returned home and began liaising with the army, "becoming drawn in to the military's machinations against the nationalist government", which as Parmar shows, involved economic development plans in line with IMF and World Bank strategies.[122]

In the period that followed the coup that removed Sukarno, as ties between the US state and the Indonesian government strengthened, major tax incentives were implemented for foreign, mostly US-based, investors who, by 1973, controlled 59 percent of the capital invested in forestry, 96 percent in mining, 35 percent in industry, 47 percent in hotels and tourism, and

[117] Johnson, *Blowback*, pp.59 and 138-139.
[118] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism: The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol I*, (Boston: South End Press, 1979), p.206.
[119] McClintock, *Instruments of Statecraft*, chapter 7.
[120] Amnesty International, *Indonesia: An Amnesty International Report*, (London: Amnesty International, 1977), pp.13 and 73-77.
[121] Quoted in Inderjeet Parmar, 'American Foundations and the Development of International Knowledge Networks', *Global Networks*, vol.2, no.1, (2002), p.18.
[122] Ibid. p.19.

33 percent in agriculture.[123] Meanwhile, after failing to criticise the slaughter of 1965, the US continued to provide military support, including training of Indonesian military forces, despite Indonesia's repression of its own population and the East Timorese. While Carter claimed to be pursuing a foreign policy in which human rights mattered, his administration provided military training and weapons to the Indonesian government, as the now declassified summary of a meeting between Carter's vice-president, Walter Mondale, and President Suharto of Indonesia shows. In this meeting Mondale discussed with Suharto the US administration's desire for expanded arms sales to Jakarta, including the sale of the F-5 jet, and a co-production plant to produce the M-16, and also indicated that the Carter administration "does not question the incorporation of East Timor into Indonesia", but noted that "there are problems on how to deal with our mutual concerns regarding East Timor and how to handle public relations aspects of this problem."[124] Carter thus supported Indonesia despite the fact that the UN and later, the European Community, did not recognise Indonesia's claim to East Timor.

The East Timor Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation found that US "political and military support were fundamental to the Indonesian invasion and occupation", and that:

> This was so not only because weapons and equipment purchased from the United States played a significant role in Indonesian military operations in Timor, but also because it never used its unique position of power and influence to counsel its Indonesian ally against embarking on an illegal course of action."[125]

Carter's own foreign policy was, therefore, consistent with previous administrations that had been complicit in human rights abuses in the South despite his human rights rhetoric.

Vietnam

In Vietnam, the US was directly involved in repression, including torture. During the Vietnam war, in which the US sided with Saigon against the communist North, the Phoenix programme was established by the CIA, under the Public Safety Programme, to improve

---

[123] Richard Robison, 'Toward a Class Analysis of the Indonesian Military Bureaucratic State', *Indonesia*, vol.25, (1978), p.24. <http://cip.cornell.edu/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/seap.indo/1107119888>

[124] US Department of State, 'Telegram 6076 from US Embassy in Jakarta to US Secretary of State, "Summary of Vice President's Meeting with Suharto", 10 May 1978', (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 29 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 174), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB174/10may1978%20suharto%20mtg%20summary.pdf>

[125] NSA, 'East Timor Truth Commission finds U.S. "Political and Military Support were Fundamental to the Indonesian Invasion and Occupation"', George Washington University, 24 January 2006, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB176/index.htm>; and Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation, 'Chapter 8: Responsibility and Accountability', Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation, East Timor, 2006, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB176/CAVR_responsibility.pdf> The National Security Archive chose to post the chapter on its website, because copies had already been circulated in the international press, but the East Timorese government have not yet put the full report in the public domain.

intelligence and wipe out what was known among the CIA as the Vietcong Infrastructure (VCI). Douglas Valentine, who has written the definitive account of Phoenix, based on interviews with those involved and original documents, notes that VCI was actually misinterpreted to mean any Vietnamese citizen, rather than the organisational hierarchy that the CIA had originally intended, and that this contributed to the widespread and indiscriminate programme of killing and torture that Phoenix became.[126] Under Phoenix , according to Valentine, "Vietnamese citizens were rounded up and jailed, often in tiger cages, tortured, and killed, either in the process of being arrested or subsequently."[127] Phoenix thereby had the effect not simply of destroying the VCI, but also of instilling terror among Vietnamese civilians, and killing thousands. Civilians, often not even members of the VCI, simply family members or neighbours of suspected members, were frequently killed in their sleep by US and South Vietnamese military personnel:

> Phoenix was, among other things, an instrument of counter-terror – the psychological warfare tactic in which VCI members were brutally murdered along with their families or neighbours as a means of terrorising the neighbouring population into a state of submission. Such horrendous acts were, for propaganda purposes, often made to look as if they had been committed by the enemy.[128]

As well as murder, torture was widespread under Phoenix, often at Province Interrogation Centres (PIC's), in which atrocities occurred including:

> Rape, gang rape, rape using eels, snakes, or hard objects, and rape followed by murder; electrical shock ("the Bell Telephone Hour") rendered by attaching wires to the genitals or other sensitive parts of the body, like the tongue; the "water treatment"; the "airplane," in which a prisoner's arms were tied behind the back and the rope looped over a hook on the ceiling, suspending the prisoner in midair, after which he or she was beaten; beatings with rubber hoses and whips; the use of police dogs to maul prisoners.[129]

All this occurred at the PIC's, through which the CIA learned the identity and structure of the VCI in each province.[130] John Patrick Mouldon was the first director of the PIC programme in Vietnam and he maintained that, "You can't have an American there all the time watching these things," and blamed the torture on inexperienced advisors, as well as on the practice of the advisors handing responsibility for the PIC's onto hired assistants who were "former cops or Green Berets – paid by the CIA but worked for themselves, doing a dirty job in exchange for a line on the inside track to the black market".[131] According to CIA officer William Colby, who directed Phoenix between 1968 and May 1971, 20,587 alleged Vietcong cadres died as a result of Phoenix. The South Vietnam government places the number at 40,994.

---

[126] Douglas Valentine, *The Phoenix Program*, Second Edition (Lincoln: Authors Guild BackinPrint.Com, 2000), p.420.
[127] William Blum, *Killing Hope. US Military and CIA interventions since World War II*, (London: Zed Books, 2003), p.131.
[128] Valentine, *The Phoenix Program*, p.13.
[129] Ibid. p.85.
[130] Ibid. p.80.
[131] Ibid. p.85.

The true number will never be known, neither will the number of those killed under the programme's forerunners, operational from 1965.[132]

The Congo

US intervention in the Congo, under a UN mandate, first occurred in the wake of the granting of independence by Belgium in June 1960. Joseph Kasavubu was elected president and Patrice Lumumba appointed prime minister.[133] Shortly afterwards, the rich Katanga province which was home to Belgium's Union Minière enterprise, providing 60 percent of the entire wealth of the country, declared its independence. On 9 July the Belgians opted to intervene and rescue their expatriates from the rebels. The US, under President Eisenhower, responded to Lumumba's urgent call for UN intervention to keep the Belgians out and end the secession of Katanga.[134] While UN forces were being sent in US planes, the Soviet Union chose to send its own forces and equipment to strengthen Lumumba who was primarily an African nationalist, but sympathetic to communism. Kasavubu sacked Lumumba because of the growing Soviet influence and tension this brought with the US.[135] Months of diplomatic efforts to resolve the crisis failed. The US feared that disengagement would provide what they saw as the communists with significant influence, and as Stephen Weissman points out this would threaten future access for the US to the wealth of mineral resources, specifically copper, cobalt, diamonds and tin.[136] The US opted in late 1962 for military intervention to crush the Katanga revolt, in conjunction with the UN secretariat. By 1 January 1963 UN forces had occupied three quarters of the production facilities at Union Minière. Prime Minister Tshombe of Katanga ended the secession on 16 January, but the peace would not last. Lumumba had set up his own nationalist, anti-Western government, in Stanleyville in the North, and declared this the legitimate government of the whole of the Congo. Despite his kidnap and murder in February under Tshombe's custody, the Soviet Union, its allies, and the more radical African states continued to recognise the Stanleyville government as legitimate. In January 1962, the US backed a UN force to defeat the 300-strong gendarmerie force and Stanleyville.[137]

As UN forces withdrew, the US continued a covert operation to arm the central Congolese government in Leopoldville, led by Kasavubu, worth $6 million. This included covert

---

[132] Blum, *Killing Hope*, p.131; Chomsky and Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*, p.324.
[133] Richard Barnet, *Intervention and Revolution: The United States in the Third World,* (London: Paladin, 1972), p.249; and Stephen Weissman, *American Foreign Policy in the Congo, 1960-1964,* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1974).
[134] Ibid. pp.248-249.
[135] Ibid.
[136] Weissman, American Foreign Policy in the Congo, pp.28-29.
[137] Barnet, Intervention and Revolution, pp.248-253.

training for Congolese officers in techniques for "protecting legally constituted governments against subversion and domestic disorder."[138] The CIA recruited a number of Americans to fly fighter missions to attack rebel positions, and when faced with Soviet objections, Cuban exiles were used for the missions instead. By early 1964, three revolts had broken out and rebels succeeded in recruiting thousands of forces which were able to spread out and defeat the US-backed government. Christopher Gbenye led the rebels to Stanleyville where he declared the People's Republic of Congo, and appealed to the Soviet Union for further support. The rebels were involved in extensive repression, torturing and killing as many as 20,000 people.[139] Gbenye also took 280 Belgians and 16 US citizens hostage. Kasavubu had decided that only Tshombe, along with hired white mercenaries from South Africa, could defeat the rebels. The US orchestrated Operation Dragon Rouge, which was to involve a drop by US planes of 545 Belgian paratroopers to rescue the hostages. It was not simply a rescue mission however, and was used to seize the city with the help of Kasavubu's mercenaries. Civilians were killed, and while not on the scale of those killed by the rebels, as Richard Barnet points out, from the point of view of the Congolese, US-backed white thugs were killing black people in order to prevent the establishment of a left-leaning government that would threaten US interests.[140]

This selection of cases demonstrates that throughout the Cold War the US was engaged in repression in various forms, including sponsoring coups, supporting repressive regimes, advocating state terror, using and advocating torture, and implementing extensive CI operations across the South, through its own military and intelligence agencies, under the general guise of containing communism. This often occurred through collaborative networks involving elites from various states.

Conclusion

Despite being absent from the dominant academic discourse in IR, support for and use of repression, including using state terrorism and torture, was an integral part of US foreign policy strategy in the South during the Cold War. Repression by the US included direct invasion of some states, but more often the sponsorship of allies in the South to carry out US objectives. That sponsorship included the provision of military hardware and training. Allies carried out coups and CI campaigns, and also collaborated in a US-led network of intelligence gathering, interrogation, torture and assassination. Frequently this exacerbated human rights abuses in the region. Such activity was not limited to Latin America, but also

[138] Ibid. p.253.
[139] Ibid. p.255.
[140] Ibid. p.256.

occurred in Indochina, where US engagement was even more intense, with the US fighting protracted wars at enormous cost to human life, and where there is substantial evidence to show that US military and intelligence personnel were behind programmes which involved the widespread use of torture and assassination as part of the CI campaign in the region. Such use of torture flies in the face of claims that Western liberal democracies do not practice torture, and that where they do, it is intended to secure intelligence. As the Phoenix programme shows, torture was frequently used against individuals as a tool to instil fear, rather than as a direct mechanism for acquiring intelligence. This is consistent with the stability model of the use of torture, discussed in chapter three, which exposes its true functions – to instil fear and curtail demands for political reform which would benefit oppressed groups within society, at the expense of capitalist elites, rather than as a reliable method for extracting intelligence.

US Cold War foreign policy was driven by the goal of ensuring that the US fashioned the South so that it could serve the interests of the US state and US capital, as had been articulated in the Grand Area Planning strategy at the end of World War II, discussed in chapter two. This meant ensuring that pressure for social reform which might threaten US strategic and capitalist interests was thwarted. The dominant discourse among decision makers in relation to US foreign policy was one of containing the communist threat, under which demands for social and political reform were subsumed, particularly in Latin America. Nevertheless, the many declassified documents referred to here show that that senior officials within the Departments of State and Defence also identified the protection and promotion of US capital as a central component of US foreign policy. Thus the interests of the US state were understood not simply in terms of the perception that Soviet expansion posed a threat to the future of liberal democracy and freedom, but also, among many senior officials, as ensuring that threats to the interests of US capital were overcome and that the South was further opened up to US capital. This was achieved through the support and condoning of repression, as well as through advocating torture. These repressive strategies were incorporated into US training of military forces from the South throughout the Cold War, as I show in chapter five.

CHAPTER FIVE: US FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING DURING THE COLD WAR

This chapter assesses whether US training of military forces from the South, or what was referred to as the "Third World", reflected broader US foreign policy approaches during the Cold War. As discussed in chapter three, Cold War US foreign policy strategies in the South were broadly characterised by support for repression. I first outline the extent of the training, before exploring the nature, purposes and intended outcomes, in relation to repression and human rights, of the training, using the School of the Americas (SOA) as the main case study. This involves analysing the content of the training with reference to International Humanitarian Law, and assessing competing claims about the impact of the training upon repression and human rights.[1] I then explore the role of torture, if any, in the training. This is because Northern democracies claim not to torture, yet torture was a major feature of US foreign policy strategy during the Cold War, as shown in chapters three and four. Finally, I discuss the role of SOA Watch (SOAW) in the closure of SOA and its replacement by the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC).

The extent of the training

The data available on US training of military forces from the South is patchy. Analysis is complicated further by the fact that training has and continues to be provided under a number of programmes, some of which are geared specifically towards training, and others of which have different primary purposes, such as supplying military hardware, but may also offer training. Prior to 1975, training was provided under the Military Assistance Programme (MAP), although some programmes other than MAP, such as Foreign Military Financing (FMF) also provided training. MAP did not simply include appropriations of US funding for training, but also for military hardware.[2] After 1975, MAP was disbanded, and a number of programmes under different government agencies made the provisions previously covered by MAP. The International Military Education and Training (IMET) programme was established in 1976 to oversee training jointly organised by the Departments of State and Defence.[3] Information concerning IMET was made available to Congress and the public as

---

[1] This chapter will deal with International Humanitarian Law, given that the cases discussed occurred either in conflicts in which the US was directly involved or in which the US assisted military forces from states within the South which were involved in internal conflicts and insurgencies, so the provisions of International Humanitarian Law apply, as discussed in the Introduction.

[2] North American Congress for Latin America (NACLA), *The US Military Apparatus: Defence Department Organisation; the Intelligence Establishment; US Bases and Forces Abroad; Military Police Aid; Arms Sales*, (Berkeley: NACLA, 1972), p.41.

[3] John Cope, 'International Military Education and Training: An Assessment', Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1995, <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/macnair/mcnair44/m44cont.html>, see ch.3, p.5, endnote 10.

of 2001, but prior to this, there was no such requirement.[4] Data is available on the number of students trained, their countries of origin, and the funds spent on training under the MAP programme.[5] There is less data on IMET once MAP was disbanded and up until 2001. The data available on training prior to 2001 was compiled by the Defence Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA).[6] It lumps together all the funding for foreign military training under MAP and IMET between the years 1950 and 1993. There are no details on the nature of this training year by year, only on the period as a whole.

MAP accounted for more than 80 percent of the training between 1950 and 1993.[7] IMET programmes were much smaller because of the carving up and allocation of services previously provided by MAP among a number of US government agencies after 1975. MAP and IMET provision during the Cold War reflected US foreign policy priorities, outlined in chapter two. There was a steady increase in funding, the number of students trained, and global reach. When IMET was introduced in 1976, 42 countries received training. This had risen to 102 countries by 1992, with funding increasing from $28.75 million in 1976 to $42.2 million in 1992.[8] Of those trained between 1950 and 1993, 49 percent were from the East Asia and Pacific region, 21 percent from the Western Hemisphere, 19 percent from Europe and Canada, eight percent from the Near East and South Asia, and just three percent from Africa. In terms of MAP and IMET funds allocated during that period for training, 36 percent went to the East Asia and Pacific region, 26 percent to Europe and Canada, 12 percent to the Western Hemisphere, 11 percent to the Near East and South Asia, and just 6 percent to Africa.[9] With regard to how the US' foreign military training priorities shifted during the Cold War, initially the focus was Europe, particularly during the period 1947 to 1963. The emphasis shifted in the 1960s and 1970s, once Europe had been rehabilitated following World War II, and was oriented to the South.[10]

Between 1950 and 1993, the region that received the most MAP and IMET provision was the East Asia and Pacific Region, both in terms of funds and numbers trained. A total of $915.5

---

[4] US Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest: Joint Report to Congress', Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, 2001-2004, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/>August 2005. Executive Summary, p.1.
[5] NACLA, *US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel: The Pentagon's Protégés*, (Washington DC: NACLA, 1976), pp.24-32.
[6] Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts. As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, 2003, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf>
[7] Cope, 'International Military Education and Training', see chapter 3, note 10.
[8] Cope, 'International Military Education and Training', chapter 3, p.5. See tables 4 and 5 in Appendix 1.
[9] DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts'; and NACLA, *US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel.* Also see Tables 1 and 2 Appendix 1. NB. It is not clear what the remaining ten percent was used for.
[10] Ernest Graves and Steven Hildreth, *US Security Assistance. The Political Process*, (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1985), pp.14-27.

million was granted, with 298,147 students receiving training during that period.[11] However, of those, 249,790 were trained between 1950 and 1975 under MAP.[12] Thus only 16 percent of the total between 1950 and 1993 were trained after 1976 under IMET. The majority of those trained prior to 1976 were from Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam, with 67,485 Cambodians, 37,771 Laos, 35,788 South Vietnamese, and 32,479 South Koreans receiving training.[13] This is consistent with US priorities in that region during the Cold War, since all of those states were key players in US CI efforts, as outlined in chapter four. Indeed, almost the entire officer class of Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Laos and Thailand received its advanced training courtesy of the US Department of Defense during the 1960s and 1970s.[14]

Europe and Canada received $672.5 million of MAP and IMET funds between 1950 and 1993, with a total of 114,145 people trained. Of these, 98,162 were trained under MAP, so just 15,983 were trained under IMET.[15] Up until 1963, Europe and Canada had been the highest ranking recipients of MAP funding, but following 1963 it was the East Asia and Pacific region that were to receive the most MAP assistance.[16] The next highest recipient of MAP and IMET provision between 1950 and 1993 was the Western Hemisphere, with $311 million granted, and 128,130 people trained. Of these, 60 percent, (76,479) were trained under IMET, with the remaining 40 percent (51,651) receiving training prior to 1976 under MAP.[17] This increase under IMET is consistent with increasing US-led CI campaigns in the Western Hemisphere in the 1970s and 1980s, as outlined in chapter four. The regions in receipt of the least MAP and IMET provision were the Near East and South Asia, and Africa. The Near East and South Asia region was granted $270 million during the period 1950-1993, with a total of 45,308 people receiving training during that time. Of those, less than half (20,681) received training under MAP, which means that, as with the Western Hemisphere, more were trained under IMET after 1976.[18] Finally, Africa received just $144.7 million of MAP and IMET aid between 1950 and 1993, with 17,882 receiving training. Of those, half were trained under MAP and half under IMET.[19] While these figures give us an indication of US foreign training during the Cold War, they tell us little about the nature of the training. The remainder of this chapter will explore the nature of the training provided by the US to

---

[11] DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts'. Also see Tables 1 and 2 Appendix 1.
[12] NACLA, *US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel,* pp.24-32. Also see tables 1 and 2 Appendix 1.
[12] NACLA, *The US Military Apparatus,* p.41.
[13] DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts'; and NACLA, *US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel,* pp.24-32.
[14] Graves and Hildreth, *US Security Assistance,* p.23.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid.

military personnel from the Western Hemisphere at the School of the Americas (SOA) during that period.

The nature and purposes of the training

US training of military forces from the South during the Cold War advocated repressive CI measures, the purposes of which were to thwart efforts by civilian populations to pursue a path of self-determination which might threaten US interests. The proclaimed purpose of the training, as I will show, was sometimes to contain communism, sometimes to protect US material interests, and sometimes both. The origins of the training lie in the seizure of the Panama Canal Zone by the US in the early 1900s, which was, as President William Taft stated in 1912, intended to secure access to materials for US capitalists:

> The day is not far distant when three Stars and Stripes at three equidistant points will mark our territory: one at the North Pole, another at the Panama Canal, and the third at the South Pole. The whole hemisphere will be ours in fact, as by virtue of our superiority of race, is already ours morally … the correct path of justice in US foreign policy may well be to include active intervention to secure for our merchandise and our capitalists opportunity for profitable investment.[20]

The cooption of local military forces through US military training was to become a key tool in pursuit of this objective, leading many of the Latin America militaries to act as US allies during the Cold War. Initially, military training in the Panama Canal Zone was established exclusively for US forces to develop jungle warfare skills. By 1946, Panamanian and other Latin American military personnel were being incorporated into these training programmes on special courses taught in Spanish, under the Latin American Training Centre – Ground Division, part of the US Army Caribbean Command (USARCARIB).[21] At the end of 1948 the Latin American Training Centre was combined with three other schools, specialising in catering services, medical training, and mechanics and moved to Fort Gulick on the Atlantic side of the Canal Zone. This was named the USARCARIB School and was SOA's predecessor.[22] By 1956, all training was in Spanish. The School's mission was updated in 1961, within the context of what Joseph Leuer, currently the Dean of Academics at WHINSEC, describes as "the hot-cold conflict between the two superpowers."[23] The revised mission of the USARCARIB School stated:

---

[20] President William Taft, as quoted in Chomsky and Herman, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*, p.107.
[21] Joseph Leuer, 'A Half Century of Professionalism: The US Army School of the Americas', *Adelante, Historical Edition*, (2000), p.6. *Adelante* was the journal of the School of the Americas, and this edition was published to mark the closure of the School and its replacement by WHINSEC.
[22] Ibid. p.7.
[23] Ibid. p.9. Joseph Leuer is considered among US Department of Defense personnel to be the definitive historian of SOA, and is now Assistant Dean of Academics at WHINSEC.

> The mission of the USARCARIB School is to teach the principles and tactics employed by the US as a result of our experiences of World War II, Korea and the actual Cold War … and to better our capability to operate in combat as a unified hemispheric force if necessary.[24]

The training was thus portrayed as playing a role in the conflict between the West and East, and drew on tactics developed in Indochina.

Now declassified secret memos between President Kennedy and Chester Bowles, acting Secretary of Defence, in 1961, indicate that the training of Latin American military forces at the USARCARIB School, rather than simply being aimed at containing communism, was deliberately intended to assist with the suppression of the dissatisfied populations who were beginning to mobilise. Kennedy wrote to Bowles on 5 September 1961 requesting information on the training:

> I would appreciate hearing what steps we are taking to train the Armed Forces of Latin America in controlling mobs, guerrillas, etc. In addition, as the events of the past week have shown in Brazil, the military occupy an extremely important strategic position in Latin America.[25]

Kennedy was referring to the role of the Brazilian military in preventing left-wing movements from gaining ground. Following democratic elections, Janio Quadros, conservative candidate, took office in January 1961 in Brazil, and adopted a neutralist foreign policy in the hope of strengthening his position with the left. This, along with his refusal of US funds and conditions, and his adoption of social reforms led his own party to disown him and the military to distance itself from him. With the military's sanction, he handed office to his vice president, Joao Goulart, of the Labour party. This angered Washington, but the US was confident that the military would keep the left from taking over, which made him a more suitable, if not ideal, candidate as far as Washington was concerned.[26] For Kennedy then, the military could prevent left-wing "mobs" from seizing power and from pressing for social reform that was inconsistent with US priorities in the region. Kennedy's views were shared by Bowles, who responded to Kennedy's memo:

> Recent events in Brazil demonstrated again what a strategic position the military hold in most underdeveloped countries. Through our military aid programmes we are creating trained armed forces capable of seizing power and using it for good or evil … It seems to me that we can do much to include in our training programmes for foreign military personnel a better appreciation of their role as builders, as well as defenders, of the emerging democratic societies.[27]

---

[24] US Department of Defense, *Course Catalogue*, (Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Department of Defense: US Army Caribbean School, HQ US Army Caribbean, 1960-1961), p.7.
[25] President John F. Kennedy, *National Security Action Memorandum No. 88 to the Secretary of Defence: Training for Latin American Armed Forces*, (The White House, Washington DC: The National Security Archives, Washington DC, 1961), pp.1-2.
[26] Gabriel Kolko, *Confronting the Third World. United States Foreign Policy 1945-1980*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), p.155.
[27] Chester Bowles, *Reply to President Kennedy's Memorandum No. 88 on Training for Latin American Armed Forces (with enclosures: Memorandum regarding Counter-Subversion Training for Latin American Police Forces and Memorandum, to the Secretary, August 17, 1961, re. A Coordinated Approach to Rural Development)*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1961), pp.1-3.

The US was thus happy for Latin American military forces to be instrumental in ensuring that Latin American politics remained compatible with US objectives, and that at times it would be appropriate for the military to seize power, provided it was for reasons that the US considered to be "good". Bowles added that aid for development was also necessary:

> It is evident that, save in special circumstances, there can be no successful action by guerrillas unless there is a dissatisfied rural population which can provide them a base of operations. My own feeling is that our aid programmes have woefully underemphasized an integrated attack on rural poverty and despair.[28]

This agenda was reflected in the rhetoric of Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. The Alliance for Progress failed to deliver the development that was promised, however, with far more emphasis placed on repressive CI than on economic development. Under the Alliance for Progress, $20 billion was offered to Latin American states over ten years if they instituted social and economic reforms, including land reforms, and developed CI programmes designed to thwart revolutionary movements.[29] The Latin American states received only half of the $20 billion, and ended up financing 87 per cent of the Alliance's costs themselves.[30]

Meanwhile, great emphasis was placed on CI campaigns, which underpinned the whole curriculum of the USARCARIB School, as outlined in the Supplemental Course Catalogue of 1962:

> Every course taught has definite application in the CI field […] Without exception, the instructor and the student are made fully aware of the importance of the total effort which must go into the establishment of internal security and the nation-building effort necessary for stamping out communist-led and communist-fed insurgencies […] Currently, the Department provides instruction in every aspect of CI operations, be it military, paramilitary, political, sociological or psychological […] We fully realise the great importance of our work, which is actually a part of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.[31]

The new emphasis in repressive CI training coincided with the re-naming of the School as the US Army School of the Americas (SOA) on 1 July, 1963. The Department of Defense declared that this was to reflect "the collective approach to security and defence."[32] SOA was to continue to be situated in Panama until 1984, when it was moved to Fort Benning, Georgia, in line with the conditions of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977.[33] CI dominated the training throughout this period, although numbers dwindled in the 1970s in the wake of the Vietnam war, during which time the US pulled back from Latin America.[34] CI efforts later intensified with the conflict in El Salvador in the 1980s, following the US backing of a military coup in October 1979 in the face of emerging populist movements, attempts at land reform and

---

[28] Ibid.
[29] Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p.153.
[30] Kolko, p.150.
[31] USARCARIB School Supplemental Course Catalogue, 1962, pp.5-7. Cited in Leuer, 'A Half Century of Professionalism', p.13.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid. pp.13-17.
[34] Ibid. p.13.

unionisation.[35] US support for the military junta in El Salvador deepened with the provision of military training for large sections of the Salvadoran armed forces from 1981 onwards.[36] The Department of Defense stated that the purpose of the training was:

> To control and discipline the armed forces in their treatment of civilian populations and indoctrinate military leaders with principles of the Geneva Convention and the code of conduct.[37]

Yet the Salvadoran forces were behind widespread repression against the civilian population throughout the 1980s, during which around 75,000 people were killed, and many were tortured.[38] The UN Truth Commission found that 85 percent of the 22,000 complaints it received of serious violence, including disappearances, executions and torture, were attributed to the State, paramilitary groups allied to the State, and the death squads, also linked to the State.[39] As I will show, some of the US training materials to which some SOA students were exposed, far from advocating respect for the Geneva Conventions, actually advocated serious violations of International Humanitarian Law.

The purpose of the training then, during the Cold War, was to encourage regional military forces in Latin America to ensure that popular movements that posed a threat to US interests were thwarted. The training itself was characterised by repressive CI techniques which were intended for use among civilian populations that were seen as a threat to US-supported elites. Department of Defense officials claim that the training was intended to foster respect for human rights and democracy. Opponents of the training disagree, and training materials have emerged which support the argument that the training advocated repression.

The intended outcomes of the training in relation to repression and human rights

SOA has acquired a notorious reputation, which is closely related to the CI agenda of US foreign policy throughout the Cold War. Opponents of SOA, specifically SOA Watch (SOAW), argue that the training has caused the systematic repression by individuals trained at SOA against citizens of their own states, and that this was part of a US-led campaign of state terrorism. The competing claim by SOA's defendants, is that the training was intended to foster respect for human rights and democracy, and appropriate civil-military relations in the region, and that atrocities were committed by members of Latin America's armed forces

---

[35] Noam Chomsky, *Turning the Tide. US Intervention in Central America and the Struggle for Peace*, (Boston: Pluto Press, 1985), p.102.
[36] Leuer, 'A Half Century of Professionalism', p.17.
[37] Chief of Staff of the Army, *Meeting with BG Gutierrez on 5 March 1982*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, May 1982), cited in Leuer, 'A Half Century of Professionalism', p.18.
[38] Thomas Buergenthal, 'The United Nations Truth Commission for El Salvador', *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol.27, no.3, (1994), p.502.
[39] United Nations Security Council (UNSC), 'From Madness to Hope: the 12-year War in El Salvador: Report of the Commission on the Truth for El Salvador', 1993, Chapter 4, 'Cases and Patterns of Violence', <http://www.usip.org/library/tc/doc/reports/el_salvador/tc_es_03151993_V.html>

despite, rather than because of, the training. I will first outline the claims made in defence of SOA, before discussing the case against the training.

A review of course catalogues and memoranda relating to SOA show that it was not until the 1980s that there was any mention of exposing Latin American military forces to US values and norms, nor to emphasising professionalism and an emphasis on International Humanitarian Law.[40] Course Catalogues for 1948, 1961-1962 and 1963 make no mention of professionalisation, no mention of exposure to US norms and values, and no mention of International Humanitarian Law in any of their mission statements. That is not to say that such issues were not covered within the training, but they were not central to the School's mission. Materials from the period 1963 to 1983 are not available. By the 1980s, there was a good deal of emphasis on these issues within SOA's documents, and officially, this is attributed to shifts in the training during Carter's presidency. The School's mission statement in 1983 reads:

> Mission: To develop and conduct military education and training, using US doctrine, in Spanish for Latin American personnel to achieve a higher level of military professionalism and to improve the effectiveness of military education and training in Latin America, concurrently fostering greater cooperation among the American armed forces and increasing their knowledge of North American customs and traditions.[41]

Leuer attributes this shift in emphasis to President Carter's cutting off of military aid and sanctions against countries that did not comply with human rights standards in 1976. This resulted in just nine of the eighteen countries that had received SOA training being permitted to continue sending students to the School. In 1977 SOA was forced to remove the Military Intelligence Course because of concern that the CIA was implicated in intelligence sharing with military leaders in Chile, which, it was alleged, led to the assassination of Orlando Letelier, who had been a Chilean cabinet member in the Allende government. Leuer stated that the removal of the course from the curriculum was a reaction to these concerns, rather than because SOA was in any way implicated in Letelier's assassination.[42] Various interviewees also associated these shifts in emphasis at SOA with Carter's human rights agenda, although, as noted in chapter four, this was mostly rhetorical.[43] One such interviewee was Jose Sorzano, retired US ambassador to the UN:

---

[40] US Department of Defense, *Escuela Latino Americana Terrestre. Catalogo de Cursos, 1948-1949*, (Fort Gulick, Panama: Department of the Army in the Caribbean, 1948); *Course Catalogue*, (Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: US Army Caribbean School, HQ US Army Caribbean, 1960-1961); *Catalogo*, (Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: US Army School of the Americas, 1963); and *Organisation, Mission, and Functions. US Army School of the Americas*, (Fort Gulick, Panama: Department of the Army, US Army School of the Americas, 1983).
[41] US Department of Defense, *Organisation, Mission, and Functions. US Army School of the Americas*, (Fort Gulick, Panama: US Army School of the Americas, 1983), p.2.2.
[42] Personal correspondence with Joseph Leuer, 6 June 2005.
[43] William Blum, *Killing Hope. US Military and CIA interventions since World War II*, (London: Zed Books, 2003), p.198.

> From the 1950s to the 1980s the democracies in the region could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Military dictatorship was the norm. Military dictatorships were not subordinate to civilian control. When you trained these people they already came with that baggage, of authoritarian rule, torture, violence, etc. It was not until Jimmy Carter was in office that human rights received any importance, then it became the centrepiece of foreign policy.[44]

This shift to professionalism and exposure to US norms and customs, as well as International Humanitarian Law, coincided with the move of the School from Panama to Fort Benning, Georgia. This is affirmed by SOA's commandant, Jose Alvarez, from 1993 to 1995:

> There was a signal change when the school was moved. Exposing people for a good length of time, for a year, to US culture – the learning process of this is much more beneficial than anything that the training can do.[45]

This assumption fits with US legitimation strategies that are intended to influence those outside the US to accept and embrace certain aspects of the US model, and specifically capitalist democracy, as desirable. CI still dominated US foreign policy and the training, even though legitimation efforts were beginning to feature, as a review below of the training materials will show.

Various Department of Defense interviewees acknowledged that CI was harmful and may have violated International Humanitarian Law. This tended to be justified within the context of containing communism, or of being necessary within the Vietnam war. For example one interviewee stated:

> Some of that counterinsurgency stuff is ugly stuff, but the manuals were not produced for that purpose. Counterinsurgency is not of questionable legality but it can very easily be carried one step too far or be misinterpreted.[46]

Another interviewee noted that repressive CI may violate International Humanitarian Law in response to a question about the content of one of the training manuals which advocates the exposure of intelligence informants to the enemy once they are not longer useful.[47] He stated:

> Some of the material could violate the [Geneva] Conventions, but you have to think about the context. The Geneva Conventions were intended for conventional land warfare. The [CI] manuals were for Vietnam. It's unethical, and immoral, but back then threatening to expose the informant if he becomes a liability was what happened. What may have been a legal law enforcement technique may now be a violation of international law.[48]

This indicates a willingness to condone violations of the Geneva Conventions among Department of Defense personnel involved in CI training at the time. Such techniques have

---

[44] Interview with Jose Sorzano, former US Ambassador to the UN; Director for Latin America Peace Corp; Current member of WHINSEC Board of Visitors, 21 June 2004, Interviewee's office, Arlington, West Virginia.
[45] Interview with Jose Alvarez, former SOA Commandant (Feb 1993 – March 1995), 8 June 2004, The Pentagon, Washington DC.
[46] Interview with Jose Alvarez.
[47] US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources, School of Americas Training Manual*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1989).
[48] Interview with Ken LaPlante, WHINSEC liaison with the Army and WHINSEC Board of Visitors, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, International Affairs; Former SOA instructor, early 1980s, 3 June 2004, The Pentagon, Washington DC.

never been legal under International Humanitarian Law. He was not alone in holding such views. Various officials I interviewed shared this view. As I will show, similar attitudes prevail now in the current "War on Terror."

Previous research on the link between the training and repression

While there is compelling evidence that some SOA graduates were involved in repression, and that the training encouraged this, previous research has not established the relationship between the training and the repression as thoroughly as possible. Such research has been undertaken by Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer and Kate McCoy. Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer has attempted to investigate the purposes of SOA and the consequences of its existence in two works, *School of Assassins* and an updated version, *School of Assassins: Guns, Greed and Globalisation.*[49] Kate McCoy has undertaken quantitative research in which she attempts to show that SOA training is likely to result in human rights abuses.[50]

The above researchers have tried to prove that the training caused acts of repression. While this is plausible, their findings tend to revolve around a handful of cases in which allegations have been made against individuals who, at some point in the past 50 years, received some SOA training. Nelson-Pallmeyer points to a number of cases of repression in which SOA graduates have been implicated. He argues that various SOA-trained soldiers were implicated in the assassination of Archbishop Romero; the rape and murder of four US churchwomen; the murder of two union leaders; the massacre of 900 civilians at El Mozote; the El Junquillo and Las Hojas massacres; the murder of six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter; the kidnap, rape and torture of Diana Ortiz and the murder of nine Peruvian students and a professor.[51] It is not clear whether those cited in these cases were ever found guilty. Yet Nelson-Pallmeyer argues that these cases provide a "representative sampling" of linkages.[52] It is not clear whether this "representative sampling" represents the actions of all the students trained or just the cases in which SOA graduates are implicated. He also states that "many" SOA graduates are behind "many thousands of human rights violations" in Latin America, but it is not clear how many is "many".[53] He does not discuss other factors that may have caused individuals to commit abuses. If it could be shown that a majority of the 61,000 students trained went on to commit such violations, it could be more convincingly

[49] Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer, *School of Assassins*, (New York: Orbis Books, 1997); and *School of Assassins: Guns, Greed and Globalisation*, Second Edition, (New York: Orbis Books, 2001).
[50] Katherine McCoy, 'Trained to Torture: A Statistical Analysis of Human Rights Violations Committed by Graduates of the US Army School of the Americas, 1960-2000', (University of Wisconsin, Master of Science Thesis, 2003). See introduction.
[51] Nelson-Pallmeyer, 1997, pp. 7, 9 and 10-15, and 2001, pp.27 and 42-43.
[52] Nelson-Pallmeyer, 1997, p.9.
[53] Nelson-Pallmeyer, 1997, p.19.

argued that SOA has encouraged repression in Latin America. Even then it would be difficult to prove that the training alone was the cause.

It is not possible to prove that SOA training was the primary determining factor in the actions of SOA-trained individuals who committed repressive acts in Latin America. Those acts are likely to be the result of a combination of factors, one of which may be the training that an individual received. Indeed it is likely, given the nature of the SOA training, that this may have influenced individuals who were involved in human rights violations, but it would be difficult to prove that this was the only cause.[54] McCoy attempts to show not only that the training was responsible for repression, but also that the more training an individual received, the more likely they were to commit such acts. Her findings show that very few of those trained at SOA have been convicted for human rights abuses, and that allegations have only been made against a small number of students. She undertook a statistical analysis of data relating to graduates over a forty year period.[55] She constructed a sample of 11,797 graduates, indicating which of them had had allegations made against them in relation to human rights.[56] McCoy refers to such cases as those in which students or instructors were "caught for human rights violations."[57] From the datasets that she drew the material from, it is clear that she is referring to cases in which allegations of repression were made, few of which have been proven. These amount to 153 cases in total. So of the 11,797 graduates in the dataset, there are allegations against 153 of them, or 1.3 per cent of the total number included. The records collated by SOAW reveal that nine of the 153 graduates that McCoy states have been "caught" for human rights abuses have actually been convicted.[58] Of these nine, three were sentenced by Peruvian military courts, and three were sentenced by civil courts in Argentina, El Salvador and Panama. One Guatemalan was sentenced by a US court, and it is not clear what type of court sentenced the other two, who were from Peru.[59] Thus, of those against whom allegations have been made, there is a conviction rate of six per cent.

---

[54] While not within the scope of this study, it would be worthwhile to consider the cultural impacts upon those who received the training. This might include looking at the sub-cultures at work, including the highly masculinised nature of the US military and its training, as well as the machismo culture, particularly in Latin America that may also have shaped the training.
[55] McCoy, 'Trained to Torture', pp.4-5.
[56] This included students from six countries (Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Guatemala, El Salvador and Panama) who attended SOA between 1960 and 2000. The dataset draws on student records of graduates from its inception until 2000, which were released under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), following pressure from SOAW. These records include information on students from 14 countries, such as their name, country of origin, rank at the time of attendance, date of attendance, and course attended. The dataset also draws on a SOAW database entitled "Notorious Graduates", which is compiled from data from various non-governmental organisations focusing on human rights, media, and UN Truth Commissions, and indicates whether any allegations have been made against individuals listed in the records released under the FOIA to acts of repression. See Sean Donahue, 'General Clark, the School of the Americas and US Values', School of Americas Watch, 2004, <http://www.soaw.org/new/article.php?id=721>
[57] McCoy, 'Trained to Torture', pp.47-48.
[58] SOAW, 'Notorious Graduates'.
[59] Ibid.

This amounts to convictions against just nine out of 11,797 graduates of the School, or 0.08 per cent of all graduates.[60]

Nevertheless, the incidence of acts of repression committed was probably far higher than McCoy's research suggests, given the context of impunity. In a climate of extreme political violence and impunity, people are unlikely to report repression out of fear of reprisals. McCoy's findings may only be the tip of the iceberg. Furthermore, while McCoy's work does not prove that the training led to those abuses, given the nature of the training, it is likely to have been one of a number of factors that influenced those responsible for human rights abuses, and while only a small number have been tried, the allegations against them are likely to be indicative of a greater extent of abuses, as is often the case with crimes such as rape and child abuse.

In order to determine the degree to which SOA training did condone or advocate repression, it is important to assess the nature of the training. Lesley Gill's anthropological study offers a more nuanced account of SOA, situating it within a broader context of US foreign policy.[61] She analyses the way in which the training is intended to shape the Latin American militaries in accordance with US foreign policy objectives. She examines the experiences of three different groups: Latin American and US personnel at SOA; Latin American forces and their interactions with coca growing communities in Bolivia and Colombia; and activists within SOAW. These analyses are helpful in describing the influences that the School, and by extension, US policy, has had on these distinct groups. Her assessment of the interactions between US and Latin American military personnel at SOA is based on interviews with staff and students at SOA and on observations of training between 1999 and 2000.[62] Her accounts of the relationships between staff and students and of attitudes that are fostered are insightful. She points to the "civilising" agenda which she encountered during her observations:

> Some SOA officials account for the savage tactics used by Latin American armies against their enemies as a propensity that is somehow intrinsic to them. Brutality is, in the words of one SOA official, a character flaw that can be changed only when "the Latin Americans clean up their acts." They can do so, he believes, through exposure to the good citizens of Columbus and firsthand observations of a democratic system in action.[63]

---

[60] The remaining 144 graduates against whom allegations have been made have not been found guilty of any crime There is no evidence within the dataset to indicate whether legal proceedings have been brought against any of the remaining 144 graduates allegedly involved in repression. Of course it is possible that some of the allegations made were false.
[61] Lesley Gill, *The School of the Americas. Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), p.3.
[62] Ibid. pp.259-262.
[63] Ibid. p.32.

Gill argues that this underscores the hierarchical and paternalistic attitudes of the US staff that she encountered towards Latin American students.[64] Gill's work contains some fascinating interview material with SOA graduates, including with Juan Ricardo, a Bolivian member of the armed forces who received training from SOA-trained graduates during the 1970s. Some of his fellow students were also sent to SOA. Gill reports that when she asked him what sorts of things they had learned, he replied:

> How to tie up prisoners of war and how to torture them – techniques that you have to utilise to get them to make declarations. [For example] you don't let them sleep and you get results. Other knowledge that they brought from the School of Americas I remember very well. It was axiomatic among the Rangers that a dead subversive was better than a prisoner. Having a prisoner interfered with the subsequent operations, thus it's better that he is four metres underground than to have him alive … There has to be continuity, and therefore, if we take prisoners [the idea is to] get information from them quickly, put them four metres underground and continue the operation.[65]

Ricardo allegedly asserted that instructors returning from SOA had "internalised a culture linked to their military education that they had not developed in Bolivia."[66] If this is a fair reflection of the SOA training, it adds further weight to the case against SOA, and would be consistent with training materials that were endorsed among some of the students, as I will show. Ricardo's account must be viewed with caution. There is no guarantee that other students, even from the same cohort, would offer the same analysis as Ricardo, and it is not possible to prove his claims. We should also be wary of assuming that US CI training was what caused Latin American governments to engage in acts of repression. Latin American military governments had networks in place independently of US military intervention, as shown in chapter four.

As this overview of previous research has shown, there is a heavy emphasis on arguing that SOA training caused repression. Yet there is little discussion of the other factors that are likely to have contributed to these abuses, such as the norms within the Latin American militaries at the time, the influence of peers over the behaviour of individuals, the pre-existing context of extreme political violence and the fear of individual personnel. It is impossible to prove that training was the key factor, and it is a mistake to emphasise this without consideration of other causes. In this sense, much of the research to date has failed to justify the label "School of Assassins" that has been attached to the School by SOAW. Gill's is the only work that has made an important attempt to situate the School within the wider context of US policy.

Spanish language manuals: advocating repression

---

[64] Ibid. p.130.
[65] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, p.99. Brackets Gill's.
[66] Ibid. p.100.

While previous research has been limited, largely because of the misplaced focus on establishing a causal link between the training and specific acts of repression, there is strong evidence that the training advocated repression. This evidence, within the wider context of US CI strategies makes for a compelling case against SOA and US foreign policy more broadly. The US military was complicit in repression through the use of training materials which condoned and advocated repression, including torture. In March 1992, the US Assistant to the Secretary of Defence for Intelligence Oversight (ASDIO) presented a report to the Secretary concerning seven manuals in Spanish that were used as part of intelligence training in Latin America and at SOA between 1987 and 1991.[67] These were: *Handling Sources*; *Counterintelligence*; *Revolutionary War and Communist Ideology*; *Terrorism and the Urban Guerrilla*; *Interrogation*; *Analysis I*; and *Combat Intelligence*. The ASDIO report stated that they had been prepared from outdated instructional materials which had been in use since 1982, and concluded that six of the manuals "contain about two dozen passages of objectionable and questionable material and that they were prepared without the required doctrinal approval."[68] These manuals were released to the public following immense Congressional and public pressure on 20 September 1996, along with a press release stating:

> Two dozen short passages in six of the manuals, which total 1169 pages, contained material that either was not or could be interpreted not to be consistent with US policy.[69]

These manuals were not an anomaly, but were consistent with Cold War CI doctrine across the US military and intelligence agencies. A CIA manual entitled *Interrogation* was produced in 1983 using material from the training notes for a CIA training course for the Honduran Battalion 316, and using material from a 1963 manual entitled *KUBARK*, which had been written for use by CIA agents against communist subversion, and advocated repression, including torture.[70] A further CIA manual called *Psychological Operations in Guerrilla Warfare*, which instructed Nicaraguan rebels in the techniques of political assassination and guerrilla warfare, was leaked to the House Intelligence Committee in 1984.[71]

---

[67] Lisa Haugaard, 'Declassified Army and Central Intelligence Agency Manuals Used in Latin America: An Analysis of their Content', Latin American Working Group, 1997, <http://www.lawg.org/pages/new%20pages/Misc/Publications-manuals.htm>

[68] US Department of Defense, 'Fact Sheet Concerning Training Manuals Containing Materials Inconsistent With United States Policy', Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defence, 1992, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/archive/news/dodmans.htm>

[69] Haugaard, 'Declassified Army and Central Intelligence Agency Manuals'.

[70] Representative Joseph Kennedy, *Report on the School of the Americas*, (Washington DC: Federation of American Scientists, 1997).

[71] Ibid. pp.5-6.

The Spanish language manuals were consistent with these, and were based on US CIA and Army doctrine that had been circulating since the 1960s, including Project X.[72] Project X was part of the US Army's Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme and was developed in 1965-66 by the OACSI "to assist select foreign countries in organising and developing military intelligence operations."[73] Representative Kennedy, who undertook an investigation into the manuals, notes that "virtually no official documentation of the origin or scope of the project exists today."[74] WHINSEC's liaison to the Army until 2005, Kenneth LaPlante, stated, "Project X was not sinister but a foreign military officers course called Project X because the filing system was alphabetic. X was the letter used for foreign instruction."[75] This cannot be verified. Permission was given for all unclassified Project X material to be used to compile training manuals for Military Intelligence (MI) course at SOA.[76] These were then distributed among SOA students and by MTT's in Latin America.

According to LaPlante, only four of the seven Spanish language manuals cited in the ASDIO report, were actually distributed to SOA students.[77] These were *Handling Sources*, *Counterintelligence*, *Combat Intelligence* and *Analysis I.* LaPlante insists that they were only issued to those on the MI course as supplemental readings, and that between 1989 and 1991 only two MI courses were offered. He stated that this amounted to 50 students in total, and that it could be safely assumed that another 25 people, primarily faculty members, also took these materials.[78] These and the remaining manuals, were, however, used among MTT's, and it is unclear how many individuals would have been exposed altogether. It is certainly likely to be far more than the 50 that are said to have had access to them at SOA. It has not been possible to further verify both how many manuals were originally distributed, nor how many of those manuals were recovered. Indeed, a further investigation in 1997 by the Inspector General concluded that total retrieval of all of the manuals was unlikely to be possible.[79] Responsibility for the manuals' compilation and use has not been attributed to any particular officials.

---

[72] Interviews with DoD personnel between June and September 2004 enabled me to trace the development of the Spanish language materials. The manuals were compiled from lesson plans that had been put together by Captains Vic Tise and John Zindar, who were working for the US Army Intelligence Centre and School (USAICS) at Fort Huachuca. USAICS had been instructed by the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (OACSI) to provide unclassified lesson plans to SOA. According to an investigation by Representative Joseph Kennedy, a working group was formed to undertake this task, and the OACSI asked if Project X materials could be used in the lesson plans. See Kennedy, *Report on the School of the Americas,* pp.6-7.
[73] Ibid. pp.6-7.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Interview with Kenneth LaPlante.
[76] Kennedy, *Report on the School of the Americas,* pp.6-7.
[77] Interview with Kenneth LaPlante.
[78] Ibid.
[79] US Inspector General, *Report of the US Inspector General: Policy and Oversight,* (Washington DC: Office of the US Inspector General, 1997), pp.7-8.

Various passages within the manuals advocate the violation of Article four of Protocol II additional to the Geneva Conventions, henceforth Article four, which prohibits violations of human rights.[80] Within *Handling Sources*, the material which "was or could be interpreted not to be consistent with US policy" violated Article four. As well as the passages mentioned in the ASDIO report, numerous others not mentioned also pose a threat to human rights. One of the passages highlighted by the ASDIO report refers to the elimination of guerrillas:

> Every countermeasure that concentrates on the activities of the guerrillas, without taking into consideration the secret organization and the great preparation before the violence explodes, is destined to fail. The mere elimination of the guerrillas does not alter in any way the basic organization of the insurgents. If it is to achieve a victory permanent in nature, the internal defence operations must be planned before the guerrillas initiate their operations, attack that contemplates the subversive secret elements as well as its military arm, once the movement reaches its second phase.[81]

Article four is clear that if individuals are not directly involved in hostilities, killing them is prohibited.

While the Department of Defense maintains that all seven manuals contain just two dozen passages which are or could be interpreted to be inconsistent with US policy and democratic standards, I identified seventeen more, not mentioned in the report, within *Handling Sources* alone. These included material that advocated infiltration of all types of legitimate social organisation, including youth groups, trade unions, and political parties; using fear and revenge to recruit counterintelligence agents; and using criminals as informants.[82] Some of the most disturbing passages relate to the termination of a counterintelligence employee's contract.[83] For example:

> If the insurrection advances to last phases and the guerrillas dominate certain areas that create borders, there is a series of things that could be done, especially if the main thing is to get rid of bin [sic] and it is not important if he talks with the guerrillas or not. Changing his identification is a way that he could not pass verifications by the guerrilla security elements, sending him in a

---

[80] Article 4 states: "All persons who do not take a direct part or who have ceased to take part in hostilities, whether or not their liberty has been restricted, are entitled to respect for their person, honour and convictions and religious practices. They shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, without any adverse distinction. It is prohibited to order that there shall be no survivors. Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, the following acts against the persons referred to in paragraph I are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever: (a) violence to the life, health and physical or mental well-being of persons, in particular murder as well as cruel treatment such as torture, mutilation or any form of corporal punishment; (b) collective punishments; (c) taking of hostages; (d) acts of terrorism; (e) outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment, rape, enforced prostitution and any form or indecent assault; (f) slavery and the slave trade in all their forms; (g) pillage; (h) threats to commit any or the foregoing acts." See International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), 'Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II, Article 4)', 1977, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/d67c3971bcff1c10c125641e0052b545?OpenDocument>

[81] US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources*. The terms 'guerrilla', 'communist', 'insurgent' and 'enemy' are used interchangeably throughout the manual, and it is clear that the individuals referred to using these terms are political opponents of the government and the counterintelligence personnel.

[82] US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources*, pp.1-32 and 128.

[83] US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources*, p.130.

> specially dangerous mission for which he has been inadequately prepared, or pass information to guerrilla security elements are methods that could be used.[84]

This is betrayal and poses a direct threat of violence or death, and violates Article four. A further passage advocates executions:

> The counterintelligence agent could increase the employee's value destroying the structure of the guerrilla organization around said employee. This could be done by means of arrests, executions, or pacification taking care not to expose the employee as the information source. If the employee is one of the few survivors, he could be a key member in a new or different guerrilla organization. Also the employee's reputation could be strengthened in this occasion by means of story fabrication, documents and witnesses, who are not only credible but also difficult to refute, since there will be very few guerrillas that have survived.[85]

Following arrest, individuals cease to be engaged in hostilities, and killing them is a violation of Article four. A further passage advocates terror and violence against employees no longer needed for intelligence gathering:

> In this carefully planned and controlled operation, the agent must discover what actions are needed to strengthen the employee's pretention an ideal guerrilla recruit [sic]. A vital part of this program is the educational system tending to indoctrinate and recompense government employees who inform when a guerrilla element approaches them and tries to recruit them. The counterintelligence agent could cause the arrest or detention of the employee's parents, imprison the employee or give him a beating as part of the placement plan of said employee in the guerrilla organization.[86]

Under Article four, non-combatants should not be subjected to violence or mental intimidation. The calculated use of repression as advocated in this and the other manuals in the context of military impunity, which was widespread under military governments in Latin America during the Cold War, is indicative of US complicity in repression.[87] Even though Department of Defense personnel deny that such things were ever formally part of SOA's curriculum, they were included in those manuals which were recommended to at least 50 SOA personnel, and which were distributed among many, possibly thousands, of Latin American military forces by MTTs throughout the Cold War. Worse still were some of the materials used by the CIA and US military during the Cold War.

The role of torture in the training

The Spanish manuals were consistent with Cold War CIA manuals which encouraged repression, including torture. One of these, *Human Resource Exploitation* was used by CIA personnel when training Latin Americans between 1982 and 1987.[88] It has not been possible to verify how widely this manual was used. The *Kubark* manual was used for training within

---

[84] US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources*, p.130.
[85] US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources.*
[86] Ibid.
[87] The other manuals also contain similar passages and additional passages not mentioned in the ASDIO report which also advocate human rights violations.
[88] Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), *Human Resource Exploitation Manual*, (Washington DC: CIA, 1982, Manual acquired by National Security Archives, under the Freedom of Information Act), p.1.

the CIA from 1963 onwards, but it has not been possible to verify whether it was used in the training of military or intelligence personnel from the South, although, as noted above, it was used in the compilation of the Spanish language manuals.[89] Both manuals were acquired by the *Baltimore Sun* in 1997. The *Human Resource Exploitation* manual contains various annotations that have been added later, passages that have been crossed out but which are still legible, and passages that have been blacked out. No such revisions are present in the *Kubark* manual. A page has also been added at the beginning of the *Human Resource Exploitation* manual, which states:

> Page Revision/Change
>
> A-2: Under D, last line, add the following: "We will discuss coercive techniques that have been used by many, and the reasons why we are against the use of these techniques".
>
> I-8: Bottom of page: Delete 7) Physical Violence
>
> K1: Include in the introduction to Coercive Techniques: We will discuss some of those coercive techniques that have been used by many, and the reasons why we are against the use of these techniques. We do not use these techniques, nor do we condone the use of them. Add the attached disclaimer, "Prohibition Against the Use of Force" to the introduction. Reiterate when discussing Non-Coercive and Coercive techniques. Ensure that the students understand our position.[90]

The disclaimer referred to follows the contents page and states:

> The use of force, mental torture, threats, insults, or exposure to unpleasant and inhumane treatment of any kind as an aid to interrogation is prohibited by law, both international and domestic; it is neither authorised nor condoned. […] Use of force is a poor technique, yields unreliable results, may damage subsequent collection efforts, and can induce the source to say what he thinks the interrogator wants to hear. Additionally. The use of force will probably result in adverse publicity and / or legal action against the interrogator (et al) when the source is released. However, the use of force is not to be confused with psychological ploys, verbal trickery, or other non-violent and non-coercive ruses employed by the interrogator in the successful interrogation of reticent or uncooperative sources.[91]

This is a striking condemnation of torture and undermines claims, discussed in chapter three, that torture can yield credible intelligence. It is unclear when the revisions page and the disclaimer were added to the training manual, but certainly by the time they were acquired by the *Baltimore Sun*, the above pages had been inserted and various annotations, crossings out and replacements of words and passages had been made throughout the manual. Much of the material that had been crossed out is still legible, and provides valuable insight into the methods of interrogation that were originally advocated.

It is unclear whether the *Human Resource Exploitation* manual was used for teaching purposes in its original or its annotated form and whether it was just this copy, or whether all

---

[89] National Security Archive (NSA), 'Prisoner Abuse: Patterns from the Past', 2004, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB122/index.htm>
[90] CIA, *Human Resource Exploitation Manual*, p.3.
[91] Ibid. p.5.

copies were amended. Either way, the instructor, and potentially the students, would have seen both the old and new material. The best case scenario would be that the annotations had been made before the manual was used for teaching purposes and that both instructor and student would abide by the prohibitions that have been added to the manual. But there is no guarantee that this was the case. The passages from the *Human Resource Exploitation* manual, in their original form, if acted upon, would constitute both torture and inhumane and degrading treatment which violates Article four. At no point does the manual make any reference to detainee access to legal representatives. The first of the passages refers to the use of coercive techniques during interrogation:

> Successful questioning is based upon a knowledge of the subject matter and upon the use of psychological techniques which are not difficult to understand. We will be discussing two types of techniques, coercive and non-coercive. While **we do not stress [crossed out and DEPLORE written above]** the use of coercive techniques, we do want to make you aware of them **and the proper way to use [crossed out and SO THAT YOU MAY AVOID written above]** them.[92]

As this passage demonstrates, in its original form the manual did not prohibit coercive techniques. Rather, it was interested in their effective use. The manual continues:

> Coercive techniques always require prior HQS approval **[crossed out and CONSTITUTE AN IMPROPRIETY AND VIOLATE POLICY written above]**. [93]

And:

> Has the 'questioner' obtained approval for any coercive techniques to be used? **[Crossed out]**.[94]

Again, the issue in the original text was gaining approval for coercive techniques rather than banning them completely.

Originally the manual permitted time, space and sensory deprivation that may be intolerable, and therefore constitute torture:

> The initial advantage always lies with the 'questioner'. From the outset, he knows a great deal more about the subject than the subject knows about him. He is able to manipulate the subject's environment, to create unpleasant **or intolerable [crossed out] situations, to disrupt patterns of time, space and sensory perception [crossed out].**[95]
>
> And:
>
> His questioner should be careful [crossed out and replaced with ANOTHER COERCIVE TECHNIQUE IS] to manipulate the subject's environment to disrupt patterns, not to create them, such as arranging [this added as handwritten note] meals and sleep should be granted [replaced with SO THEY OCCUR] irregularly, in more than abundance or less than adequacy, on no discernible time pattern. This is done to disorient the subject and destroy his capacity to resist.

---

[92] Ibid. p.A2, paragraph D. Copies of the passages cited from the *Human Resource Exploitation Manual* are included in Appendix 2, so that the reader can see the changes and annotations that were made within the manual.
[93] Ibid. p.B2, paragraph B-5. See Appendix 2.
[94] Ibid. p.H6, paragraph H-24. See Appendix 2.
[95] Ibid. paragraph F. See Appendix 2.

> However, if successful it causes serious psychological damage and is a form of torture [this handwritten note was added].[96]

And:

> Solitary confinement acts on most persons as a powerful stress. A person cut off from external stimuli turns his awareness inward and projects his unconscious outward. The symptoms most commonly produced by solitary confinement are superstition, intense love of any other living thing, perceiving inanimate objects as alive, hallucinations, and delusions. **Deliberately causing these symptoms is a serious impropriety and to use prolonged solitary confinement for the purpose of extracting information in questioning violates policy [added in handwritten notes]. Although conditions identical to those of solitary confinement for the purpose of 'questioning' have not been duplicated for scientific experimentation, a number of experiments have been conducted with subjects who volunteered to be placed in 'sensory deprivation tanks'. They were suspended in water and wore black-out masks, which enclosed the entire head and only allowed breathing. They heard only their own breathing and some faint sounds of water from the piping [all crossed out]. To summarize the results of these experiments [crossed out] Extreme [added in handwriting]** deprivation of sensor stimuli induces **unbearable [added in handwriting]** stress and anxiety, **and is a form of torture. Its use constitutes a serious impropriety and violates policy [added in handwriting]. The more complete the deprivation, the more rapidly and deeply the subject is affected [all crossed out]. The stress and anxiety become unbearable for most subjects. They have a growing need for physical and social stimuli. How much they are able to stand depends upon the psychological characteristics of the individual. Now let me relate this to the 'questioning' situation. As the 'questioner' becomes linked in the subject's mind with human contact and meaningful activity, the anxiety lessens. The 'questioner' can take advantage of the relationship by assuming a benevolent role [all crossed out]. Some subjects progressively lose touch with reality, focus inwardly, and produce delusions, hallucinations, and other pathological effects. In general, the more well-adjusted a subject is, the more he is affected by deprivation. Neurotic and psychotic subjects are comparatively unaffected or show decreases in anxiety [all crossed out]**[97]

The notes that have been added to these passages, and the passages that have been crossed out indicate an acknowledgement that such deprivations constitute torture. Yet they were originally included in the manual, and there is no evidence available to prove that such techniques were not encouraged and endorsed by US intelligence personnel.

The manual also refers explicitly to the use of torture and the role that this can play as part of the interrogation process. Again, a prohibition was added later, but the passage indicates that the producers of the manual considered it to be a useful method. The passage also shifts any blame for feelings of pain from the interrogator to the victim :

> The torture situation is an external conflict, a contest between the subject and his tormentor. The pain which is being inflicted upon him from outside himself may actually intensify his will to resist. On the other hand, pain which he feels he is inflicting upon himself is more likely to sap his resistance. For example, if he is required to maintain rigid positions such as standing at attention or sitting on a stool for long periods of time, the immediate sources of **pain [replaced with DISCOMFORT]** is not the 'questioner' but the subject himself. His conflict is then an internal struggle. As long as he maintains this position he is attributing to the 'questioner' the ability to do something worse. But there is never a showdown where the 'questioner' demonstrates this ability. After a period of time, the subject **is likely to [replaced with MAY]** exhaust his internal motivational strength. **This technique may only be used for periods of time that are not long enough to induce pain or physical damage [added in handwriting].**[98]

---

[96] Ibid. p.K2, paragraph L-3. See Appendix 2.
[97] Ibid. pp.K6-7, paragraph L-10. See Appendix 2.
[98] Ibid. pp.K9-10, paragraph L-12. See Appendix 2.

As is clear, the coercive techniques alluded to in the manual violate International Humanitarian Law in that they condone the use of torture and degrading and humiliating treatment for interrogation purposes. Even where changes have been made in the text of the copy of the manual obtained under the FOIA, there is no evidence to prove that all copies of this manual used for training purposes among Latin American forces were similarly altered. This manual is even more incriminating than the Spanish language materials distributed among some SOA students and by MTTs in Latin America, in that it its original form, *Human Resource Exploitation* permits torture, as well as various forms of degrading and humiliating treatment. Furthermore, these manuals were not an anomaly. Rather, they were entirely consistent with US foreign policy during the Cold War, which was characterised by repression, and included turning a blind eye to, or indeed advocating, widespread torture. The exposure of these manuals was to ignite a highly effective campaign against SOA which would lead to SOA's closure and its replacement by WHINSEC.

SOA Watch and the birth of WHINSEC

Bolstered by the release of the manuals, SOAW mounted a highly successful campaign against the school. This included attempting to get bills passed to close SOA, in collaboration with specific Congress and Senate representatives. Ultimately these efforts resulted in its closure and replacement by WHINSEC.[99] A strength of the campaign has been its ability to foster public support. For the last few years SOAW has attracted 10,000 people to its annual protest at the gates of Fort Benning.[100] The movement began in 1990, when ten people met at the gates, led by Father Roy Bourgeois, to hold a fast in protest against SOA, once they had learned that a number of Salvadoran soldiers implicated in the massacre of all the men, women and children in El Mozote , El Salvador on 10 December 1981, had been trained at SOA.[101] In 1993, Newsweek journalist, Douglas Waller, published an article entitled, "Running a 'School for Dictators'", about then commandant of SOA, Colonel José Alvarez.[102] Bourgeois argues that this helped raise the campaign's profile:

---

[99] Prior to the closure of SOA and its replacement by WHINSEC, there were nine such efforts. Of these, four were introduced and voted on in Congress, but only one of them was won, in 1999. This was, however, then defeated in the Senate. One bill was introduced in the Senate in 1997 but this didn't make it past the House Armed Services Committee. The remaining four were referred to the Congress Armed Services Committee but never taken forward. Their cumulative effect, however, was to raise the profile of SOA and its unpleasant past, leading to an amendment in 2000 to the Floyd Spence National Defence Authorisation Act for 2001 which closed SOA and replaced it with WHINSEC. Full details of these efforts are listed in Appendix 3.

[100] Interviewees from the US Department of Defense, WHINSEC staff, and SOA Watch all agreed on the figure of 10,000 protestors.

[101] Interview with Father Roy Bourgeois at his office, situated outside the gates of Fort Benning, Columbus, Georgia, 20 July 2004. See also United Nations Security Council (UNSC), *From Madness to Hope: the 12-year War in El Salvador: Report of the Commission on the Truth for El Salvador,* (New York: UNSC, 1993), introduction and parts A, B and C.

[102] Douglas Waller, 'Running a 'School for Dictators': US Training Doesn't Turn Soldiers into Democrats,' *Newsweek,* 9 August 1993, pp.34-37.

> In 1993, shortly after the Newsweek article, Mart Meehan (Massachusetts) got up in Congress and called on them to read the Newsweek article, saying that if this school had an alumni reunion it would bring the biggest thugs of Latin America together. Many were hearing about the School for the first time [...] The Moakley report was the first Congressional-level interest … Joe Kennedy got passionate about it. Months later he introduced the Bill in Congress to close the school … The first vote on the Kennedy amendment was 175-256, which is very respectable for a first vote. When the torture manuals hit the news in 1996 there were big problems for the school. It couldn't recover.[103]

The impact of Bourgeois' efforts is corroborated by LaPlante. I had asked him for evidence that the manuals were withdrawn and destroyed following the ASDIO report. In the course of answering, he indicated that SOAW protests had made a big impression:

> I was the Chief of the Latin American branch here on the Army staff and came in January 1993 so I was involved with the tail end of this. I do recall every Military Group replying mission complete. I do not have copies as, at the time, the issue was complete and not inflammatory until Bourgeois started SOAW efforts really hard in 1993. Then the Intelligence Oversight Board carried out their investigation and there was the subsequent release [of the report].[104]

SOAW campaigning contributed to the undertaking of the ASDIO investigation. The official line from the Department of Defense has always been that the closure of SOA and opening of WHINSEC had little to do with the claims that SOA had been complicit in repression and more to do with new approaches for the post-Cold War world. Army Secretary, Louis Caldera stated:

> It's not going to be oriented toward the Cold War challenges of the past that are the thing people have criticized about the school. It will be oriented toward the security challenges of the future for the countries of Latin America: strengthening democracy, fighting drug trafficking, responding to natural disasters, building regional security and cooperation.[105]

Yet various officials attributed the transition to SOAW. Joseph Leuer stated:

> They have done a lot and they don't realise it. They have made this institute the US DoD's best Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law training institution. They have allowed SOA and now WHINSEC to place into the military lexicon human rights in a positive light. They took a $4 million institution and made it the agenda at the national level. Father Roy Bourgeois is the father of WHINSEC.[106]

Not only does this indicate that SOAW did have a significant influence on SOA's future, but it has also had an impact upon the content of the training. The CI agenda central to the training throughout the Cold War phase would disappear, and a heavy emphasis would be placed on democracy and human rights promotion. However, as I will show in chapter seven, this is not typical of the majority of US training programmes for military forces from the South.

Conclusion

---

[103] Interview with Father Roy Bourgeois.
[104] Interview with Father Roy Bourgeois.
[105] Kim Burger, 'Army Secretary, DoD Back 'Serious Reform' at the School of the Americas', US Department of Defense - Inside the Army, 2000, <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usamhi/usarsa/main.htm>
[106] Interview with Mr. Joseph Leuer, Assistant Dean of Academics, WHINSEC, 16 August 2004.

Just as US foreign policy in the South during the Cold War was broadly characterised by repression, US training of military forces from the South also advocated repression, including torture. The training was a key tool for US strategists in its support for coercion in the South, particularly in Latin America, and was intended to play an important role in ensuring that governments in the region were compatible with US strategic interests. Indeed, part of that training was deliberately aimed at ensuring that the military forces in the South were in a position to act for the US, able to seize power from existing governments where those governments were implementing policies at odds with US interests. This was entirely consistent with the frequent interventions in Latin America by the US throughout the Cold War, which included sponsoring military coups against democratically elected governments. The training was extensive, and increased steadily throughout the Cold War, in line with US foreign policy objectives across the South. Official discourse surrounding the training emphasised the need to curtail communist expansion in the South, but the declassified documents, and particularly the training manuals discussed here, reveal that the CI training was intended to specifically target those assumed to be involved, or likely to become involved, in movements which posed a threat to the interests of the US state and US capital.

The training advocated widespread human rights violations, including torture, not simply against a minority of suspected insurgents or terrorists, but against whole sections of the population. The concentration of the SOA Watch campaign on SOA, and research to date which has also focused almost exclusively on SOA training, might lead us to conclude that SOA was an anomaly. This chapter shows that the notorious Spanish language manuals were not anathema to broader military training initiatives, both for domestic and foreign military personnel, or to wider US foreign policy objectives, but were typical of a strategy adopted within US foreign policy of supporting repression in the region. This included advocating torture, not as a tool for gathering intelligence, which is the function that it is widely assumed to serve, but rather to instil fear to prevent the growth and strengthening of political opposition to the current regime. Thus the training advocated repression on the part of allied forces in the service of US strategic and capitalist interests in the South. As the following chapter demonstrates, a shift occurred in the strategies for achieving US foreign policy objectives in the post-Cold War years, towards a less repressive model, with a greater emphasis on securing popular endorsement for democracy and neoliberalism in order to spread global capitalism.

CHAPTER SIX: US FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY SINCE THE COLD WAR

US foreign policy strategy in the South following the Cold War underwent a significant shift, with a far greater emphasis placed on strategies of legitimation. This was nevertheless accompanied by repressive means, but these were not as dominant as they had been during the Cold War. As discussed in chapter three, legitimation involves the promotion of democracy and securing popular endorsement for neoliberalism in order to secure access, primarily for US elites, to resources and markets in the South. The form of democracy being promoted is characterised by offering limited choices in elections, and by seeking to ensure that only those who will cooperate with US objectives are elected. In circumstances where legitimation fails, and where the US perceives that its objectives are threatened, the US resorts to repression. In this chapter I first demonstrate that following the Cold War, the promotion of US state and capital interests remained central to US foreign policy, and that legitimation was deemed by US policy-makers to be the most effective strategy for achieving US objectives in the South. I then show how these efforts benefit international capital as well as the US state and US capital. I then outline the organs that the US uses to promote democracy and neoliberalism in the South.

The case of El Salvador, typical of US democracy promotion efforts since the Cold War, is then analysed. El Salvador is held up by the US state as a success story in its post-Cold War foreign policy strategy, although the benefits for many Salvadorans are limited, as I will show. The contrasting case of Haiti, in which the US reverted to repression when legitimation failed, will then be assessed. Support for repression in this way remains a tool of US foreign policy, albeit in fewer cases than during the Cold War, and indeed operates in conjunction with legitimation strategies.

Nevertheless, I will then demonstrate that since 9/11 there has been a resurgence of repression in US foreign policy, including moves to legitimise the use of torture. This resurgence of repressive strategies needs to be understood within the context of the events of 9/11, as it was the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon that provided the impetus, as well as the justification, at least initially, for the use of force externally and internally. The attacks of 9/11 were devastating, and for the first time since Pearl Harbour, constituted an attack on US home soil. It was because of this "sense of homeland violation", in the words of Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, that a swift and decisive response was demanded,[1] and it was no surprise that this would be a military one. It is difficult to overstate

[1] Ken Booth, and Tim Dunne, (eds.), *Worlds in Collision. Terror and the Future of Global Order*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p.2. The Taliban regime of Afghanistan, which it was understood had harboured Al

the irony of this sense of "homeland violation" when compared with the millions in the South who have had their own homelands violated by US foreign policy. This sense that the US was under attack, and that terror posed a real and present danger, would serve to legitimate further oppression by the US, including legislation such as the USA PATRIOT Act, passed in October 2001, giving US authorities significant powers in relation to the terrorist threat; the signing of a presidential executive order which permitted the trial of suspected alien terrorists in military tribunals with no criminal law or evidential rules of protection;[2] the invasion and occupation of Iraq; the detention of terror suspects in Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, and other US detention facilities; the policy of extraordinary rendition; and massive increases in US military spending and military operations and training of foreign military personnel.[3] The analysis in this chapter provides the context for an assessment of the degree to which these two strategies are reflected in US training of military forces from the South since the Cold War.

Promoting democracy and neoliberalism through legitimation: 1991-2001

Just as securing foreign resources and markets to sustain US capital dominated US foreign policy from the early 1800s and up until the end of the Cold War, this continued to be a principle aim under President George H W Bush, as articulated in the 1991 National Security Strategy:

> National security and economic strength are indivisible. We seek to promote a strong, prosperous and competitive US economy; ensure access to foreign markets, energy, mineral resources, the oceans and space; promote an open and expanding international economic system, based on market principles, with minimal distortions to trade and investment, stable currencies, and broadly respected rules for managing and resolving economic disputes.[4]

Thus, any effort to promote democracy by the US was to work in tandem with these aims. It is clear from the National Security Strategy that democratisation and neoliberalisation are intended to assist the US in its goals:

> America will continue to support an international economic system as open and inclusive as possible, as the best way to strengthen global economic development, political stability and the

---

Qa'ida, was to be the initial target, along with the Al Qa'ida cells operating in the mountains of Afghanistan, and of course, Bin Laden, the architect of the attacks, and would be the first operation of the US "War on Terror". This was accompanied by extensive intelligence operations at home and abroad to detect other Al Qa'ida cells and operatives, to be rounded up and detained or killed the theatre of war, in the case of those in Afghanistan.

[2] Michael Cox, 'Meanings of Victory: American Power After the Towers', in Booth and Dunne, (eds.), *Worlds in Collision*, p.157.

[3] This renewed emphasis on repressive strategies was ushered in by the events of 9/11, but has also been influenced by neo-conservative policies which have gained ground since President Bush appointed various neo-conservative figures to office in his administration. While many of them have now left the Bush administration, neoconservative ideas continue to shape US foreign policy, including the commitment to US military primacy, the establishment of democracy and neoliberalism across the South by whatever means, including force where legitimation fails, US unilateral action, and prioritising the military sphere over economic and social issues. These priorities sit extremely well with, and indeed have fed into, the "War on Terror".

[4] US National Security Council, 'National Security Strategy of the United States', 1991, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/918015-nss.htm>

> growth of free societies […] Our interests are best served in a world in which democracy and its ideals are widespread and secure.[5]

Thus there was a clear shift in US foreign policy strategy following the Cold War with an emphasis on legitimation, by promoting democracy and securing popular endorsement for neoliberalism. This contrasted with the widespread use of repression during the Cold War in order to achieve US foreign policy objectives. This is not to say that all states in the South have been the target of US democratisation and neoliberalisation efforts. The US has continued to support states that are undemocratic and known abusers of human rights since the Cold War. For instance, despite refusing to implement democratic reform, and having consistently poor human rights records, as indicated in the State Department's annual human rights reports, Saudi Arabia continues to enjoy extensive US military aid and sales.[6] Nevertheless, securing acquiescence with neoliberalism, often through establishing democracy, has been the dominant US foreign policy strategy since the end of the Cold War.

Legitimation has to be achieved through the domination of political and civil society by classes and groups that share US commitments to neoliberalisation. US foreign policy makers have recognised that power ultimately rests in civil society in this way, so the aim is to ensure that dominant groups and classes establish legitimacy for neoliberalism by politically and ideologically incorporating subordinate groups within society, often through democracy. They thereby defeat or marginalise significant opposition.[7] This should be understood in relation to one of the key functions of the capitalist state which, as Nicos Poulantzas argues, is to ensure that dominated classes are politically disorganised so that they are unable to overcome their economic isolation and are therefore unable to threaten the interests of the dominant classes.[8] This is achieved through the state appearing as a "political unity of a society of divergent economic interests", which are articulated not as class interests but as the interests of private individuals.[9] The state therefore appears to be neutral, an appearance which is in part ensured by the state sometimes acting in the economic interests of dominated classes, in the short-term, at the expense of capital, while always guaranteeing the long term political interests of the economic elite.[10]

---

[5] Ibid.
[6] US Department of State, 'Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2004: Saudi Arabia', 28 February 2005, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41731.htm> US Foreign Military Sales to Saudi Arabia in 2003 totalled $692.65 million, second only to Egypt in the Near East and South Asian region. US Foreign Military Sales to Egypt in the same year totalled $930.64 million. See Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts. As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, 2003, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf>
[7] William Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention, and Hegemony*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p.24.
[8] Nicos Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*, Translated by Timothy O'Hagan, (London: Verso, [1968] 1987), pp.130-191.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid.

The organs of neoliberalisation and democratisation

The US has established a number of organs that are intended to assist those classes and groups in the South that share a commitment to neoliberalisation in their efforts to establish dominance and to incorporate subordinate groups, thereby weakening opposition without recourse to repression. Their remit is to build up institutions of political and civil society of intervened countries with the aim of developing structures which, as Robinson argues, were "capable of absorbing tensions, maintaining social control, and steering societies in directions responsive to US and transnational interests."[11] This is a different view from that of liberals such as Thomas Carothers, a key figure in US democracy promotion through his role as International Research Fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations, who argues that programmes to support democracy by such organs were primarily "related to the heightened anticommunism of Ronald Reagan's foreign policy" rather than specifically to promoting democracy.[12] He argues that this eventually led to a shift away from support for authoritarian regimes that were friendly to the US and resulted in democracy assistance programmes.[13] He makes no connection to the function that such programmes serve within the framework of promoting US and global capitalist interests.

Organisations with this agenda include the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), the US Agency for International Development (USAID), and the US Department of State. An indicator of the shift to a strategy of legitimation in US foreign policy is the increase in programmes run by these organisations since the Cold War. For instance, in 1990 the US, via the NED, was funding just 21 democracy promotion projects in Africa, and 94 by 1995. In Asia, 27 projects were funded in 1990, and 75 by 1995. In Latin America and the Caribbean, 71 projects were funded in 1990, and 87 by 1995, and in the Middle East, there was just one project in 1990, but 40 by 1995.[14] This upward trend has continued, with NED projects worldwide increasing from 223 in 1990, to 418 in 2003.[15] These, as I will show, are part of a process of ensuring the protection and promotion of elite interests, without resorting to repression.

The NED was established in 1983 by the US government as a private, non-profit organisation. Its stated aim is to "strengthen democratic institutions around the world

---

[11] Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, p.83.
[12] Thomas Carothers, *Aiding Democracy Abroad. The Learning Curve*, (Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999), p.29.
[13] Ibid.
[14] National Endowment for Democracy (NED), 'Democracy Projects Database', 2005, <http://www.ned.org/dbtw-wpd/textbase/projects-search.htm>
[15] Ibid.

through nongovernmental efforts".[16] While it is supposedly non-partisan, its donors include the Department of State and USAID, and organisations closely linked to specific political parties, including the International Republican Institute (IRI) and the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, which receive funding from the State Department.[17] These institutions share a commitment to neoliberalism.

USAID similarly focuses on the promotion of democracy, emphasising that this will ultimately serve US foreign policy objectives:

> The strategic long-term domestic and foreign policy objectives of the United States are best served by enlarging the community of democratic nations worldwide. Establishing democratic institutions, free and open markets […] all of these contribute to the goal of establishing sustainable democracies.[18]

The State Department website gives some indication of the type of development it has in mind for the South:

> We will support programs that encourage broad-based participation and civil society development as the foundation for democracy and good governance, economic growth and free enterprise, sound environmental stewardship, and quality education and healthcare.[19]

I will show, with reference to the case of El Salvador, that this kind of support is closely tied to neoliberalisation, and is a key component of US efforts to reproduce the global political economy in the South.

El Salvador

El Salvador's transition to democracy is typical of US legitimation strategies in the South since the Cold War. It is seen among liberals as a model of US democracy promotion. For example Carothers argues that the emphasis in US assistance on elections and the administration of justice, were major components in US democracy promotion, and had their beginnings in El Salvador.[20] I agree that it has become the model for US democracy promotion efforts, not simply because of its emphasis on support for elections and administration of justice, but also because of the emphasis on ensuring that elites who share US commitments to neoliberalisation dominate political and civil society, and that they successfully co-opt subordinate classes and groups in order to secure popular endorsement for the reproduction of the global political economy in the South.

---

[16] NED Website: <http://www.ned.org/about/about.html> accessed August 2005.
[17] NED, 'Democracy Projects Database: El Salvador', <http://www.ned.org/dbtw-wpd/exec/dbtwpub.dll>; 'Democracy Projects Database: Haiti', <http://www.ned.org/dbtw-wpd/exec/dbtwpub.dll> accessed August 2005.
[18] US Agency for International Development (USAID), 'Promoting Democracy and Good Governance', 2005, <http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/>
[19] US Department of State, 'US Department of State Mission Statement', 2004, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/dosstrat/2004/23503.htm>
[20] Carothers, *Aiding Democracy Abroad,* p.35.

Elections were held El Salvador in March 1994, following the civil war which ended in 1994, during which the US had condoned repression through its ongoing support of the military government.[21] The right-wing ARENA party gained 69 percent of the vote and the left-wing FMLN, 31 percent.[22] These results were upheld by the UN Observer Mission to El Salvador (ONUSAL), despite significant irregularities in the elections.[23] For example, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) found that there were approximately 750,000 people of voting age who were not on the electoral register.[24] This is not surprising given that the country had been in the grips of violent conflict for more than a decade, during which many thousands of people were displaced.[25] Of the Salvadoran population eligible to vote, approximately 15 percent were unable to because of weaknesses in the system. With just 50 percent of registered voters going to the polls, the vote for ARENA amounted to support from just 34.5 percent of the eligible voting population.[26] The outcome may have been different had all those who had registered actually been permitted to vote. The ARENA party have remained in power since those first elections in 1994, with observers concluding that progress is being made in the electoral system, despite some ongoing irregularities and low turnout.[27]

ARENA's success in maintaining power and successfully instigating neoliberalism can be attributed at least in part to US support. This began with the US ignoring the role of members of the post-1994 government in human rights violations during the war. Research by the Centre for International Policy, an independent research group in Washington DC, analysed thousands of previously classified documents, including cables and reports from the US embassy, and found that high ranking members of the armed forces and of ARENA, many of whom continued to hold office following the 1994 elections, were involved in the planning of

---

[21] HRW (HRW), *El Salvador's Decade of Terror*, (New York: HRW / Americas, 1991), pp.1-27.
[22] Organisation of American States (OAS), 'Political Database of the Americas: El Salvador Presidential Election Results 1994', Georgetown University and OAS, 1999, <http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba/Elecdata/ElSal/pres94.html>
[23] UN, 'United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, Background', United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, 1995, <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/onusalbackgr2.html>
[24] El Salvador's Supreme Electoral Tribunal (TSE) set about updating the register and issuing polling cards. Birth certificates were required as proof of identification. By the closure of the register in January 1994, it was anticipated that while 95 per cent people would be on the electoral roll, only 85 percent would have had their voting cards issued. The IPU also found that 60,000 applications would be turned down because people did not have their birth certificates. See Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), 'Report of the Inter-Parliamentary Delegation to Observe the Electoral Process in El Salvador', 1994, <http://www.ipu.org/elcn-e/rptslvdr.htm>
[25] Ibid.
[26] OAS, 'Political Database of the Americas'.
[27] See IPU website: <http://www.ipu.org/english/parline/reports/arc/2099%5F03.htm> I was part of a UN-supported NGO observer team during the 2003 elections, and while on the whole the elections were fair and followed appropriate procedures, some people have still not received polling cards, despite applying in good time; polling registers continue to be out of date, with the names of deceased persons continuing to appear while more recent additions have not been updated; the system is still open to manipulation because of these flaws. For a fuller report, see <www.ruthblakeley.co.uk> and select 'My Research'.

death squad activities throughout the 1980s and early 1990s.[28] Yet the US raised no objection to individuals implicated in human rights violations from holding office in the new government. In 1991 Americas Watch reported:

> Officials of the Bush administration failed to acknowledge any army violations of the rules of war during the FMLN urban offensive, instead shifting the blame for any harm to civilians solely to the rebels.[29]

The UN Truth Commission found that the majority of human rights violations were committed by the armed forces and paramilitary groups allied to them.[30] It reports that of the 22,000 complaints of serious acts of violence between January 1980 and July 1991, 85 percent were complaints against agents of the state, with just five percent of the complaints attributed to members of the FMLN. Over 60 percent of all complaints concerned extra-judicial killings, over 25 percent enforced disappearances, and over 20 percent torture.[31] These figures do not cover every act of violence. They are just a sample of cases which the Commission was able to collate in the three month period in which it gathered testimony.[32] After the elections El Salvador was governed by people who had previously been responsible for extensive human rights abuses. The Salvadoran public, especially those who had supported the opposition, are likely, therefore, to have feared those in office because of their past involvement in human rights violations. This may have contributed to the neutralisation of opposition following the war.

Neoliberalisation favours the elites

The US also contributed to the weakening of opposition groups by ensuring that subordinate groups within El Salvador were integrated into the neoliberal agenda. I will show that support through USAID and the NED has favoured organisations sympathetic to neoliberalism, while marginalizing and neutralising opposition from groups affiliated with the left-wing FMLN, whose policies emphasise alternatives to neoliberal economics, in particular, equitable land distribution.[33] In negotiations between ARENA, the FMLN, and

---

[28] By independent I mean organisations and institutions that are in no way funded by the government. Numerous 'independent' non-governmental organisations receive government funding for some or all of their work. The Centre for International Policy's budget, however is free from government and political party funding; its work is funded entirely by individual donors and private foundations. See Centre for International Policy (CIP), 'Funding Sources', 2005, <http://ciponline.org/aboutus.htm> On the election of former members of death squads, see Lauren Gilbert, 'El Salvador's Death Squads: New Evidence from US Documents', CIP, 1994, <http://ciponline.org/dethsqud.htm>

[29] HRW, *El Salvador's Decade of Terror,* p.133.

[30] United Nations Security Council (UNSC), 'From Madness to Hope: the 12-year War in El Salvador: Report of the Commission on the Truth for El Salvador', 1993, <http://www.usip.org/library/tc/doc/reports/el_salvador/tc_es_03151993_V.html>

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Frente Faribundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN) Party Website,

representatives of the US government, at a meeting of the World Bank Consultative Group in 1992, $800 million was secured for El Salvador's National Reconstruction Plan.[34] This involved Structural Adjustment Policies which encouraged private sector development, and the privatisation of public services.[35] Between 1994 and 1999, ARENA privatised formerly state owned sugar mills, telephone services, and electricity distribution companies.[36]

This emphasis on privatisation was reflected in the way funds for reconstruction were distributed. US support for civic and political groups was channelled towards groups aligned with ARENA which served to marginalize the FMLN. For instance, rather than creating an independent agency to oversee post-war reconstruction, a government agency, the Secretaría de Reconstrucción Nacional (SRN), was established to administer the reconstruction.[37] The SRN, in turn, channelled the majority of the funding, which came from USAID, through the Municipales en Acción programme, which had been established under the Comisión Nacional para la Restauración de Areas Afectadas, the agency in charge of the civilian components of the counterinsurgency efforts during the war.[38] Thus, institutions that had previously been involved in CI against the left were now responsible for overseeing reconstruction among the very communities they had previously suppressed. Less than one percent of the SRN funds were channelled through opposition NGOs, even though they had proven experience in local development projects in the former conflict zones.[39] One of the outcomes of this, according to an ONUSAL official, was that although the SRN designated 106 municipalities in the former battle zones as eligible for funds, it tended to concentrate resources in the 28 municipalities whose pro-ARENA mayors had returned, having been driven out by the FMLN during the war, after the peace accords were signed.[40] This was part of a process of marginalizing the FMLN.[41] This was a consequence of the way in which reconstruction efforts were established under the control of ARENA, instead of an independent agency, a decision that went unchallenged by USAID.

< http://fmln.org.sv/portal/index.php>, accessed 10 May 2006; and Cherrene Horazuk, 'Turning Point for the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador', *Crossroads*, 1995, <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/47/067.html>

[34] Richard Stahler-Sholk, 'El Salvador's Negotiated Transition: From Low-Intensity Conflict to Low Intensity-Democracy', *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs*, vol.36, no.4, (1994), pp.20-21.

[35] See World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Brief', 2003, <http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/LAC/LACInfoClient.nsf/5996dfbf9847f67d85256736005dc67c/79051920dc2134e985256c08006f0cb2/$FILE/El%20Salvador%20Brief.pdf>

[36] World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Assistance Evaluation', 2002, <http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/B27BD8596FD1289C85256B810052C1EC/$file/el_salvador.pdf>

[37] Stahler-Sholk, 'El Salvador's Negotiated Transition', p.21.

[38] Peter Sollis, *Reluctant Reforms: The Christiani Government and the International Community in the Process of Salvadoran Postwar Reconstruction*, (Washington DC: Washington Office on Latin America, 1993), cited in Stahler-Sholk, 'El Salvador's Negotiated Transition, p.21.

[39] Kevin Murray et al. (eds.) *Rescuing Reconstruction: The Debate on Post-War Economic Recovery in El Salvador*, (Cambridge, MA: Hemisphere Initiatives, 1994).

[40] Stahler-Sholk, 'El Salvador's Negotiated Transition', p.21 and note 22.

[41] FMLN Website: <http://fmln.org.sv/portal/index.php>, accessed August 2005; and Horazuk, 'Turning Point'.

There were instances in which the NED was more directly involved in channelling funds to groups that were aligned with ARENA. A review of NED initiatives in El Salvador indicates that a large proportion of NED funds donated to El Salvadoran civic groups between 1990 and 1995 was given to a group with close ties to ARENA. This was the Asociación Nacional de Empresa Privada (ANEP) or National Association of Private Enterprise. According to the ANEP website, this organisation is intended to "contribute to the economic, cultural and social development of El Salvador, promoting the strengthening of the business sector and the right-wing democratic state".[42] ANEP's members include CEO's of the major companies active in El Salvador, and the directors of numerous commercial groups representing the different financial and industrial sectors of the country.[43] ANEP was one of the primary beneficiaries of NED support in the early 1990s. 26 percent of NED funds for El Salvador were invested in ANEP projects. The rest were invested in election observing, women's groups, independent media, moderate human rights groups, labour legislation and mediation, and university projects. No FMLN-associated NGOs received any donations.

Efforts to promote neoliberalism in El Salvador, then, have been spearheaded by USAID, and the NED. This is beneficial for US capital, and to some extent, to global capital although the US state and international financial institutions are keen to stress the benefits for the Salvadoran economy. The State Department points out that El Salvador "is pursuing an aggressive strategy to increase exports, especially manufactured and non-traditional products, and to attract foreign investment" and that "the negotiation of trade agreements such as CAFTA [Central American Free Trade Agreement] that reduce trade and investment barriers is a central part of this effort."[44] The World Bank argues that trade liberalisation, financial sector and pension reform, the privatisation of state-owned enterprises, and the transition from a primarily domestic-oriented agricultural economy to an export-based diversified and deregulated economy have all contributed to El Salvador's growth.[45] This is a view shared by the US State Department, particularly because of the benefits that this generates for US capital:

> Maquila exports have led the growth in the export sector and have made an important contribution to the Salvadoran economy […] US support for El Salvador's privatisation of the electrical and telecommunications markets expanded opportunities for US investment in the country. More than

[42] Website of the Asociaión Nacional de Empresa Privada (ANEP), El Salvador: <http://www.anep.org.sv/actaconstitucion.htm>, accessed August 2005.
[43] See ANEP's website, list of associates: <http://www.anep.org.sv/anaso.htm>
[44] US Department of State, 'El Salvador Profile', Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, April 2005, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2033.htm>
[45] World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Brief'.

> 300 US companies have established either a permanent commercial presence in El Salvador or work through representatives in the country.[46]

This outcome is indicative of the ways in which the reproduction of the global economy in the South reaps benefits for US capital.

Neoliberalisation and El Salvador's poor

The impacts of neoliberalisation on El Salvador's poor have been mixed. Growth has occurred since the end of the 1980s, and a number of social indicators have improved. In this sense, the transition to democracy and neoliberalisation have been beneficial. Between 1989 and 2000, per capita GDP grew at 2.7 percent per year and average inflation fell from 20 percent in 1989 to around 2 percent in 2000. Households in poverty fell from 60 percent of the total in 1991 to about 41 percent in 1999. Life expectancy at birth increased from 64 years in 1987 to about 70 years in 1998, infant mortality declined from 46 per 1,000 births in 1990 to 31 per 1,000 in 1998. Literacy improved as school enrolment increased from 81 percent in 1990 to 97 percent in 1997.[47]

Problems persist, however. Poverty is still extremely high compared to other Latin American states. In 1991, the extreme poverty rate was 33 percent.[48] While this has fallen, the United Nations Development Programme reports that on the international extreme poverty line, whereas the incidence of extreme poverty for Argentina and Uruguay was just 0.2 percent, El Salvador was at the top end of the scale with an extreme poverty rate of 18 percent in 2002.[49] Some of the growth in GDP is the result of extraordinary levels of remittances from Salvadoran workers living overseas, which account for more than 10 percent of annual GDP, according to the World Bank.[50] Many Salvadoran children grow up with little contact with their fathers, because they can eke out a better salary by working overseas, usually in the US, than they can in El Salvador. Poverty and inequality are still high and there are large health and education gaps, and limited infrastructure in the poorest areas, which tend to be rural.[51]

ARENA has been a willing partner in streamlining itself with neoliberalism as pushed by the US. Traditionally ARENA has been made up of El Salvador's elites, so it has not been

---

[46] US Department of State, 'El Salvador Profile'.
[47] World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Assistance Evaluation'.
[48] Jose Silverio-Marques, 'Operationalising Pro-Poor Growth. A Country Case Study on El Salvador', Joint Initiative of AFD (GTZ, KFW Development Bank), Department for International Development and the World Bank, 2004, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/oppgelsalvador.pdf>
[49] United Nations Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 'Meeting the Millennium Poverty Reduction Targets in Latin America and the Caribbean', 2002, <http://www.undp.org/rblac/documents/poverty/mdg/MDGs-libro70.pdf>
[50] World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Assistance Evaluation'.
[51] Ibid.

contrary to the interests of the ruling party to follow the neoliberal model. Given the success of ARENA in securing the vote in every election since the end of the conflict, not least because of the assistance that civil society groups allied with ARENA have received from US government departments such as USAID, there has been no recourse by the US to coercive means to ensure that El Salvador keeps in step with neoliberalisation. El Salvador has come to represent the model of legitimation strategies that the US favours for the South, with similar liberalisation initiatives pursued by US government agencies in countries across the South, particularly in Central and Latin America, former Yugoslavia, and the former Soviet states of Eastern Europe.[52]

Repression: 1991-2001

Between 1991 and 2001, US foreign policy strategy in the South was dominated by legitimation efforts, as in El Salvador. Where legitimation efforts were deemed inadequate for achieving US objectives, the US was perfectly prepared to resort to repression. This involved covert use of repression that typified US interventions, often through allies, across the South during the Cold War, as I will show with reference to the case of Haiti. I will show that the US resorted to the covert use of repression in the early 1990s when legitimation efforts were deemed ineffective for achieving US objectives. I argue that it was reminiscent of US foreign policy strategies in the South during the Cold War, but that it was a rare case of such activity by the US in the South during the 1990s. I will then show, however, that since 9/11 there has been an increase in US repression of this kind, as well as of repressive strategies more broadly.

Haiti

When elections deemed to be free and fair by the UN were held in December 1990, the outcome was unsuitable both to Haitian and US elites.[53] The US therefore supported repression in order to ensure the neoliberalisation of Haiti. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, a Catholic priest and proponent of liberation theology, who campaigned on a radical agenda of social

---

[52] For a detailed account of liberal democracy promotion efforts by the US, considered by liberals to be successes as a result of USAID, State Department and NED efforts, see Larry Diamond, 'Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives', Carnegie Corporation, Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1995, <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/mb.htm> For specific country accounts, on Serbia see United States Institute of Peace, 'Whither the Bulldozer? Nonviolent Revolution and the Transition to Democracy in Serbia', 6 August 2001, <http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr72.html> On Guatemala, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and South Africa see International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 'Democracy and Deep Rooted Conflict', 1998, <http://www.idea.int/publications/democracy_and_deep_rooted_conflict/> See also the websites of the US Department of State <http://www.state.gov/>; USAID <http://www.usaid.gov/>; and NED <http://www.ned.org/> for details of democracy promotion initiatives in these regions.

[53] United Nations Support Mission in Haiti, 'Haiti: Background Summary', 1995, <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unmihbackgr1.html>

and economic reform, won with 67.5 percent in elections which were deemed by the UN Observer Group for the Verification of the Elections in Haiti to be "highly successful".[54] Aristide took up office in February 1991, but was overthrown in a coup in September that year led by Lieutenant-General Raoul Cédras, and supported by disaffected members of the army and the country's economic elite.[55] It is unclear whether the US was directly involved in the coup. Emmnuel Constant, former leader of the FRAPH, (Front for the Advancement and Progress of Haiti), an organisation that had been formed from right-wing political and paramilitary organisations by Constant in 1986, appeared on the *60 Minutes* programme on 3 December 1995 and claimed that he and others involved in the coup, had been employed by the CIA shortly afterwards and that he had received $700 per month in cash from the CIA station chief in Port-au-Prince. He had been kept on the payroll until just before the US invasion in October 1994. This was confirmed by the CIA.[56] It later transpired that the FRAPH had been formed at the suggestion of the CIA and Defence Intelligence Agency, to "balance the Aristide movement" and conduct intelligence against it.[57]

It is not clear whether there was any direct encouragement or support from the CIA or any other US government organ for the coup. Haitian army documents on the subject remain in the possession of the US government, after they were seized when US troops entered Haiti in 1994, according to HRW, who stated:

> Washington has said that it will only return the materials once US citizens names have been deleted … The US government has maintained that US citizens' names and identifying information must be deleted from the materials before they are returned to Haitian custody.[58]

This does raise suspicion that the US government is attempting to cover up US complicity in the coup, as well as in human rights abuses linked to the FRAPH.[59] Regardless of US involvement, the position adopted by the US following the coup was to contribute to further human rights violations in Haiti.

Both the Bush and Clinton administrations publicly condemned the coup, and liberal scholars such as John Ballard insist that the OAS and US were "drawn to Aristide's defence because

---

[54] Ibid.
[55] UN, 'Haiti: Background Summary'; and US Department of State, 'Haiti: Background Profile', 2005, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/1982.htm>
[56] New York Times, 'Haitian Ex-Paramilitary Leader Confirms CIA Relationship', *New York Times*, 3 December 1995, pp.8-9. See also Alan Nairn, 'Haiti Under the Gun: How US Intelligence Has Been Exercising Crowd Control', *The Nation*, 8 January 1996, pp.11-15; Alan Nairn, 'Our Man in FRAPH: Behind Haiti's Paramilitaries', *The Nation* 1994, pp.458-461; New York Times, 'The CIA and Haiti,' *New York Times*, 8 December 1995, <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/43a/187.html>; and 'CIA Formed Haitian Unit Later Tied to Narcotics Trade', *New York Times*, 14 November 1993, p.1.
[57] Nairn, 'Our Man in FRAPH'.
[58] HRW, 'US Government Must Return Seized Haitian Documents. Deportation of Haitian Death Squad Leader Urged', 1999, <http://www.hrw.org/english/docs/1999/09/16/haiti1641_txt.htm>
[59] Ibid.

of their support for democratically elected leaders, regardless of their political records."[60] He asserts that the US immediately pledged to return Aristide from exile.[61] Aristide was returned to office in 1994, after authorisation was secured on 31 July 19994, under UN Security Council Resolution 940, for a US-led multinational force to invade Haiti and reinstate Aristide.[62] As the 20,000-strong force began deploying in the months that followed, former US President Jimmy Carter led negotiations with the military leaders in Haiti, which resulted in the resignation of General Cédras and Aristide's return to office on 15 October.[63] The delay between the coup and Aristide's reinstatement provided the US with the opportunity to successfully refashion Aristide according to its neoliberal agenda. Aristide's policies were out of step with the free market model that the US intended for Haiti because he resisted privatisation of public services; called for reform of the agricultural sector with an emphasis on production for the domestic market rather than for export; advocated increased wages and production, rather than the low-wage strategy of USAID; and called for regional and South-South economic and political relations as an alternative way to increase Haiti's autonomy and counteract US dominance.[64] At the same time, as the refugee crisis worsened and the plight of Haitians under the military government was publicised, a legitimation strategy was gaining greater currency for the realisation of US interests.

From 1991 to 1994 the Bush and Clinton administrations sought to persuade Aristide to accept various conditions that would water down his radical agenda in return for his reinstatement. This included granting a general amnesty for the coup leaders.[65] It also involved forming a broad-based government that included representatives from the elite that opposed Aristide and supported the coup against him; accepting the neoliberal agenda developed by USAID and the international financial institutions; agreeing to hold new presidential elections in 1995 without insisting on reclaiming the years lost from his five-year term following the coup.[66] The US also imposed an embargo while calling for a return to democracy, although US corporations were exempt from this until the last few months before the 1994 invasion by US troops.[67]

---

[60] John Ballard, *Upholding Democracy. The United States Military Campaign in Haiti, 1994-1997*, (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1998), p.50.
[61] Ibid.
[62] United Nations Security Council, 'Resolution 940 (1994)', 31 July 1994, <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N94/312/22/PDF/N9431222.pdf?OpenElement>
[63] United Nations, 'Haiti: Background Summary', United Nations Support Mission in Haiti, 1995, <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unmihbackgr1.html>
[64] Alex Dupuy, *Haiti in the New World Order*, (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1997), pp.102-103.
[65] Ibid. p.138.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid. pp.138-139; and Clara James, 'Haiti: The Roof is Leaking', *Z Magazine*, 1997, <http://www.zmag.org/ZMag/articles/june97james.htm>

HRW and the Haitian Coalition for Refugees were highly critical of US policy, because human rights violations were ignored and those behind the repression would enjoy immunity under the US demand for amnesty for those involved in the coup:

> The Clinton administration deliberately ignored the issue of human rights […] As could be predicted, the amnesty proved to be a serious point of contention between Aristide and the de facto leaders. But instead of siding with Aristide in a public unequivocal way, the Administration consistently refused to state publicly its position on which crimes should be included in the amnesty.[68]

So while the US was busy in its efforts to mould Aristide into its neoliberal image, human rights violations escalated, with little deterrent for the perpetrators, given the impunity that it seemed likely they would enjoy. AI stated that the days following the coup were marked by violent repression, particularly in poor communities where support for Aristide had been strongest:

> Soldiers deliberately and indiscriminately opened fire into crowds, killing hundreds of people, including children. In one neighbourhood soldiers reportedly raided private homes and shot more than 30 unarmed people dead, then forced relatives and other local people to bury the bodies. Other human rights violations were widely reported, including torture and short-term arbitrary arrests without warrant, usually accompanied by several beatings.[69]

AI estimate that over 1,500 civilians were killed immediately following the coup, and that the number of arrests reported to AI exceeds 300. AI added that following the coup, an estimated 200,000 people were forced into hiding, several thousand left and more than 10,000 attempted to flee to the US. AI stated, "But these figures could substantially underestimate the extent of the human rights crisis," due to "problems in communications and the climate of fear and repression."[70] Indeed, by the time Aristide was reinstated in 1994, an estimated 4,000 people were killed, and 300,000 were internal refugees.[71] The US had not only turned a blind eye to the repression that ensued from the illegal coup, but was complicit because it gave a green light to the perpetrators by granting them immunity, in order that it could maximise on the opportunities afforded by the coup to ensure Aristide's acquiescence with its agenda.

US government agencies were heavily engaged in efforts to neutralise opposition to neoliberalism among the Haitian population through non-coercive means too. Aristide's return was to be accompanied by heavy involvement of USAID, the IMF and World Bank, with Aristide forced to accept significant reductions in state involvement in the economy, and the privatisation of public services, although as I will show, this did not actually improve

---

[68] HRW, *Terror Prevails in Haiti: Human Rights Violations and Failed Diplomacy* (Washington DC: HRW/Americas and the National Coalition for Haitian Refugees, 1994), p.35.
[69] Amnesty International, 'Haiti - The Human Rights Tragedy: Human Rights Violations Since the Coup', 1992, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/countries/haiti/document.do?id=CF1E58816376C148802...>
[70] Ibid.
[71] Dupuy, *Haiti*, p.139.

growth in Haiti, nor the lives of the majority of Haitians.[72] Involvement of these institutions dated back to the 1980s, when the IMF and US state worked together to neoliberalise Haitian finance. This included the establishment of a development bank and a mortgage bank to provide loans to encourage private industrial and housing projects, and the cutting of tariffs so that Haiti could become a market for US agricultural surpluses.[73] Throughout the 1970s there was a massive influx of transnational corporations into Haiti, with around 240 mainly US-based corporations specialising mainly in textiles, electronics, toys and sports goods, setting up in Port-au-Prince to take advantage of the plentiful supply of labour, as well as the minimum wage of US$3 per day and little trade union activity.[74] The simultaneous growth of agro-industries forced peasant farmers into the cities and provided a pool of cheap manual labour for textile and electronics companies.[75] By 1984 this meant that Haiti had become dependent on the US for 65% of its imports, and US companies dominated the Haitian export market, with the US taking the majority of Haitian goods.[76]

This growth in trade has not been matched by improvements in the lives of the majority of Haitians, even if US corporate elites have faired rather well. The World Bank reported in 2003 that 65 percent of the population live under the poverty line; life expectancy remains low at 53 years; under-five mortality stands at a rate of 123 per 1,000; half the population does not have access to clean drinking water and only 28 percent have access to decent sanitation; nearly half the population is illiterate; Haiti has the highest incidence of HIV/AIDS outside of sub-Saharan Africa, at five percent of the population; and 97 percent deforestation has occurred. As with El Salvador, Haiti relies on remittances from Haitians living overseas which make up 19 percent of GDP.[77] The World Bank reports that after growing at an average annual rate of 2.3 percent in real terms in the 1970s, real per capita GDP fell an average of 2.4 percent per year in the 1980s and continued to decline in the 1990s at an average annual rate of 2.6 percent.[78] Thus, the situation in Haiti was even more bleak than in El Salvador.

While growth has been falling in Haiti, US agencies such as NED and USAID, as well as international organisations, have continued to work among groups within Haiti to ensure that civil society is aligned with the neoliberal agenda, even though this is not actually showing

---

[72] James, 'Haiti: The Roof is Leaking'; and Blum, *Killing Hope*, p.382.
[73] Rod Prince, *Haiti Family Business*, (London: Latin American Bureau, 1985), pp.52-56.
[74] Ibid. pp.47-48.
[75] James, 'Haiti: The Roof is Leaking'.
[76] Prince, *Haiti Family Business*, p.51.
[77] World Bank, 'Haiti Country Overview', 2003, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/LACEXT/HAITIEXTN/0,,contentMDK:20226261~pagePK:141137~piPK:141127~theSitePK:338165,00.html>
[78] Ibid.

signs of benefiting the lives of the majority of Haitians.[79] Democracy promotion programmes under USAID and the NED focused on more conservative groups within civil society in order to marginalize and impede those who supported the radical policies of Aristide. USAID support pre-dated the coup, and emphasised development and humanitarian programmes.[80] Such support was accompanied by efforts to marginalize left-wing groups. The CIA were giving funding to the American Institute for Free Labour Development (AIFLD) to weaken the influence of the more radical union Centrale Autonomne des Travailleurs Haïtiens (CATH) which was pressing for wage increases from those US-owned companies which were still operating in Haiti.[81] In 1990 there was a marked increase in USAID funding for Haiti, when $13 million was poured in, through three programmes in 1990 and again in 1991: the Development of Democracy Project; the Elections Management and Assistance Project; and the Development of Civil Society Project. This was followed in 1991 by the four-year Democracy Enhancement Project, overseen by America's Development Foundation.[82] It tended to invest in groups that the NED had already been working with prior to the coup.[83]

NED funding favoured three conservative groups up until 1990. These were the International Institute for Research and Development (IHRED) which had been founded in 1986 with NED assistance; and the two conservative unions, FOS and the General Organisation of Haitian Workers (OGITH).[84] The IHRED helped form a loose association of anticommunist political leaders known as the Group of Ten, who headed a collection of political parties, none of which could claim much popular support, but which the NED and IHRED promoted as representative of the democratic movement in Haiti. They included Marc Bazin, a former World Bank official favoured by Washington.[85] According to Jean Geneus, Haiti's consul general, the aid given to FOS and OGITH was intended to "break CATH", the more radical trade union, a policy which he argued was successful, because in early 1990, a conservative wing was able to take over the leadership of CATH, with the backing of Bazin.[86]

Between 1990 and 2004 the NED website indicates that $2,681,700 has been invested in Haitian projects. The vast majority of this, 91 percent, came through organisations with an

---

[79] For a helpful analysis of the role of the OAS in democracy promotion in Haiti see Yasmine Shamsie, 'Building 'Low-Intensity' Democracy in Haiti: The OAS Contribution', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.25, no.2, (2004), pp.1097-1115.
[80] Beth Sims, 'Populism, Conservatism, and Civil Society in Haiti', Interhemispheric Resource Centre, 1992, reprinted March 2004, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/analysis/2004/0403ned-haiti.php>
[81] James Ferguson, *Papa Doc, Baby Doc. Haiti and the Duvaliers*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1987), p.137.
[82] Sims, 'Populism'.
[83] America's Development Foundation, 'America's Development Foundation Website', <http://www.adfusa.org/home.htm>; and USAID, 'Development Experience Clearing House: Haiti, Recent Reports on Democracy and Governance', <http://www.dec.org/country/more_display.cfm?country=Haiti&category=dg>
[84] Sims, 'Populism'.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid.

overtly neoliberal agenda, with the remaining nine percent channelled through a range of NGOs, many of which were based in Quebec.[87] Of the total, 25 percent ($667,404) was given to the Free trade Union Institute, now the American Centre for International Labour Solidarity.[88] The FTUI was no supporter of Aristide, and in its 1990-1991 report to the NED it stated:

> Aristide prepared to usher in his new order, a rhetorically extreme programme that seemed to be deliberately framed to strain relationships with many of Haiti's democratic friends.[89]

The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs received 24 percent, ($636,060), of the total, during the Clinton administration only;[90] the Centre for International Private Enterprise received 18 percent ($473,067);[91] the International Republican Institute received 16 percent ($430,531);[92] and the America's Development Foundation received 9 percent ($239,000).[93] This breakdown serves to demonstrate that in Haiti, as in El Salvador, democracy building initiatives favoured institutions with a strong neoliberal commitment, with few left-wing organisations receiving NED support.

The neoliberalisation of Haiti following the ousting of the Duvalier dynasty, did not go to plan for the US and its elite allies. This resulted in the coup against Aristide and repression of his supporters, with tacit support from the US. Whether or not the US was directly implicated in the coup, its delaying of the reinstatement of Aristide in order to persuade him to comply with their neoliberal agenda for Haiti exacerbated the repression in that country. This use of repression was accompanied by non-violent means of ensuring that Haiti would comply with neoliberalisation on Aristide's reinstatement. The case of Haiti was the exception rather than the norm in the decade following the Cold War, with El Salvador setting the precedent for democratisation and neoliberalisation through legitimation across the South. However, Haiti shows that repression was to remain a tool in US foreign policy strategy in the South where legitimation efforts fail to fulfil US objectives.

Legitimation and repression since 9/11

In the years since 9/11, the US has continued to promote democracy and neoliberalisation in the South, with increased investment in programmes through USAID and the NED. Indeed

---

[87] NED, 'Democracy Projects Database: Haiti'.
[88] Ibid. The percentages that I present are based on my own calculations using the information provided in the database.
[89] Sims, 'Populism'.
[90] See National Democratic Institute for International Affairs website, <http://www.ndi.org/>, accessed 10 May 2006.
[91] See Centre for International Private Enterprise website, <http://www.cipe.org/index.htm>, accessed 10 May 2006.
[92] See International Republican Institutes website, <http://www.iri.org/>, accessed 10 May 2006.
[93] NED, 'Democracy Projects Database: Haiti'.

US foreign policy rhetoric has continued to emphasise the promotion of democracy as a key tool in its "War on Terror". As discussed in chapter three, US neo-conservatives are determined to spread democracy and neoliberalism. While they favour legitimation strategies in the South, they are entirely committed to using armed coercion and regime change strategies, unilaterally if necessary, in order to bring about conditions in which neoliberalisation flourish. Since 9/11, while there have been increased efforts to spread democracy and neoliberalisation, there has also been a resurgence in repression, ostensibly in order to combat international terrorism and thwart imminent threats from weapons of mass destruction. This has involved increasing militarisation of the South, particularly Latin America. Although this is not necessarily synonymous with the actual use of armed force, it is a symptom of the neo-conservative commitment to the military sphere being prioritised over social and economic issues, and the increasing use of the Pentagon since 2001 to take on political roles previously performed by the Department of State and USAID. It has also included support for coups in Venezuela and again, in Haiti; the invasions and occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq; and efforts to justify the use of torture; as well as the rejection of international legal standards with regard to the detention of terror suspects. US actions in specific countries have been accompanied by repression against individuals from many countries who are supposed enemies of the US in the "War on Terror". I will briefly outline the ongoing emphasis on legitimation strategies in US foreign policy since 9/11, before discussing cases in which the US has resorted to repression where legitimation is deemed by the US to be ineffective. I will then briefly discuss the increasing efforts to militarise the South, and particularly Latin America. Finally, I will discuss the ways in which there has been a return to repression in the name of the "War on Terror."

Neoliberalisation and democracy promotion

Since 9/11, the Bush administration has continued to stress the need to promote democracy and neoliberalism in the South, and has consistently linked this objective to its fight against international terrorism, as illustrated in the National Security Strategy of 2002:

> We will actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world. The United States will stand beside any nation determined to build a better future by seeking the rewards of liberty for its people. Free trade and free markets have proven their ability to lift whole societies out of poverty—so the United States will work with individual nations, entire regions, and the entire global trading community to build a world that trades in freedom and therefore grows in prosperity.[94]

[94] President George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington DC: The White House, 2002), pp.iv-vi.

Organizations such as the NED continue to play an important role in this process, and have significantly increased their involvement since 2001.[95] The NED 2002 Strategy Report states that its core budget has grown over the last two years, and "is now supplemented by special funds for a number of regions or countries to which Congress or the Administration attaches particular importance."[96] The current priority of the NED is to focus its efforts in the Islamic world, which helps to account for the increase in projects in the Middle East. The Strategy Report states:

> Promoting democratic institutions and values in the Muslim world is thus one of the most urgent challenges now facing the NED […] The fact that NED already has a track record in the Middle East and a network of grantees and contacts upon which to build an expanded program there and in other Muslim regions is due entirely to its global approach, which assumes that no region where democrats are asking for help should be disregarded, no matter how difficult the challenges there might be. Moreover, as September 11 made clear, any seam of dysfunction in the international system, however marginal to the main centres of political and economic interest, can become a source of exposure and threat.[97]

US foreign policy since 9/11 then, has continued to emphasise the promotion of democracy and neoliberalisation, deemed essential for defeating terrorism.

Repression

Since 9/11, the use of repression by the US in the South has increased. This has involved the covert use of repression in Haiti and Venezuela where legitimation efforts failed to fulfil US objectives, as I will show. It has also involved increased support for military personnel in the South. This is discussed in relation to training in chapter seven, but I will briefly outline the efforts by the Pentagon to increase its influence and presence in Latin America, ostensibly to fight terrorism, but as already indicated, a consequence of the increasing use of the Pentagon to carry out political roles, which is a direct result of neo-conservative strategies to use military power in order to spread democracy and neoliberalism. I then show that the US has been involved in overt support for repression since 9/11, both through armed coercion in the invasions and occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq, and also through efforts to circumvent international law in the treatment of detainees in the "War on Terror".

Haiti

---

[95] The NED funded just 29 projects in Africa in 2001, but was funding 112 by 2003. It funded 56 projects in Asia in 2001, and 50 in 2003. 68 were funded in Central and Eastern Europe in 2001, and 70 were funded in 2003. In Latin America, 49 projects were funded in 2001, and 61 in 2003, and in the Middle East, 60 projects were funded in 2001, as compared with 105 in 2003. NED, 'Democracy Projects Database'.
[96] NED, 'Strategy Document', January 2002, <http://www.ned.org/publications/documents/strategy2002.html>
[97] Ibid.

President Aristide's Lavalas party won the parliamentary and local elections with 15 of the 19 contested seats in the Senate, in May 2000, although the results were challenged by election observers from the OAS, who were concerned about irregularities in the polling and calculations when counting the votes.[98] Aid donors threatened to continue withholding $500 million in aid if the government failed to reach an agreement with the opposition.[99] Following this, political groups opposed to Aristide's party formed a coalition with support from USAID's "Democracy Enhancement" programme, the purpose of which is to "fund those sectors of the Haitian political spectrum where opposition to the Aristide government could be encouraged," and the funding for which comes from the International Republican Institutes, a close neocon ally and a key NED partner.[100] In November 2000 further presidential elections were held, with Aristide, the only candidate, winning 91.5 percent of the vote, and with an estimated turnout of 61 percent.[101]

In 2004, Louis-Jodel Chamblain and Guy Philippe, both known abusers of human rights that had been involved in the 1991 coup, [102] were behind a second coup to overthrow Aristide. They began by taking cities in the North and were advancing on Port-au-Prince by 4 February.[103] Within days, US Representative Barbara Lee wrote to Secretary of State Colin Powell:

> I must say, Mr. Secretary, that our failure to support the democratic process and help restore order looks like a covert effort to overthrow a government. There is a violent coup d'état in the making, and it appears that the United States is aiding and abetting the attempt to violently topple the Aristide Government. With all due respect, this looks like "regime change."[104]

It is clear, therefore, that politicians in the US had knowledge of US support for these anti-democratic acts in Haiti. There are conflicting accounts of what followed. Aristide, who had been cooperating with Cuba and Venezuela in trade agreements,[105] maintains that he was taken at gunpoint along with his wife and brother-in-law to a US commercial jet and flown, without knowledge of his destination, into exile in the Central African Republic. He states

---

[98] HRW, 'Haiti's Tarnished Election Results', 2000, <http://www.haiti-info.com/article.php3?id_article=54>; and OAS, 'The OAS Electoral Observation Mission in Haiti: Chief of Mission Report to the OAS Permanent Council', 13 July 2000, <http://www.upd.oas.org/EOM/Haiti/haitichief%20of%20mission%20report.htm>
[99] Associated Press, 'Clinton Urges Aristide to Resolve Haiti's Electoral Impasse,' 7 December 2000, <http://archives.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/americas/12/07/haiti.clinton.ap/>
[100] Derek Mitchell, 'The 2004 Removal of Jean-Bertrand Aristide', *Centre for Cooperative Research*, 2005, <http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/timeline.jsp?timeline=the_2004_removal_of_jean-bertrand_aristide&startpos=100>
[101] Ibid.
[102] Amnesty International, 'AI Press Release. Haiti: Convicted Human Rights Violators Must Not be Allowed to Take Power', 3 March 2004, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR360142004?open&of=ENG-HTI>; and Mitchell, 'The 2004 Removal of Jean-Bertrand Aristide'.
[103] Paisley Dodds, 'Convicted Assasin Gets Role in Haiti,' *Associated Press*, 3 March 2004, <http://www.independent-media.tv/item.cfm?fmedia_id=6014&fcategory_desc=Haiti>
[104] Barbara Lee, 'Letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell', 11 February 2004, <http://www.haitiaction.net/News/bl2_24_4.html> A further letter to the same effect was sent days later to Colin Powell by Representative Maxine Walters, see Maxine Waters, 'Letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell', 13 February 2004, <http://www.haitiaction.net/News/mw2_13_4.html>
[105] Mitchell, 'The 2004 Removal of Jean-Bertrand Aristide'.

that he was warned by US diplomat Luis Moreno that if he did not leave, thousands of Haitians were likely to die and Philippe would attack the presidential palace and kill him. Aristide maintains that this was a US-supported coup d'état. The US government insists that Aristide voluntarily went into exile, following advice from US ambassador Foley that the Bush administration could ensure his safe departure if he choose to resign, and that this was what the administration thought he should do. Moreno maintains that Aristide also handed over a letter of resignation and that Aristide left willingly. Aristide's concierge disputes the US's account, however, and states that US soldiers took Aristide at gunpoint and that he did not want to leave.[106] Pro-Aristide Haitians, following the coup, were victims of violence and murder at the hands of those responsible for the coup and the armed gangs associated with them. AI reported that the Catholic Church's Justice and Peace Commission documented some 300 cases of killings in Port-au-Prince alone.[107]

The truth of the Bush administration's role in Aristide's overthrow and exile in 2004 may not be known for some time. However, the US was slow to act to prevent those rebels from launching their coup, which culminated in Aristide's exit from office, and repression of his supporters. At the very least the US turned a blind eye to the actions of those rebels, and at worst, was directly involved.

Venezuela

Venezuela has also experienced covert and overt US interference in its democratic process, including being implicated in a coup in 2002 to overthrow democratically-elected leader, Hugo Chavez. Since coming to power, Chavez has undertaken a series of reforms that included the expropriation of private farm and corporate land that is not being used, for redistribution among the Venezuelan people.[108] The strategic and material importance of Venezuela to the US must be acknowledged, because they help to explain US involvement in the Venezuelan coup of 2002. In a written statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee in September 2000, Lieutenant General Peter Pace from Southern Command outlined the importance of Venezuelan oil to the US:

---

[106] Mitchell, 'The 2004 Removal of Jean-Bertrand Aristide'.
[107] Amnesty International, 'Haiti: Breaking the Cycle of Violence: A Last Chance for Haiti', 21 June 2004, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR360382004>
[108] Joe Grim-Feinberg, 'The Bolivarian Revolution', *ZNet*, 2 January 2006, <http://www.zmag.org/ZNETTOPnoanimation.html>

> A common misperception is that the US is completely dependent upon the Middle East for our nation's petroleum needs. However, our largest supplier of petroleum is actually Venezuela – a country that provides from 15-19 percent of our imported oil in any given month.[109]

Pace went on to stress the need to preserve pro-US governments in Latin America, "so as to provide stability for access to markets in the US SOUTHCOM AOR [Area of Responsibility], which is critical to the continued economic expansion and prosperity of the US."[110]

The coup which took place in Venezuela in 2002 was short-lived, with Chavez returned to power within 48 hours, but while it is not possible to prove at this stage whether the US engineered it, there was overt approval, as confirmed by the comments of George Folson, president of the International Republican Institute the day after the coup:

> Last night, led by every sector of civil society, the Venezuelan people rose up to defend democracy in their country. Venezuelans were provoked into action as a result of systematic repression by the Government of Hugo Chavez.[111]

This reflected the Bush administration's position – that Chavez is undemocratic. OAS sources indicated that the Bush administration had sanctioned the coup:

> The failed coup in Venezuela was closely tied to senior officials in the US government […] Now officials at the Organisation of American States and other diplomatic sources, talking to The Observer, assert that the US administration was not only aware the coup was about to take place, but had sanctioned it, presuming it to be destined for success.[112]

While the coup did not culminate in the same levels of violence and repression that were unleashed in Haiti, *The Observer* reports that 100 people were killed in the events surrounding the coup.[113] CIA documents have surfaced that show the CIA and other senior US officials had prior knowledge of the coup but did not warn Chavez in advance, an indication of US support for the coup.[114] While the documents show that US officials knew the coup was coming, and may also imply tacit approval, they do not constitute definitive proof that the US was directly involved.[115] Nevertheless, that the US approved of the coup is clear.

---

[109] Peter Pace, 'Written Statement by Lieutenant General Peter Pace to the Senate Armed Services Committee', United States Senate, 6 September 2000, <http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2000/000906pp.pdf>
[110] Ibid.
[111] George Folsom, 'IRI President Folsom Praises Venezuelan Civil Society's Defense of Democracy', *PR Newswire*, 12 April 2002, <http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=PRNI2&STORY=/www/story/04-12-2002/0001705053&EDATE=>
[112] Ed Vulliamy, 'Venezuela Coup Linked to Bush Team,' *The Observer*, 21 April 2002, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,6903,688071,00.html>
[113] Ibid.
[114] Bart Jones and Letta Tayler, 'US Aware of Venezuela Coup Plot in '02, CIA Documents Show,' *The Seattle Times*, 24 November 2004, <http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2002099262_venezuela24.html>
[115] Ibid.

Part of the US response following the coup has been to increase its democratisation and neoliberalisation programmes through partners such as the NED:

> NED has increased its funding over the past two years for programs in Venezuela that help groups defend basic democratic rights. The objective of the NED's programs in Venezuela, as in all such countries where democratic rights are threatened, has been and remains to support groups and individuals struggling to strengthen democratic processes, rights, and values, irrespective of their political or partisan affiliations.[116]

This suggestion that democracy is under threat in Venezuela is undermined by the observation mission undertaken by the Carter Centre under former US President Jimmy Carter, which declared that in the 2004 elections "the official results reflect the will of the Venezuelan electorate as expressed on August 15, 2004."[117] Yet the US continues to make the same claims. Following the expulsion of a US naval attaché from Venezuela in early February, 2006, the US expelled a Venezuelan diplomat from the US just days later. State Department spokesperson, Sean McCormack argued that Venezuela was being governed by President Hugo Chavez "in a non-democratic way."[118] This echoed previous remarks made by Donald Rumsfled, speaking at a National Press Club meeting two days before, who stated: "I mean we've got Chavez in Venezuela with a lot of oil money. He's a person who was elected legally – just as Adolf Hitler was elected legally – and then consolidated power and now is of course, working closely with Fidel Castro and Mr Morales and others."[119] The cases of Haiti and Venezuela are indicative of US interference in states in the South in which the leaders of those states are not compliant with neoliberalisation.

Militarisation of the South

The US has been seeking to further its military presence in Latin America by establishing military bases, and by attempting in 2004 to have all Latin American military activities coordinated through US Southern Command, under the dubious pretext of curtailing the activities of narco-terrorists and criminal gangs, which Pentagon officials have claimed are linking up with Al Qa'ida operatives in what is known as the tri-border region of Brazil,

---

[116] NED, 'National Endowment for Democracy Venezuela Programme Frequently Asked Questions', <http://www.ned.org/grants/venezuelaFacts.html>

[117] The Carter Centre, 'Executive Summary of Comprehansive Report', 30 September 2004, <http://www.cartercenter.org/documents/1837.pdf>

[118] Bradley Graham, 'Venezuelan Embassy Official Expelled', *The Washington Post*, 4 February 2006, p.A13.<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/03/AR2006020301858.html>

[119] Graham, 'Venezuelan Embassy Official Expelled'. Evo Morales is the recently elected President of Bolivia, and head of the Movimiento al Socialismo (Movement Toward Socialism) party. He is Latin America's first indigenous president, unpopular with the US because of his programme for reform which includes the re-nationalisation of oil and gas reserves, previously owned by multinational corporations. This will impact upon the interests of international and US capital. See Stewart Bailey and Alex Emery, 'Bolivia to Seize Oil and Gas Reserves, President-Elect Says', *Bloomberg News* (The Washington Post Company), 12 January 2006, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/01/11/AR2006011102212.html>

Paraguay and Argentina.[120] There is little evidence of any such links, and even the State Department has admitted as much, saying that there is no "credible information" confirming that Al Qa'ida is operating in the region.[121] Southern Command chief Brantz Craddock also admits that the Pentagon has "not detected Islamic terrorist cells anywhere in Latin America."[122] The region's military leaders reject both US practices and the pretext, with some of them, including Brazil's José Alencar and Chile's defence minister, refusing to accept that terrorism, or even narco-terrorism are the number one problems of the region, and arguing that poverty, and failed neoliberalisation are what have caused instability in Latin America. Even though the Pentagon acknowledges that "free market reform and privatisation of the 1990s have not delivered on the promise of prosperity", as stated in Southern Command's most recent annual review, their response has been, as Greg Grandin argues, to position the Department of Defense as "globalisation's Praetorian Guard, making the opening up of markets across Latin America a central objective of its mission."[123] As a consequence, whereas the Pentagon had a relatively small presence in Latin America during the Cold War, usually operating through its allies, as shown in chapters four and five, it is now increasingly the Pentagon and not the State Department that sets policy and undertakes diplomacy in Latin America.

Southern Command now has a staff of 1,400 and a budget of $800 million, which is more that the combined budgets of the State Department, the Treasury, Commerce and Agriculture for the region.[124] Some clue as to the purpose of these efforts to increase the US military presence in the region is given in the Pentagon's reference to establish "dominion" over "ungoverned spaces", including boundary areas such as the tri-border region, but also poor city areas where gangs operate, rural areas where civil institutions are weak and waterways and coastlines where illegal trafficking takes place.[125] And while some Latin American leaders are resisting this, Paraguay has proved a willing partner, inviting the Pentagon to undertake bilateral military exercises on Paraguayan soil, and engaging with the US on plans to expand the US-built Mariscal Estigarribia air base in northern Paraguay.[126]

Invasion and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq

---

[120] Greg Grandin, 'The Wide War - How Donald Rumsfeld Discovered the Wild West in Latin America', Tomdispatch.com, 7 May 2006, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/printer_050806L.shtml>
[121] Ibid.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Ibid.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Charlotte Eimer, 'Spotlight on US Troops in Paraguay', *BBC Online*, 28 September 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4289224.stm>; and Grandin, 'The Wide War'.

As well as engaging in increasing its presence in the South, the US has been directly involved in repression through the invasions and occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq. The war on Afghanistan in response to 9/11 was to prove devastating for the Afghan people, not simply because of the deaths and suffering caused, but because of the inability of the US to stabilise society and establish credible democratic institutions.[127] A key element of the war was the use of anti-Taliban forces, and particularly former Mujahidin Northern Alliance groups, to work on the ground to wipe out Taliban militia. This meant that the US, as Paul Rogers argues, "took sides in a long-running civil war, supporting a range of groups that themselves had an appalling human rights record before the Taliban had progressively taken power."[128] Civilian casualties in the initial three months may have exceeded 3,000. Cluster bombs were used widely, killing and injuring many local people as a result of accidental detonation of unexploded cluster bombs.[129] A significant consequence of this strategy was the withdrawal and going into hiding of many Taliban troops, and the flooding of the country with arms from Russia as the Northern Alliance advanced.[130]

This has had significant consequences for Afghanistan's stability. By the end of 2003, the economy was in ruins and the main source of income was the heroin trade. Mujahidin warlords control the state and reconstruction has been limited because of corruption, despite the US pouring in millions of dollars.[131] HRW states that many Afghans live in fear of violence and that women have particularly suffered.[132] The outcome for the US in terms of its foreign policy objectives has been much more favourable than the outcome for the Afghan population. As Rogers notes, the US, as a result of the war, has been able to extend its military presence significantly into Central Asia, with bases not just in Afghanistan, but also in Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan.[133] This serves neo-conservative aims to ensure military reach and pre-eminence well.

The US-led invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003 was a facet of neo-conservative designs on the Middle East region, where it was intended that the US would rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein's regime, considered, as Herring and Rangwala note, "a long-term threat to both US dominance in the Gulf area and to Israel, prized as the model democracy in an undemocratic

---

[127] Roger Burbach and Jim Tarbell, *Imperial Overstretch. George W Bush and the Hubris of Empire*, (London: Zed Books, 2004), p.203.
[128] Paul Rogers, *Losing Control. Global Security in the 21st Century*, Second Edition, (London: Pluto Press, 2002), p.143.
[129] Ibid. p.144.
[130] Ibid. p.144.
[131] Burbach and Tarbell, *Imperial Overstretch*, pp.203-206.
[132] HRW, 'Afghanistan: Civilian Life Must be Donor Priority', 30 January 2006, <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/01/30/afghan12554.htm>
[133] Rogers, *Losing Control*, p.145.

region."[134] This goal was most explicitly articulated in a strategy document produced by the neo-conservative think-tank, the Project for the New American Century in 2000:

> [T]he United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein.[135]

That permanent role includes securing the region for the spread of neoliberalism. A number of scholars including William Robinson, David Harvey, Roger Burbach and Jim Tarbell, have demonstrated that invasion and occupation was also intended to further the interests of US-supported capitalist elites. They show the invasion of Iraq to have been for the purposes of establishing a neoliberal democratic state in the Middle East that would lend itself to the expansion of US-supported capital in the region, would secure US access to oil, and would help to transform much of the Middle East along the same lines.[136] The invasion and occupation of Iraq is an example of the push among the neo-conservatives to use regime change in its strategies to establish democracy and neoliberalisation and maintain US primacy. This, as Herring and Rangwala, has not succeeded and has resulted in the fragmentation rather than the stabilisation of the Iraqi state.[137]

The costs to the people of Iraq have been catastrophic, with the medical journal *The Lancet* estimating that 100,000 deaths have occurred since the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003, beyond what would otherwise have been expected.[138] The extensive damage to the infrastructure, which was already in a poor state following the 1991 Gulf War and subsequent decade of economic sanctions also further exacerbated the suffering of Iraqi civilians. There has been a catalogue of abuses against Iraqi civilians by occupation forces, covered in detail elsewhere, but in brief, these have included the abuse and torture of prisoners at the Abu Ghraib prison and in other detention facilities.[139] It also included the assault against Fallujah where civilians remained alongside the insurgents that were said to be the target of the attack, with many hundreds killed.[140] The US also used weapons including white phosphorous in

---

[134] Eric Herring and Glen Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments: The Occupation and its Legacy*, (London: C. Hurst and Co, 2006).
[135] Project for the New American Century, 'Rebuilding America's Defences: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century', September 2000, p.14. <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>
[136] Burbach and Tarbell, *Imperial Overstretch*, pp.149-171; David Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp.1-25 and 87-182; and William Robinson, 'What to Expect from US "Democracy Promotion" in Iraq', *New Political Science*, vol.26, no.3, (2004), pp.441-447.
[137] Herring and Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments.*
[138] Les Roberts et al., 'Mortality Before and After the 2003 Invasion of Iraq: Cluster Sample Survey', *The Lancet*, 2004, <http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140673604174412/abstract>
[139] See Seymour Hersh, *Chain of Command. The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*, (London: Penguin Books, 2004),
[140] Herring and Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments.*

Fallujah, and given the numbers of civilians that remained, it is likely that they were affected. It is a violation of international law to target civilians with white phosphorous.[141]

Torture

Further indications of US support for repression by the US in the "War on Terror" are the efforts to legitimise torture against individual suspects, undermining US claims to uphold international law. This has also been through attempts to re-define torture; the detention of terror suspects in facilities such as Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, where alleged abuses have occurred and where human rights monitoring groups such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) have been denied access or granted only limited access; the detention of suspects in secret prisons; and the policy of extraordinary rendition.[142] This policy, headed by the US but implicating numerous allies, involves the transfer of suspects to third party states where torture is commonplace.[143] Fourteen EU states have been involved in US rendition programmes, at least by knowing what was going on, and in the case of the UK, by handing over information about its residents and former residents that has allegedly led to renditions and torture; in the cases of the UK, Ireland, Portugal and Greece, by providing stopovers for CIA aeroplanes; in the cases of Spain, Turkey, Germany and Cyprus, by providing staging posts for rendition operations; in the cases of Italy, Sweden, Bosnia and Macedonia, by allowing the rendition of their citizens; and in the cases of Poland and Romania, by allegedly allowing the US to run secret prisons on their territory.[144] Thus elites in numerous EU states, the US, and states in the South to which terror suspects are rendered, are tied together by a common cause which transcends state boundaries.

---

[141] Andrew Buncombe and Solomon Hughes, 'The fog of war: white phosphorus, Fallujah and some burning questions', *The Independent*, 15 November 2005, <http://news.independent.co.uk/world/americas/article327094.ece>

[142] On attempts to redefine torture see Jay Bybee, 'Memorandum for Alberto R Gonzales, Counsel to the President. Re: Standards of Conduct for Interrogation under 18 USC 2340-2340A (US Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel)', in Karen Greenberg and Joshua Dratel, (eds.), *The Torture Papers. The Road to Abu Ghraib*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1 August 2002), pp.172-214. On access by the ICRC to facilities such as Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib see Hersh, *Chain of Command*, and on secret prisons see Dana Priest, 'CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons,' *The Washington Post*, 2 November 2005, p.A01,<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644_pf.html> On the policy of extraordinary rendition see Jane Mayer, 'Outsourcing Torture. The Secret History of America's 'Extraordinary Rendition' Programme', *The New Yorker*, 2005, <http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050214fa_fact6>; Dana Priest, 'Jet is an Open Secret in Terror War', *Washington Post*, 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27826-2004Dec26.html>

[143] Hersh, *Chain of Command*; Jane Mayer, 'Outsourcing Torture. The Secret History of America's 'Extraordinary Rendition' Programme', 7 February 2005, <http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050214fa_fact6>; Dana Priest, 'CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons', *Washington Post*, 2 November 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644_pf.html>; and 'Jet is an Open Secret in Terror War', *Washington Post*, 27 December 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27826-2004Dec26.html>

[144] Stephen Grey and Ian Cobain, 'From Logistics to Turning a Blind Eye: Europe's Role in Terror Abductions', *The Guardian*, 7 June 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/usa/story/0,,1791991,00.html>

As outlined in chapter three, senior US officials have made the ticking terrorist argument to justify torture in the "War on Terror". It has also been the basis for efforts to re-define torture so that only the most extreme forms of physical pain be defined as such.[145] In a memo from the US Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, sent to Alberto Gonzales, counsel to the President in 2002, Jay Bybee advised that torture may be justified to prevent terrorist attacks:

> In the current circumstances, however, an enemy combatant in detention does not himself present a threat of harm […] Nonetheless, leading scholarly commentators believe that interrogation of such individuals using methods that might violate Section 2340A [of title 18 of the US Code, which implements the UN's Convention Against Torture] would be justified under the doctrine of self-defence [...] If hurting him is the only means to prevent the death or injury of others put at risk by his actions, such torture should be permissible, and on the same basis that self-defence is permissible."[146]

It is simply assumed torture might be successful in preventing terrorism. Following criticism of the Bybee memo, however, the Department of Justice issued a new memo in December 2004, stating that it "supersedes the August 2002 memo in its entirety," and that, "Torture is abhorrent both to American law and values and to international norms."[147] While the new memo did not directly address the earlier conclusions that torture might be justified on self-defence grounds, this declaration is clear that the US state officially prohibits torture.

Such arguments have also been invoked in defence of detention facilities such as Guantanamo Bay in the "War on Terror". Those detained are portrayed as having information about ticking terrorists, terrorist networks and potential threats that must be mined through interrogation, or "enhanced interrogation techniques" – the latest euphemism for interrogation involving torture.[148] Such techniques were recommended for use in 2003 by a working group headed by Donald Rumsfeld, including hooding; dietary and environmental manipulation, including extremes of temperature; the adjustment of sleeping times; threat of transfer to a country that the detainee is likely to fear would subject them to torture or death; forced shaving of hair or beard; prolonged standing; sleep deprivation; forced nudity; increasing anxiety through the presence of a dog without directly threatening action.[149] Threats of torture are a form of mental torture which is prohibited under Article 75 of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions.[150]

---

[145] Bybee, 'Memorandum for Alberto R Gonzales', pp.172-214.
[146] Ibid. p.211.
[147] Daniel Levin, 'Memorandum for James B. Comey, Deputy Attorney General, from Daniel Levin, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Re: Legal Standards Applicable Under 18 USC, 2340-2340A', Office of Legal Counsel, US Department of Justice, 30 December 2004, <http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/dagmemo.pdf>
[148] Agence France-Presse, 'White House Declines to Totally Rule Out Torture', 13 November 2005, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/usattackstorture>
[149] Donald Rumsfeld, *Working Group Report on Detainee Interrogations in the Global War on Terrorism: Assessment of Legal, Historical, Policy and Operational Considerations*, (Washington DC: Office of the Secretary of Defence, 4 April 2003), pp.341-344.
[150] International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I)', 8 June 1977,

Conclusion

Whereas during the Cold War US foreign policy strategy was broadly characterised by support for and use of repression, since the end of the Cold War there has been a shift in US foreign policy strategy, with a much greater emphasis on legitimation in order to establish neoliberalism in the South, often by promoting democracy. The purposes of US foreign policy, however, remain unchanged. US foreign policy continues to be geared towards maintaining dominance in the international system, and to ensuring that the South is secured for US strategic interests and for the expansion of US capital. In the post-Cold War world the most efficient way for the US to achieve these goals is through the reproduction of the global capitalist system in the South, which is intended to open it up to US capital, and thereby international capital, and to ensure that states in the South operate in partnership, rather than in opposition to, US strategic interests. In order to achieve this, the US has established a complex global network of programmes and institutions which are intended to assist states in the South in their transition to democracy and in their trade liberalisation through legitimation. The cases of El Salvador and Haiti show that despite the benefits to US and international capital from the neoliberalisation of the economies of Southern states, the benefits to the majority of people in those states have been overplayed, with many still suffering from extremely poor living conditions. And where US efforts at neoliberalisation fail, and where parties and politicians who propose reforms which would benefit more of the poor are elected in those states, the US is willing to revert to repression to ensure that such states fall into line with US strategic and capitalist interests. Interventions of this kind in Haiti and Venezuela are reminiscent of the repressive means that characterised US foreign policy strategy throughout the Cold War.

US efforts to promote neoliberalism in the South have intensified since the attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon, but use of repression, while not the dominant strategy since the Cold War, has also increased since 9/11. This is primarily because of neo-conservative policies of establishing democracy and neoliberalism in the South, by whatever means, including armed coercion in the form of regime change. The invasions and occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq have had disastrous consequences for the human rights of the citizens of those states. The US has also sought to increase the influence and presence of the US military in the South, particularly in Latin America, again as part of the neo-conservative objective of ensuring military pre-eminence and guaranteeing US strategic and

---

<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/f6c8b9fee14a77fdc125641e0052b079?OpenDocument>

material interests. The US has also engaged in covert support for coups, as in Haiti and Venezuela, and has engaged in and condoned activities which violate international law and the liberal norms it claims to uphold, including torture. Even though torture has been shown to be often unreliable as a method for acquiring intelligence, its use has been justified by senior administration officials on intelligence grounds. Meanwhile, the dominant foreign policy discourses continue to emphasise democracy promotion, freedom, liberty and respect for human rights, with little mention of the other key feature of US foreign policy, which is to open the South up to US capital. Remarkably, even repressive activities such as torture and extraordinary rendition are presented as being a necessary part of US efforts to establish liberal democracy and human rights. The next chapter outlines the impact that the shifts in US foreign policy strategy since the end of the Cold War have had on US training of military forces from the South, and in turn, the degree to which the training has shaped US foreign policy strategy.

CHAPTER SEVEN: US FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING SINCE THE COLD WAR

This chapter explores the degree to which US training of military forces from the South reflected wider strategies for achieving US foreign policy goals following the Cold War, looking first at WHINSEC, and then the rest of the training. US foreign policy strategy in the South following the Cold War was broadly characterised by legitimation in order to secure popular endorsement for neoliberalism, often through democracy promotion. This contrasts with the Cold War, during which US foreign policy strategies were characterised by repression, contributing to widespread human rights violations, often at the hands of US allies.

SOA was re-launched as WHINSEC in 2001, following massive public protest by SOA Watch (SOAW). SOAW argue that the re-launch was purely cosmetic, that WHINSEC continues to pose a threat to human rights, and that it should be closed. Since the re-launch, there has been no detailed research to assess WHINSEC training.[1] I will first explore the nature, purposes and intended outcomes of WHINSEC training, in relation to repression and human rights. Based on interviews with Department of Defense personnel, and a two-month period of observation and interviewing at WHINSEC, I will show that genuine and positive changes have taken place. I will discuss the validity of SOAW claims that WHINSEC continues to promote torture, and the implications this has for the future of the campaign. I will then assess the training beyond WHINSEC both for domestic and non-US forces, and will show that consistent with shifts in US foreign policy since 9/11, which has been marked by a resurgence in repression, the training is secretive, and has been offered to states with appalling human rights records.

Extent of the training

Details of more than half of all US training for foreign military personnel are classified, because there is no requirement for information about training purchased by other states, as opposed to training which the US pays for, to be made publicly available. In 2004 the US provided training to overseas personnel at a total value of $411 million, training approximately 50,000 foreign military personnel from 152 countries in 40,750 different

[1] Amnesty International's research on the extent of US training of foreign military personnel included a brief section which commented on the improved transparency and introduction of human rights training at WHINSEC. See 'Unmatched Power, Unmet Principles: The Human Rights Dimensions of US Training of Foreign Military and Police Forces', Amnesty International, 2002, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/stoptorture/msp.pdf>

training events.[2] Of this, over half, 52 percent, was paid for by the recipient countries through the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) programme, at a total value of $215 million.[3] There is no evidence available that such training contains any human rights content.

Of the remaining 48 percent of the training, only half comes under IMET, which is funded by the State Department and subject to detailed Congressional oversight, and which, by law, should not be given to states with poor human rights records. Under IMET 11,823 foreigners were trained in 2004, just 24 percent of the total number trained during that period, at a value of $91.2 million, just 23 percent of the total value of all US foreign military training.[4] The remaining $104.8 million of training is split between other State Department-funded and Defence Department programmes.[5] Limited details about each of these initiatives, including the numbers of students trained, their countries of origin, and the training initiative in which they took part, as well as the costs, are outlined in the *Foreign Military Training and Department of Defense Engagement Activities of Interest Joint Report to Congress* (henceforth FMTR) in Volume I, Part IV, except for those initiatives which are classified and contained in Volumes II and III of the report.[6]

A review of the FMTR indicates how extensive and varied the training is beyond IMET. The *Description of Programmes* shows that the training extends far beyond weapons training and conflict-specific content.[7] The US also continues to provide CI training through its Mobile Training Teams, discussed in more detail below.[8] Much of the training provided is delivered in conjunction with military hardware provision, which locks the militaries of other states

---

[2] US Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest: Joint Report to Congress', Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, 2001-2005, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/> (Henceforth, FMTR), *Executive Summary*, 2005. NB. Figures for 2005 and 2006 are not yet publicly available.
[3] FMTR, 2005, Part II, Description of Programmes.
[4] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)', 2002-2007, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/cbj/>
[5] FMTR, 2005, Part II, *Description of Programmes*. State Department programmes include: Foreign Military Financing (FMF); International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INL); African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA); Enhanced International Peacekeeping Capabilities (EIPC); Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET); the Regional Defence Fellowship Programme; the Economic Support Fund for assistance to Eastern European and Baltic States and for Independent States of the former Soviet Union; Anti-terrorism Assistance; International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement; Export Control Systems and Border Control; Humanitarian Demining; the Africa Regional Fund; and the African Crisis Response Initiative. Department of Defense programmes include: Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities; Combatant Command Security Cooperation Activities (e.g., Counter-Narcotics, Humanitarian Demining); other Non-Security Assistance programs; Service Academy; Aviation Leadership Program; Exchanges and Regional Programs; the Asia-Pacific Centre for Security Studies (APCSS); the George C. Marshall European Centre for Security Studies (Marshall Centre); the Centre for Hemispheric Defence Studies (CHDS); the Near East South Asia Centre for Strategic Studies (NESA Centre); and the Africa Centre for Strategic Studies (ACSS); and certain classified Combatant Command activities. See FMTR, 2004, *Executive Summary*.
[6] FMTR.
[7] Training includes such subjects as law enforcement; computing; medical laboratory maintenance; data systems maintenance; nursing services; obstetrics and gynaecological nursing; nuclear emergencies; petroleum laboratory maintenance; law enforcement; dental health; accounting and diving. Of course, there is a great deal of training associated with traditional military practice, such as weapons training; strategy; counter-terrorism; mine warfare; and dessert survival. FMTR, 2005, Part II, Description of Programmes.
[8] FMTR, 2005, Part II, Description of Programmes.

into dependent relationships with the US, in that they depend on the US for equipment, new parts, upgrades, and training. This is a deliberate outcome, as the FMTR states:

> Because FMF monies are used to purchase U.S. defence articles, services, and training, FMF contributes to a strong U.S. defence industrial base, which benefits both America's armed forces and U.S. workers.[9]

A closer look at the detail of the training initiatives indicates that it is linked closely to arms companies based primarily in the US. For instance, Israel, the highest recipient of US military assistance in the world, received $2.9 million worth of FMF training in 2004.[10] That training included various courses specific to particular aviation systems including Boeing, BAE Systems, and Lockheed-Martin.[11]

Given that over half of the training provided by the US is sold to purchasing states, and is therefore classified, and that half of the remaining training comes under programmes which are classified, or for which requirements for accountability are limited, it is not possible to fully assess the training since the end of the Cold War. We can only analyse IMET in any detail, mainly because controversy surrounding previous IMET training at SOA forced the Pentagon to make the training more transparent and accountable, as this chapter will show. IMET is the only training that legislators have ruled must not be given to countries with poor human rights records. In 1990, Congress created an Expanded IMET (E-IMET) programme which would focus on civil-military relations, military justice, resource management and human rights, with no combat training, and this could be given to countries that were banned from receiving IMET.[12] IMET is therefore the most regulated of all the training, yet it accounted for just $91.2 million in 2004, just 23 percent of the total.

IMET has steadily increased since the Cold War, with the numbers receiving training worldwide increasing from 4,500 in 1990 to 8,894 proposed for 2007. The programme saw a fall in numbers in the initial years following the Cold War, dipping to 2,597 in 1994, but increased steadily thereafter, peaking in 2003 at 11,832, and dropping again slightly since then.[13] In terms of funding, IMET has increased steadily year on year since the Cold War, from $47.2 million in 1990 to $88.9 million requested for 2007. Again, this dipped to just

---

[9] FMTR, 2005, Part II, Description of Programmes.
[10] FMTR, 2005, Part IV, Country Training Initiatives: Israel.
[11] FMTR, 2005, Part IV, Country Training Initiatives: Israel.
[12] Laura Lumpe, *US Foreign Military Training: Global Reach, Global Power, and Oversight Issues,* (New Mexico: Foreign Policy in Focus, 2002), p.27.
[13] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)'; Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts. As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, 2003, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf>; and DSCA, 'Summary of Students Trained Under IMET', 30 September 2001, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20Students.xls> Also see Tables 1 and 4 in Appendix 1.

$22 million in 1994, increasing steadily thereafter.[14] This can be explained by the decision of the Clinton administration to decrease the US defence budget by eight percent in real terms.[15]

Since 1994, Europe and Eurasia has received 36 percent of all IMET funds, the Western Hemisphere, 17 percent, Africa, 16 percent, the Near East and South Asia, 19 percent, and East Asia and the Pacific, 11 percent, with three percent allocated to inter-regional programmes and administration.[16] The highest numbers of students trained during the same period have been from the Western Hemisphere, with 33,133 receiving training, amounting to 33 percent of the world total. This was primarily because of the "War on Drugs" in Latin America, in which the US has invested heavily, with the stated aim of preventing production and trafficking of drugs from Latin America, particularly Colombia. This has included increases in IMET for counter-drug operations. Colombia alone receives a $1.3 billion military aid package, some of which includes training.[17] Training peaked in the Western Hemisphere in 2004, with 5,021 people receiving training that year, but this has since fallen, with 2,527 expected to receive training in 2007. Europe and Eurasia ranked next highest, with 29,622 trained between 1994 and 2007, 30 percent of the worldwide total. Much of this was, according to the Department of Defense, intended to help post-communist states re-build their militaries following the Cold War.[18] This peaked in 2003. Africa accounts for 16 percent of those trained worldwide under IMET since 1994, peaking in 2002 at 2,292, and this has been falling slightly since then, with 1,122 expected to receive training in 2007.

The Near East and South Asia, and the East Asia and Pacific regions have had the lowest proportion of those trained worldwide since 2004, 12 percent and 9 percent respectively. However, whereas the other regions have seen a fall in the numbers trained over the last few years, these two regions have seen a steady increase.[19] This is consistent with increased US defence spending in those areas in the name of the "War on Terror." Indeed the 2007 Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations report states that the four largest IMET recipient states in the East Asia and Pacific region – Indonesia, Malaysia, the

---

[14] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)'; DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts' ; and 'Summary of Students Trained'. Also see Tables 2 and 5 in Appendix 1.
[15] Andy Truesdell, 'Clinton's Defence Policy: A Re-examination of Requirements', Global Defence Review, 1997, <http://www.global-defence.com/1997/ClintonDefence.html>
[16] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)'; and DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts'. Also see Table 2 in Appendix 1.
[17] Doug Stokes, *America's Other War*, (London: Zed Books, 2005), p.9.
[18] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)', 2002.
[19] Ibid; and DSCA, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts'. Also see Table 1 in Appendix 1.

Philippines, and Thailand "are all key partners in the war on terrorism."[20] It also states that IMET increases in the Near East and South Asia are part of the efforts of countries in those regions to "support our global counter-terrorism efforts," with Jordan, Egypt, Morocco, Oman, Tunisia, Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and India and Pakistan named as key players.[21]

The nature and purposes of the training

Before discussing changes in the training as part of the "War on Terror", I will outline the nature and purposes of the training following the Cold War, and the changes that took place at WHINSEC once SOA's poor human rights record during the Cold War was exposed. In the post-Cold War years, in line with the shift to legitimation strategies in the South, the training was advocated on the grounds that it was essential for freeing states from authoritarian, military rule; establishing appropriate civil-military relations; and preparing military forces for new roles in the post-Cold War context, such as counter-drug operations and peacekeeping. At SOA/WHINSEC, this also involved removing coercive methods, and placing a heavy emphasis on military forces working with democratically elected civilian governments in a variety of non-combative roles. Three key themes were to dominate SOA/WHINSEC training: "appropriate civil-military relations"; peacekeeping operations; and counter-drug operations.[22]

"Appropriate civil-military relations"

Rhetoric surrounding US training of forces from the South since the Cold War has emphasised civilian control of military forces. In 1993, the Department of Defense established the George C. Marshall European Centre for Security Studies in Bavaria which, according to the Carnegie Commission, was intended to fulfil various roles within the context of democracy building and peacekeeping within Eastern Europe.[23] Following the end of the Cold War there was also a shift in emphasis at SOA, from CI operations to appropriate civil-military relations, peacekeeping, and counterdrug initiatives. Well before the campaign by SOAW resulted in the formal closure of SOA and its replacement by WHINSEC, changes

[20] US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)' 2006.
[21] Ibid.
[22] The term "appropriate civil military relations" was used frequently by US Department of Defense and WHINSEC personnel, in interview, as a shorthand for the role of the military within states with democratic, civilian-controlled, constitutional governments. The underlying assumption is that the military must always be subordinate to such governments.
[23] Larry Diamond, 'Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives', Carnegie Corporation, Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1995, <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/mb.htm>

were already occurring. These reflected broader changes in US foreign policy strategy, as articulated in the 1991 National Security Strategy of the Bush (senior) administration, which stressed US economic and security assistance policies:

> We will focus our efforts and resources on five major challenges: Promoting and consolidating democratic values […] Promoting market principles […] through institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade […] Promoting peace […] Protecting against transnational threats: International terrorism, narcotics, AIDS and environmental degradation threaten all peaceful nations […] Meeting urgent human needs.[24]

This indicates the extent to which US foreign policy prioritised neoliberalism and democracy promotion all over the world, and this was mirrored by SOA's own stated mission in the 1990s to:

> Provide doctrinally sound, relevant military training and education to the nations of Latin America; promote democratic values and respect for human rights; and to foster cooperation among the multinational military forces.[25]

The former Commandant of SOA insisted that SOA efforts in these areas preceded the establishment of the Marshall Centre:

> We pushed this in SOA – Human Rights and Democracy training. A curriculum was developed for this. This may be sour grapes, but I don't feel SOA was really embraced by the Department of Defense as it should have been, yet the Marshall Centre in Europe is hailed as some kind of icon of how all this human rights and democracy stuff is supposed to be done, yet SOA broke the ground on this, and the Marshall staff were coming to us for guidance.[26]

It is the case that even before the Marshall Centre, SOA had begun to implement changes in the curriculum following the internal investigation in 1992 into the notorious Spanish language manuals, discussed in chapter five.

It was when Alvarez was Commandant of SOA that the human rights training was first developed. In October 1993 the school implemented human rights training for all US and Latin American instructors. Joe Leuer, current Assistant Dean of Academics at WHINSEC stated:

> Each instructor received 16 hours of human rights instruction to prepare them to occupy the platform and discuss human rights issues when they arose. This programme has since matured to what it is today: the most complete instructional programme in the law of war and international humanitarian law available to any international student attending military training or education in the United States.[27]

---

[24] US National Security Council, 'National Security Strategy of the United States', 1991, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/918015-nss.htm>

[25] See the US Army School of the Americas website which has been preserved by the US Army since SOA was re-launched in 2001 <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usamhi/usarsa/main.htm>

[26] Interview with José Alvarez, Defence Contractor for the Department of Defense, and former SOA Commandant, (February 1993 to March 1995), The Pentagon, Washington DC, 8 June 2004.

[27] Joseph Leuer, 'A Half Century of Professionalism: The US Army School of the Americas', *Adelante, Historical Edition*, (2000), p.24. *Adelante* was the journal of the School of the Americas, and this edition was published to mark the re-launch of the School.

By the end of 1993, every course at SOA included a section on international human rights law.[28] By the mid-1990s SOA was also developing courses in Peace Operations and Democratic Sustainment, which, as Leuer argues, were intended to support specific aspects of US military strategy, including support for democracy; peaceful resolution of disputes; counter-drug efforts; counter-terrorism; the creation of sustainable development; and the expansion of defence cooperation.[29] The Democratic Sustainment course did, and continues to, reflect the agenda of promoting appropriate civil-military relations. The course includes studies on the nature of democracy; the role of the military within democratic states; the relationships between government and various sectors within society including religious groups; case studies on Latin American transitions to democracy and the relationships between the armed forces and society.[30]

Peacekeeping operations

The Peace Operations course, as well as promoting appropriate civil-military relations, is intended to prepare military forces from the South to be able to undertake peacekeeping operations as part of UN coalitions. This fits within the rubric of the liberal democratic model championed by the US state as a means of opening up Southern resources and markets to US capital. An element of that model is the liberal peace, within which peacekeeping is intended to play a key role. The liberal peace, as Mark Duffield describes, was intended "to transform the dysfunctional and war-affected societies that it encounters on its borders into cooperative, representative and, especially, stable entities",[31] since stability is conducive to the spread of global capitalism. It is now the case that the emphasis is on preventing such societies from becoming threatening and ensuring human security for the citizens of those states, rather than seeking to transform and industrialise them. This approach is known as therapeutic governance.[32] A WHINSEC instructor involved with the Peace Operations training indicated that the US has a keen interest in preparing military forces from Latin American states to take part in peacekeeping operations under UN mandates. He stated that this is because while the US has engaged in peacekeeping operations in the past, it prefers to focus on combat operations for the purposes of protecting and promoting US strategic goals and national security.[33] This is corroborated by Dana Priest's work which explores the role of

[28] Ibid. p.23.
[29] Ibid. p.26.
[30] I observed training on the Democratic Sustainment Course during July and August 2004. The course has been developed and implemented at SOA/WHINSEC since the mid-1990s.
[31] Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars,* (London: Zed Books, 2001), p.11.
[32] Vanessa Pupavac, 'Human Security and the Rise of Global Therapeutic Governance', *Conflict, Security and Development,* vol.5, no.2, (2005), pp.161-181.
[33] Interview with WHINSEC instructor, 9 August 2004, WHINSEC.

the US military in activities all over the world since the end of the Cold War. Her extensive interviews and observations of US military operations, including among Special Forces, indicate that there is a reluctance on the part of many within the Department of Defense to take on non-combative roles.[34] The WHINSEC interviewee stated that one of WHINSEC's aims is to teach the military forces from Latin American states to engage in peacekeeping operations effectively.[35]

The "war on drugs"

In addition to peacekeeping, military forces from Latin America were also to be trained for counter-drug operations at SOA during the 1990s, which again reflected wider US foreign policy objectives. The US had been providing counter-narcotics training since the end of the 1980s in Central and South America and in Southeast Asia, and this intensified following the Cold War.[36] The 1991 National Security Strategy underlined the centrality of counter-drug operations:

> The scourge of illegal drugs saps our vitality as a free people, diverts our energies from more positive pursuits and threatens friendly democratic governments now plagued by drug traffickers […] The United States seeks to […] reduce the flow of illegal drugs into the United States by encouraging reduction in foreign production, combating international traffickers and reducing demand at home.[37]

There followed significant investment in a war on drugs to be waged both within the US and in Latin America in the early 1990s. $47 million of Foreign Military Financing was designated for Colombia in 1992, and $58 million was requested for 1993, as well as $2.5 million in IMET provision, under which the majority of SOA/WHINSEC training is provided, each year.[38] This has intensified since the initiation of "Plan Colombia" in July 2000, with a $1.3 billion package of what was claimed to be emergency anti-drug aid to Colombia and its neighbours.[39] Since 1996, the International Narcotics Programme has covered most of the training, rather than IMET. Funding has increased for the International Narcotics Programme in Colombia, from $16 million in 1996 to $439 million in 2003 (of which $284.2 million was for police and military programmes).[40] In line with this objective, counter-drug training was introduced at SOA during the 1990s and has continued to feature

---

[34] Dana Priest, The Mission. Waging War and Keeping Peace with America's Military, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2004).
[35] Interview with WHINSEC instructor, 9 August 2004, WHINSEC.
[36] Robert Brophy and Peter Zirnite, 'US Military Training for Latin America', *Foreign Policy in Focus*, vol.2, no.48, (October 1997), <http://www.foreignpolicy-infocus.org/briefs/col2/v2n48mil.html>
[37] US National Security Council, 'National Security Strategy of the United States'.
[38] HRW (HRW), 'Colombia Human Rights Developments', 1992, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1993/WR93/Amw-02.htm>
[39] Centre for International Policy (CIP), 'Just the Facts: A Civilian's Guide to US defence and security assistance to Latin America and the Caribbean', 2002, <http://www.ciponline.org/facts>
[40] Ibid.

heavily at WHINSEC since 9/11, with the US claiming that this is an essential part of the drug war.[41]

The US government claims that Plan Colombia is intended to assist in the war against Colombia's "narco-guerrillas" as 90 percent of all cocaine entering the US originates in Colombia.[42] Yet the priority of the US has been to target the terrorist group the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), which, it has argued, is behind the majority of drug trafficking to the US. Yet the Council on Hemispheric Affairs found no evidence that the FARC was exporting drugs to the US. Rather, right-wing paramilitary groups were heavily involved in extensive drug trafficking.[43] Stokes attributes this to the US agenda of eliminating insurgency movements that threaten US interests in the region.[44] He shows that the US has actually "strengthened the largest players in Colombia's drug equation primarily because the right-wing death squads form an integral part of the US's overall strategy of counter-insurgent warfare."[45] These death squads are behind countless human rights violations. HRW reports that in 2002, 146 trade unionists were murdered in the first ten months of the year, and that the majority of these killings were committed by paramilitaries.[46] Stokes concludes that the suppression of the FARC via Plan Colombia reflects the US commitment to containing the perceived challenge posed by the FARC's alternative socio-economic model to US oil and investment interests.[47] In the Colombian peace process of 1984, the FARC was interested in promoting a number of socio-economic reforms that would benefit Colombia's poor. These included political reforms to end the Conservative and Liberal domination of Colombian politics; popular elections of local mayors; rural land reforms; and the nationalisation of foreign businesses, Colombian banks and transportation.[48] There is no justification for the violent means that they use to try and implement these socio-economic reforms in Colombia, but neither is there any justification for the US turning a blind eye to the activities of the right-wing paramilitary groups who retain strong links with the Colombian state, who are much more heavily involved in drug trafficking than the FARC, and are responsible for the majority of Colombia's human rights abuses.

---

[41] For details, see the courses section of the US Army School of the Americas website which has been maintained by the US Army since SOA was re-launched in 2001 <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usamhi/usarsa/main.htm>
[42] Doug Stokes, 'Better Lead than Bread? A Critical Analysis of the US' Plan Colombia', *Civil Wars*, vol.4, no.2, (2001), p.59.
[43] Stokes, *America's Other War*, pp.101-103.
[44] Stokes, 'Better Lead than Bread?' p.60.
[45] Ibid. p.75.
[46] HRW, 'World Report 2003: Colombia', 2003, <http://hrw.org/wr2k3/americas4.html>
[47] Stokes, 'Better Lead than Bread?' pp.75-78.
[48] Stokes, *America's Other War*, p.75.

The Colombia case is consistent with the US aim of quashing both violent and non-violent opposition to neoliberal policies in the South, and represents the way in which the US condones coercive methods to achieve this. This approach contrasts with the training at SOA/WHINSEC where the emphasis is on appropriate civil-military relations and preparation for peacekeeping activities, as well as some counter-drug training, in which support for paramilitary groups is discouraged and condemned. In this sense SOA/WHINSEC training seems to be more reflective of the legitimation strategies in US foreign policy since the Cold War.

SOA/WHINSEC as a showcase for human rights training

Following revelations of the Spanish language manuals used at SOA during the Cold War which advocated repression, the Department of Defense went to great lengths to dispel the negative publicity. The culmination of these efforts was the replacement of SOA by WHINSEC, in 2001. SOAW insist that the transition is nothing more than a name change, and argue that there is little difference between old and new training. But no SOAW representative has observed any of the training. WHINSEC continues the school's long history of serving US foreign policy agendas, namely, to ensure that the Western Hemisphere serves US material and strategic interests. These agendas take precedence over any human rights considerations. Nevertheless, the changes that have taken place are greater than SOAW are prepared to concede.

External oversight

A major change at WHINSEC has been the implementation of external oversight and greater transparency. I was permitted open access to the institution, was allowed to wander around freely, speak with any member of staff or student, and could sit in on any training session, without prior arrangement. This was in contrast to my meetings with officials at the Pentagon, where I had to be accompanied at all times by WHINSEC's liaison officer, who also had to organise all of my interviews in advance. Under Public Law 106-398, a Board of Visitors was established for WHINSEC and has to be composed of a chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, or a designee; the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or a designee; six people designated by the Secretary of Defence, including academics and religious and human rights groups representatives; one person designated by the Secretary of State; the senior military officer responsible for training and doctrine for the

Army; and the commander of SOUTHCOM or a designee.[49] Under the law, the Board is required to meet once per year.[50] However, the Board of Visitors elected to meet twice per year.[51] They are required to:

> Inquire into the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, and academic methods of the Institute, other matters relating to the Institute that the Board decides to consider, and any other matter that the Secretary of Defence determines appropriate.[52]

The institute's charter stipulates that members of the public are permitted to attend Board meetings and to address the Board.[53] Interestingly, SOAW are aware of this, and in the past members of SOAW have attended but none of SOAW's paid staff, nor Roy Bourgeois, SOAW's founder, have attended or plan to in future. They each stated that by attending they would be legitimising WHINSEC. Thanks to the external oversight and openness to the public, the School, as I will show, now has the most highly developed human rights training of all US military training initiatives.

Human rights training

Before discussing the human rights training at WHINSEC, it is necessary to situate this within the rules and laws which govern the activities of military forces with regard to the protection of civilians and combatants. All US domestic forces receive training on the Laws of Armed Conflict (LOAC), also referred to as the Laws of War. The primary document relating to such training is Army Field Manual 27-10, *The Law of Land Warfare.*[54] The sources of the LOAC, as discussed in chapter one, are the UN Charter, the Geneva Conventions and additional Protocols, and the Hague Conventions. In addition to the LOAC, US military forces are required to adhere to the Rules of Engagement and the Standing Rules of Engagement. The document dealing with these is the US Operational Law Handbook, compiled by the Judge Advocate School of the US Army.[55] This makes clear the purpose of the Rules of Engagement and the Standing Rules of Engagement. An appendix which sets out the general purposes, intent and scope of the Standing Rules of Engagement is included, although the specifics of the Standing Rules of Engagement are classified Secret:

---

[49] US Department of Defense, *Floyd D. Spence National Defence Authorisation for Fiscal Year 2001. 10 USC 2166. Public Law 106-398. Section 911, Paragraph 2166: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 2000), p.1.
[50] Ibid.
[51] The minutes from all of these meetings are documented and available from the following website: <http://www.fido.gov/facadatabase/AgenciesList.asp>
[52] US Department of Defense, *Floyd D. Spence National Defence Authorisation for Fiscal Year 2001* p.2.
[53] US Department of Defense, 'Directive Number 5111.12. Subject: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation', 2002, <http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec/uploadedFiles/InstituteCharter.pdf>
[54] US Department of Defense, 'Field Manual 27-10. The Law of Land Warfare', 1956, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/27-10/index.html>
[55] US Department of Defense, 'Operational Law Handbook, Chapter 5: Rules of Engagement', Judge Advocate General's Legal Centre and School, 2003, <http://www.juancole.com/2005/08/us-military-rules-of-engagement-and.html>

> Rules of Engagement provides [sic] restraints on a commander's action consistent with both domestic and international law and may, under certain circumstances, impose greater restrictions on action than those required by the law […] The Commander may issue Rules of Engagement to reinforce principles of the law of war, such as prohibitions on the destruction of religious or cultural property, and minimization of injury to civilians and civilian property […] It provides implementation guidance on the inherent right of self-defence and the application of force for mission accomplishment.[56]

The Rules of Engagement and Standing Rules of Engagement do therefore enable commanders to place restrictions on the conduct of military forces, which may mean that they are subject to even stricter requirements than under the LOAC.

However, the principle of self-defence at the heart of the Rules of Engagement and Standing Rules of Engagement creates a potential contradiction in the adherence to the LOAC among US military forces. While the ROE are supposed to be subsumed by the LOAC, the self-defence principle does mean that adherence to the LOAC may be undermined. This self-defence principle enables military personnel to protect themselves from anything they perceive to be hostile intent, and may actually result in violations of the LOAC. This is discussed in detail by Juan Cole, Professor of History at the University of Michigan, on his weblog, "Informed Comment", and an anonymous contributor with experience of the US military. The contributor points out that the self-defence principle permits US military personnel to act pre-emptively in circumstances in which they feel they are under threat. He illustrates with scenarios in which the behaviour of individuals in occupied territories such as Iraq may cause military personnel to assume the individual to be hostile. In such circumstances US personnel would act pre-emptively which could result in the killing of individuals assumed to be the source of a threat, but he points out that there may have been no grounds for the assumption of hostility, resulting in the killing of innocent civilians.[57] He argues, therefore, that the self-defence principle on which the Rules of Engagement and Standing Rules of Engagement are predicated gives even the lowest-ranking military personnel the authority to determine both whether force is a necessity and what amount of force is appropriate. He states:

> To be sure, there are key definitions that should limit the individual's use of force. Unfortunately, however, due to the vagaries of language and the impossibility of encapsulating all possibilities into a small, readily comprehensible blurb, each definition offers more room for confusion and liberal use of force.[58]

Thus, even though the US emphasises adherence to the LOAC and stresses this in its training of foreign military personnel, particularly at WHINSEC as I will show, the self-defence

---

[56] Ibid.
[57] Anonymous correspondent of Juan Cole, 'US Military Rules of Engagement and the Iraq War', Informed Comment: Thoughts on the Middle East, History and Religion, Weblog of Juan Cole, 10 August 2005, <http://www.juancole.com/2005/08/us-military-rules-of-engagement-and.html>
[58] Anonymous correspondent of Cole.

principle means that there is great potential for the "liberal use of force". This may lead to violations of the human rights of civilians.

WHINSEC's charter requires that all training include at least eight hours of mandatory instruction on human rights, the rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in a democratic society.[59] WHINSEC is the only US Army academic institution where human rights instruction is incorporated into every course.[60] This minimum is not only adhered to, but exceeded. Under law, the twelve-week courses are required to provide a minimum of eight hours of human rights and democracy training. WHINSEC students actually receive more than the eight hours, because the democracy part is taught separately. They therefore get a minimum of eleven hours of training.[61] The Judge Advocate and Chief of Human Rights Training at WHINSEC, Tony Raimondo, explained that attempts are made to ensure that the lessons learned from the mandatory human rights and democracy training permeate all training:

> Throughout the whole course there are scenarios in the field of military operations where the students are required to think about the consequences for human rights and where they put into practice the principles of the human rights training that they receive at the beginning of the course.[62]

On the courses I observed, the discussion of adherence to human rights law was not limited to the block of mandatory human rights training, and did feature in other aspects of the courses.[63] WHINSEC, then, not only complies with the law but exceeds it.

External oversight from the Board of Visitors has played an important role in developing the human rights programme. One of Lesley Gill's criticisms of SOA, based on her own observations, was that the human rights training was inadequate, and that Latin America's CI wars were not included in the curriculum.[64] My own experience four years after Gill's observations, was quite different. The subject matter covered in WHINSEC's human rights programme includes Ethics; Legal Imperatives; and Operational Considerations. The Ethics segment covers morals and values and the Just War Doctrine. The Legal Imperatives segment includes definitions of human rights; the UN Charter; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the American Convention on Human Rights; the relationship between human

---

[59] US Department of Defense, 'Directive Number 5111.12'.
[60] John Cope, 'International Military Education and Training: An Assessment', Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1995, <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/macnair/mcnair44/m44cont.html>
[61] Interview with Major Tony Raimondo, Judge Advocate and Chief of Human Rights Training, WHINSEC, 9 August 2004. The breakdown and explanation of the human rights and democracy training was also given at the WHINSEC Board of Visitors Meeting on 16 July 2004.
[62] Interview with Major Tony Raimondo.
[63] Outlines of the content of these courses are available from the WHINSEC website: <http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec>
[64] Lesley Gill, *The School of the Americas. Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas.*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), pp.139-149.

rights treaties and national constitutions; the right to life and the death penalty; due process of law; the definition of torture; the prohibition against torture; the Convention Against Torture; the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture; and the circumstances in which human rights violations occur.[65] The Legal Imperatives training also includes International Humanitarian Law; Combatants and Non-Combatants; Lawful and Unlawful Targets; Lawful and Unlawful Weapons; Lawful and Unlawful Tactics; Lawful and Unlawful Use of Force; the four legal requirements of a lawful order; the four legal requirements when receiving an unlawful order; the rules of engagement; treatment due to civilian non-combatants; treatment due to enemy prisoners of war; and the difference between enemy prisoners of war and detained and retained personnel.[66] The final segment is Operational Considerations. This includes four case studies. Students are expected to consider and apply ethical principles and legal requirements to their analysis of those cases. They are the My Lai massacre in Vietnam, in which US personnel massacred Vietnamese civilians; the assassination of six Jesuit priests in El Salvador by Salvadoran army personnel; the El Mozote massacre in El Salvador, again in which Salvadoran army personnel were responsible; the Bojaya case in Colombia in which FARC rebels murdered Colombian civilians, and Operation Chauvin de Huantar in Peru which involved the siege of the Japanese ambassador's residence by members of the Shining Path.[67]

A representative from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was present at WHINSEC during my field research and confirmed that the levels of human rights training at WHINSEC are far higher than elsewhere in the US military. He was delivering three days of training to the Command and General Staff Officer Course at WHINSEC on compliance with International Humanitarian Law. In private discussions he indicated that he visits a number of US training institutions, both for US nationals and foreign forces. He said that when he attends institutions for US personnel, he is not given the three-day slot that he gets at WHINSEC, and that the remit is very different. He simply has to go in and explain what the ICRC does, and what its remit is, as part of the LOAC training. At WHINSEC he was given three days to explain the content of the Geneva Conventions and to challenge the students to think about how they respond in particular situations. He used a hypothetical scenario which involved the escalation of violence between rebel forces and government military and police forces in a fictitious country. The students had to work through the scenario in groups, looking at different sets of events and determining where violations of International Humanitarian Law occurred, what the correct course of action would be and why, with

[65] Antonio Raimondo, *Democracy and Human Rights Programme Briefing,* (Columbus, Georgia: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, 2004), pp.2-3.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.

reference to international law. For instance, one of the events outlined involved the arrest by police of 60 young men, following a series of surprise attacks by rebel forces. The police suspected that either the young men had been involved, or they had information about those who were. Few of the arrests could be justified on legal grounds, in that there was no specific evidence of any involvement against the majority of those arrested. In an attempt to shed light on the previous attacks by the rebel forces, and on possible plans for future attacks, some of those detained had been mistreated and some had been tortured. Those who had been tortured admitted their involvement in some of the attacks, but there was no other evidence to confirm this against any of them. This led to unrest among the local population, and the police, using excessive force, killed and injured demonstrators.[68]

The students were asked the following questions: How would you assess this situation? What is the relevant law in this situation? What laws did the police violate? What are the circumstances under which police can arrest and detain people? Who benefited from the actions of the police? What is the value of information obtained by torture? Is information obtained through the use of torture a valid source of intelligence? I observed these sessions and found them to be some of the best in terms of challenging the students to really think through their responsibilities under international law. The students had to grapple with human rights issues that they might face in light of international law, and the message was reiterated time and again that they must do everything they can to resist illegal orders.[69] In contrast to Gill's experiences while observing at SOA between 1999 and 2001, there was a real commitment to discussing questions of accountability, and the Latin American CI wars featured heavily as examples.

Discussions with members of the Board, and the annual meeting of the Board which took place while I was at WHINSEC, revealed that the Board had pushed hard to see a comprehensive human rights course implemented. Steven Schneebaum, human rights lawyer and Chair of the Board in 2004 explained that the Board had encouraged WHINSEC to include case studies of actual abuses that had occurred, committed both by government forces and by opposition groups. That is why the case material no longer just includes the My Lai massacre, but now includes various other cases where government and opposition forces were involved in committing atrocities. They also encouraged the inclusion of likely scenarios that soldiers would face, in order that they could discuss appropriate responses based on their

[68] ICRC, *Escalada de la Violencia: Situación Hipotética (Escalation of Violence: Hypothetical Scenario - Training material used at WHINSEC by ICRC representative on Command and General Staff Officers course),* (Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross, 2004) .
[69] Observations of Command and General Staff Officers Course sessions, WHINSEC, 20-22 July 2004.

obligations under international law.[70] At the 2004 summer Board meeting, members encouraged WHINSEC to develop a case study based on the torture that took place at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq in 2003-2004.[71]

Much of the human rights training I observed at WHINSEC was of a high standard. Obligations of the armed forces under international law were frequently stressed, and students engaged well with the case material. Some discussions were cause for concern. For instance, during one session which focused on civil-military relations in Colombia, the only mention of human rights organisations was in the context of a case study, which formed a formal part of the course's curriculum, where the students were encouraged to imagine they were part of a committee that had to deal with human rights organisations who make false accusations against the armed forces. The students were asked to consider whether dealing with such allegations was a matter of public relations or whether there were more fundamental issues at stake.[72] Throughout that whole session, this was the only mention of human rights organisations, and they were being cast in an extremely negative light, with the assumption being that they were likely to make "false allegations" against the military. This is subtle, but to phrase the scenario in terms of "false allegations" rather than simply "allegations", sends signals to the students about how human rights organisations are perceived.

To what extent, then, can we be sure that the human rights training is effective? My pursuit of this line of enquiry drew the most blanks. No one within the Department of Defense nor at WHINSEC was able to provide a persuasive answer to this question. Just because human rights training exists and goes beyond the legal requirements does not mean that it is effective in preventing repression.

SOAW, WHINSEC and allegations of torture

Even though it is not clear how effective the human rights training at WHINSEC is, the School is not engaged in deliberately training students to violate international law. But SOAW has not shifted its focus to address the question of why other training initiatives are not subject to the same regulations as WHINSEC. SOAW continues to focus on an institution which has, in recent years, been transparent and highly regulated, and which is now free of its repressive CI training for which it gained such a notorious reputation in the

[70] Interview with Steven Schneebaum. Human Rights Lawyer, Patten Boggs LLP and Chair of WHINSEC Board of Visitors, Patten Boggs Office, Washington DC, 14 June 2004.
[71] WHINSEC Board of Visitors Meeting, WHINSEC, Fort Benning, Columbus, Georgia, 16 July 2004.
[72] Democratic Sustainment Course, Case Study on Colombian Civil-Military Relations, WHINSEC, Class observed on 29 July 2004.

past. It has attempted and failed to get bills and amendments passed by Congress and Senate to close WHINSEC, in collaboration with specific representatives and senators.[73]

Even SOAW staff members do not believe that WHINSEC poses any immediate threat to human rights. I asked Roy Bourgeois if he believes WHINSEC is promoting torture. He replied:

> No, not torture 101. But just bringing those soldiers to US institutions for combat training, that to me is a contradiction to what people in Latin America need. I have no doubt that the teaching in the past did involve torture. But our scrutiny now forces the Pentagon to put the school under the microscope. Before they could get away with it. Now they can't.[74]

Despite this, SOAW continues to make the claim that WHINSEC teaches torture. In a campaigning flash animation which masquerades as a spoof recruiting tool for WHINSEC, made available on the internet by SOAW in April 2006, the voice-over states:

> At the School of the Americas, Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, we're serious about success […] The curriculum for this upcoming semester includes: Bleeding Edge Torture Schemes, Streamlined Sniper Training, Interrogation Tactic Focus Groups.[75]

This is simply untrue. As discussed above, there is no evidence that WHINSEC advocates torture, and even the SOAW leadership admit this. There are no "sniper" courses on offer either, nor indeed any courses specifically oriented towards use of weapons, although all military WHINSEC staff, as with all members of the US armed forces, do have to keep their own weapons training up to date. There are no interrogation or psychological operations courses on offer, neither have there been since the School was re-launched. The animation also contains a fabricated "quotation", which it is claimed are the words of General Vazquez Velasco, former head of the Venezuelan Army:

> My time at the School of the Americas laid the groundwork for my attempt to overthrow the democratically elected government of Venezuela in 2002. Maybe one day I can join the ranks of many of my SOA peers and become military dictator, *cough* president of my own country.[76]

General Vazquez Velasco did attend the School of the Americas in 1988 at which time he was a Lieutenant Colonel. He took the Command and General Staff Officers Course. He was also one of the military leaders involved in the coup to overthrow Hugo Chavez in 2002, although he claimed that it "was not a coup nor insubordination, but a position of solidarity

---

[73] Three bills and one amendment have been introduced in Congress to close WHINSEC. The first two bills did not get taken to a vote and the third bill is in progress. The amendment introduced in 2006 under the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programmes Appropriations Act, for fiscal year 2007 was lost 188 to 218. Full details of these efforts are listed in Appendix 3.

[74] Interview with Father Roy Bourgeois at his office, situated outside the gates of Fort Benning, Columbus, Georgia, 20 July 2004.

[75] School of Americas Watch, *Shut Down the SOA Flash Movie*, (Washington DC: School of Americas Watch, 2006), <http://www.soaw.org/new/flash.php>

[76] Ibid.

with all the Venezuelan people."[77] There is no record of him ever having made a statement linking his involvement with the coup and the training he received at SOA.

Many SOAW members continue to believe that WHINSEC is no different from SOA, and that it continues to pose a threat to human rights, despite acknowledgements among SOAW's leadership that this is not the case. The inclusion of misinformation in SOAW's campaigning tools, such as the flash animation, help to explain these misperceptions. As a consequence, and conveniently for the Department of Defense, attention remains focused on WHINSEC, diverting attention from the majority of US military training, which remains secretive and devoid of adequate human rights content. Bourgeois' statement about what the Latin American populations need assumes that WHINSEC training is predominantly combative. While the Command and General Staff Officer course is aimed at preparing officers for leadership in combat, and while the counter-drug courses contain some combat training, the majority of WHINSEC's training is non-combative. The change in focus at WHINSEC to the promotion of appropriate civil-military relations seems to be a positive step forward, in that it rejects the notion that the military should play any role in governing the country, and should, instead be subordinate to civilian leaders. Courses such as Resource Management and Democratic Sustainment do focus on ensuring that military forces are accountable, and this is a necessary and important part of ensuring that military forces are at the service of civilian governments. Nevertheless, counter-drug operations could be undertaken by a variety of civilian institutions including the police, rather than the military. I suggest that using the military to perform such roles is not necessarily the mark of progressive democracy, and can impede progress in the area of human rights.

Furthermore, the question of what Latin American populations need is an important one in light of the effects of neoliberalisation. It is not the case, as the Haiti and El Salvador experiences show, discussed in chapter six, that neoliberalisation, of which WHINSEC training forms a part, is as progressive and beneficial for the majority of the populations of those countries as it could be. While WHINSEC training no longer advocates repression, military forces in receipt of that training are still a tool of the governments assisting the US to neoliberalise the region. Neoliberalisation has not met the needs of Latin America's majority poor populations for greater material and social equality and political participation, as I have shown in earlier chapters, so it is unlikely that the training will lead to progress in those areas either. For SOAW, WHINSEC is therefore a legitimate target of wider complaints about US foreign policy.

---

[77] Barry Cannon, 'Venezuela, April 2002: Coup or Popular Rebellion? The Myth of a United Venezuela', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol.23, no.3, (2004), pp.285-302.

I also asked Bourgeois why the focus of SOAW is still WHINSEC. He replied:

> This movement is not so much about the school but about US foreign policy. But as activists we know what will mobilise people. We have to maintain our focus. If we said we are moving out of the SOA issue and onto the bigger issue we would be losing our flagship with so much history.[78]

This view was shared by other staff from the SOAW office in Washington DC including Eric LeCompte:

> Our efforts on foreign policy need to be much bigger. It is not our intention to stop with one school. The existence of the school does give us time to build a movement, but it needs to be a movement with broader connections to foreign policy. I believe we will close the school but I hope it won't be too soon so that we can build a movement to make the connections with foreign policy.[79]

Thus the strategy is that if wider questions of US foreign policy are to be raised, the movement needs to retain momentum directed specifically at WHINSEC, because of the symbolic power of its murky past.

A further strategy of the SOAW leadership has been to meet with senior government and military officials from Latin American states and to try to persuade them to stop sending their personnel to WHINSEC. SOAW report that they have successfully persuaded the Venezuelan, Argentine and Uruguayan governments to cease sending nationals from those states to WHINSEC, following meetings between SOAW delegations and senior officials from the governments of those states in 2004, in the case of Venezuela, and 2006 in the cases of Uruguay and Argentina.[80] SOAW fail to note that, because of the refusal by the governments of Venezuela and Uruguay to sign an Article 98 agreement with the US, under the American Service Member's Protection Act, agreeing not to seek prosecution of US citizens in the International Criminal Court, all IMET, FMF, Excess Defence Articles, and non-drug Emergency Drawdown Authority Funds have been withdrawn from those states.[81] That means that those states cannot send their personnel to WHINSEC under the IMET and FMF programmes, and could only receive training at WHINSEC if they funded it out of their own budgets.

---

[78] Interview with Father Roy Bourgeois.
[79] Interview with Eric LeCompte.
[80] School of Americas Watch, 'Argentina and Uruguay Abandon SOA! Critical Victory for Human Rights Organisations Across the Americas', SOA Watch, 28 March 2006, <http://www.soaw.org/new/article.php?id=1290>; and School of Americas Watch E-mail/Website news item, 'Venezuela Ceases All Training of Venezuelan Troops at the School of the Americas (SOA/WHINSEC)', School of Americas Watch, 2004, <http://www.soaw.org/news/docs/venezuela.doc>
[81] US Departments of Defence and State, 'American Service-Members' Protection Act', Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, 30 July 2003, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/othr/misc/23425.htm>; and CIP, '"Article 98" Agreements and the International Criminal Court', Latin America Working Group and Centre for International Policy: Just the Facts: A Civilian's Guide to US Defence and Security Assistance to Latin America and the Caribbean, 4 April 2005, <http://ciponline.org/facts/art98.htm>

The Uruguayan and Venezuelan governments have taken a stand against the US over the issue of freedom from prosecution at the International Criminal Court of US citizens, and for this reason are no longer eligible to receive training at WHINSEC funded by the US. Whether or not they would have withdrawn their personnel from WHINSEC if this were not the case is not clear. In the case of Argentina, there had already been a decline in the numbers of students that were being sent to WHINSEC before SOAW met with the Argentine Defence Minister, Nilda Garré. Five to six sergeants were due to attend WHINSEC for the NCO Professional Development Course, in session in April 2006, but only one of them attended.[82] SOAW nevertheless reports that Garré agreed this would be the last individual that Argentina would send to WHINSEC.[83] These withdrawals of Latin American forces from WHINSEC cannot simply be attributed to the efforts of SOAW. They are a symptom of wider resistance on the part of Latin American military and political leaders against US policies, as discussed in chapter six.[84] The policy of withdrawing IMET and FMF training as a punishment against those states who refuse to sign Article 98 agreements is deeply unpopular within the Department of Defense, and General John Craddock, Commander of SOUTHCOM recently testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that this action was opening up opportunities for China to provide training to the military forces of those states whose IMET and FMF training has been withdrawn. Indeed China is already providing some non-lethal military training in Spanish to those states.[85]

Despite the claims made by SOAW, WHINSEC is not engaged in deliberately training students to violate international humanitarian law and international human rights law. It has also been stripped of its repressive CI content. It is unlikely that these changes at WHINSEC were the result of those involved concluding that repression training was counter-productive. As is clear from chapter six, the use of repressive strategies by the US has intensified since 2001, not diminished, and the Bush administration has deemed coercion, alongside legitimation, an effective means by which US foreign policy objectives can be achieved. Rather, the changes at WHINSEC were largely the result of the pressure from the SOAW campaign, and the fact that there had to be some response to the massive public protest. An obvious solution was to position WHINSEC among the legitimation tools rather than the coercive tools that the US uses to achieve its objectives. These changes have failed to silence the critics. As a consequence, the campaign continues to focus on WHINSEC without subjecting the remainder of US training for military forces from the South to the same scrutiny. The continued protest against WHINSEC is likely to have been an unintended

---

[82] Personal correspondence with Lee Rials, WHINSEC Public Affairs Officer, 13 April 2006.
[83] School of Americas Watch, 'Argentina and Uruguay Abandon SOA'.
[84] See also Greg Grandin, 'The Wide War - How Donald Rumsfeld Discovered the Wild West in Latin America', Tomdispatch.com, 7 May 2006, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/printer_050806L.shtml>
[85] Personal correspondence with Lee Rials, WHINSEC Public Affairs Officer, 13 April 2006.

outcome of the transition from SOA to WHINSEC. It may nevertheless have been beneficial to the Department of Defense, since it has served to keep WHINSEC in the spotlight, thereby diverting attention from the remainder of the training.

Training beyond WHINSEC

There is little evidence available about the remaining 99 percent of US training of foreign military personnel.[86] There is certainly no evidence to suggest that the rest of the training has undergone the same changes as WHINSEC training. The fact that the rest of the training has not been subjected to external oversight as WHINSEC has, and that the same levels and quality of human rights training has not been introduced, means that we cannot, with any confidence, conclude that the nature of the rest of the training has changed since the Cold War.

Lack of oversight

Currently, no other US training institution is subject to the same strict rules as WHINSEC with regard to the mandatory human rights and democracy training. Nor do other institutions have Boards of Visitors that are required to hold the institution to account in the same way. While US military personnel receive LOAC training, WHINSEC staff informed me that this would be similar to the WHINSEC training that covers ethics and legal imperatives, but would be less detailed, and would not include the Operational Considerations case studies covered at WHINSEC. US Army personnel at WHINSEC regularly commented that their own experience of standard US training on the LOAC was very basic compared with WHINSEC training.

Limited commitment to human rights training

As well as a lack of oversight for training beyond WHINSEC, there is also a limited commitment to human rights beyond WHINSEC, and especially for US forces. The ICRC representative who was giving training at WHINSEC during my field work stated that he has come across a "pick and choose" attitude beyond WHINSEC, among US military personnel where training in human rights and international law is concerned.[87] Furthermore, while the ICRC is encouraged to send a representative to provide extensive human rights training at WHINSEC, and minimal training on the LOAC at other US military institutions, the Bush administration chose to ignore the ICRC's investigation into conditions and treatment of

[86] Cope, 'International Military Education and Training'.
[87] Interview with International Committee of the Red Cross representative, WHINSEC, 21 July 2004.

detainees at Guantanomo Bay, Abu Ghraib, and other US detention facilities for so-called "unlawful combatants", until Pentagon memorandums on Red Cross visits to Guantanomo were leaked to the Washington Post.[88] The ICRC had been visiting Guantanomo since 2002, and submitting private reports to the US administration, but by early 2004, the ICRC was concerned that recommendations had only been "partly implemented" and that "significant changes need to be made."[89]

Just as there is complacency about ICRC recommendations at Guantanamo Bay, there is little sense among Department of Defense personnel that US forces should be subject to the same levels of human rights training as WHINSEC students. Various US military personnel working at WHINSEC in a variety of roles indicated that they had received little or no training that resembled WHINSEC's human rights training. One interviewee stated:

> We never really had separate human rights training when I trained. It came under the rules of engagement and the Law of Armed Conflict, it wasn't separated out like it is here. It was the same with the democracy teaching. The Law of Armed Conflict teaches you what you should and shouldn't do and how you should treat others. There is no specific human rights training but it is covered by this.[90]

I asked Department of Defense representatives why US forces are not provided with the same levels of human rights training as WHINSEC students. One representative commented:

> American Army personnel don't need to go into the same depth of human rights and democracy training because US personnel have a pre-existing cultural understanding of this before they get anywhere near training.[91]

This was a fairly typical attitude among Pentagon officials and WHINSEC staff. Another stated:

> We have a Judeo-Christian background in the US and Europe. That's how we are, we don't have to think about it, it's just a part of us. We don't have to think about human rights because we grow up with those attitudes.[92]

A member of staff at WHINSEC admitted saying similar things on occasion:

> I don't know how much human rights training our own soldiers get. I have caught myself saying that. I guess it's a US patronising attitude. There is a tendency to assume that our forces have this understanding by osmosis.[93]

---

[88] Seymour Hersh, *Chain of Command. The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*, (London: Penguin Books, 2004), p.13.
[89] ICRC, 'Guantanomo Bay: Overview of the ICRC's Work for Internees', International Committee of the Red Cross, 30 January 2004, <http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/iwpList74/951C74F20D2A2148C1256D8D002CA8DC>
[90] Interview with WHINSEC instructor, 9 August 2004, WHINSEC.
[91] Interview with Mr. Kenneth LaPlante, WHINSEC Liaison to the US Army, US Department of Defense, The Pentagon, 24 June, 2004.
[92] Interview with José Alvarez.
[93] Interview with Dr. Donald Harrington, Academic Dean, WHINSEC, 26 July 2004.

When such attitudes prevail, it is not surprising that there is an underlying assumption that, somehow, US military personnel are mostly beyond abusing human rights. This attitude was prevalent not just among senior officials at the Pentagon and at WHINSEC, but among more junior US officers that I talked with at WHINSEC. One stated:

> You don't get a formal class in high school on democracy, it's covered through other subjects. You walk, sleep, eat democracy living in the US. What better way to learn.[94]

This may help to explain why the human rights training is far less well developed for US forces. This complacency undermines the progress at WHINSEC. WHINSEC training, however, should not be dismissed. Significant progress has been made and pressure should be exerted on the Department of Defense to extend WHINSEC's positive human rights training initiatives. SOAW could be instrumental in such a campaign, but for now their campaigners continue to argue that WHINSEC poses a threat to human rights.

Changes to WHINSEC's Board of Visitors, 2005

Even at WHINSEC there are signs of a return to less transparency. At the end of 2004, the White House unexpectedly intervened in the selection of WHINSEC's Board of Visitors, objecting to the reinstatement of all but one of the members, and insisting on the selection of new, White House-approved members. Those sacked included the Board's chair, Steven Schneebaum, a human rights lawyer and outspoken critic of US policy in the "War on Terror", and Deborah Avant, an academic, both of whom were extremely active in ensuring the instigation of credible human rights training at WHINSEC. The only retained Board member was Jose Sorzano, former deputy ambassador to the UN under Jeannne Kirkpatrick, and known for his right wing views.[95] He is now the chairman of the Board, replacing Steven Schneebaum. The new members include Ben Hand, a republican and 2006 candidate for the Alabama Supreme court, Reverend Cletus Kiley from the US conference of Catholic Bishops, Reverend Robert Morlino, fourth bishop of Madison, Wisconsin, María Domínguez, an immigration lawyer from Miami, and Victor Bonilla, retired senior advisor to the Organisation of American States.[96] In addition, at the end of 2004, Retired Lieutenant General Gordon Sumner, previously chairman of the Inter-American Defence Board and

---

[94] Interview with WHINSEC instructor, 9 August 2004, WHINSEC.

[95] Personal correspondence with Professor Deborah Avant, 12 December 2005, and with Lee Rials, WHINSEC Public Affairs Officer, 12 December 2005; and Interview with Jose Sorzano, Arlington, Virginia, 21 June 2004, in which he excused US complicity in human rights violations during the Cold War in Latin America, arguing, "As you know the Monroe Doctrine declared the Western Hemisphere to be the US' zone of influence. We had an interest in preventing the Soviet Union, but also since urban guerrillas are associated with the Soviet side, we had a propensity to help the other side."

[96] Associated Press, 'Biographical Info on Supreme Court Candidate Ben Hand', 7 April 2006, <http://www.al.com/newsflash/regional/index.ssf?/base/news-20/1144446865455500.xml&storylist=alabamanews>; Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, 'WHINSEC Board of Visitors', WHINSEC, 2006, <https://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec/BOV.asp?id=27>

Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, and now Consultant with Sumner Associates, was appointed as an advisor to the WHINSEC Board of Visitors. He is also Board member of the International Security Council, which Edward Herman and Gerry O'Sullivan have described as the "main US agency of the Moon system in the field of terrorism propaganda", with its head, Joseph Churba, acknowledging the "generous and unwavering support of Reverend Sun Myung Moon." The proclaimed goal of this organisation is to formulate "global strategic analysis" which includes defending Israel's policy in Palestine.[97] He is also a member of the Council for National Policy, which brings together political, business and religious leaders to plan the strategy of the religious right in the US.[98] Deborah Avant rightly expressed concern that in light of White House intervention and of this shift to the right in the Board of Visitors, WHINSEC may not be able to resist the general trend in US foreign policy towards less transparent and more repressive means.[99]

Violations of the Leahy Law since 9/11

Just as training beyond WHINSEC is secretive, and there are signs that WHINSEC itself is becoming less transparent, laws preventing the provision of IMET to countries with poor human rights records have been circumvented since 9/11. The Leahy Law was intended to prevent individuals with poor human rights records from receiving training under the counter-narcotics programme. It was implemented in 1996 in response to claims that the US was training forces in Colombia that had been involved in civilian massacres. It was extended to all forms of State Department training, and then in 1999, to training provided by the Department of Defense.[100] Throughout this period, however, under the Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) programme, the US was able to continue providing training to personnel from countries that were banned from receiving training on human rights grounds, in programmes which masqueraded as training for US Special Forces. Dana Priest found that under JCET, US Special Forces trained foreign troops from countries such as Indonesia, Colombia and Pakistan, which Congress had blacklisted.[101]

Congress cut off all IMET funding to Indonesia in 1991 when it was discovered that Indonesian troops supplied with US weapons had massacred at least 280 unarmed people in

---

[97] Edward Herman and Gerry O'Sullivan, *The "Terrorism" Industry: The Experts and Institutions that Shape Our View of Terror*, (New York: Pantheon, 1989), chapter 2.
[98] Marc Ambinder, 'Inside the Council for National Policy. Meet the Most Powerful Conservative Group You've Never Heard Of', *ABC News*, <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/story?id=121170&page=1> accessed 16 March 2006.
[99] Personal correspondence with Professor Deborah Avant, 12 December 2005.
[100] Lumpe, p.30.
[101] Dana Priest, *The Mission. Waging War and Keeping Peace with America's Military*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2004), p.222.

Dili, East Timor. Some E-IMET programmes were offered in 1995. Priest discovered, however, that between 1991 and 1998 US Special Forces conducted 41 training exercises with Indonesian troops, including with 26 individuals from Kopassus, Indonesia's own Special Operations unit, which US and Australian defence officials knew to be behind killings and torture in East Timor and Irian Jaya. US officials stated that the training involved counterterrorism, mission planning, sniper skills, close-quarters urban warfare, crowd control, and rapid infiltration of troops.[102] The Department of Defense insisted that discussions of international human rights standards had also been included in the training.[103] The effectiveness of whatever efforts were made to instil notions of respect for human rights and civilian control of the military during the JCET operations in Indonesia, is called into question by the remarks of Colonel Charles McFetridge, defence attaché at the US embassy in Jakarta. He told Priest that when he began to "push the issue of civilian control of the military, the Indonesians became incredulous. They would look at me and say, 'We're not training civilians to be generals.'"[104] The message was clearly not getting through.

Since the advent of the "War on Terror" IMET training has been re-introduced to countries that were previously banned from receiving training by Congress, Indonesia among them. Lumpe notes that by March 2002 Bush had identified nineteen countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia and Latin America as allies in the "War on Terror". Yet, she adds, the security forces in fourteen of these countries had been cited by the State Department for committing serious human rights abuses.[105] Indonesia was a case in point. Mary Robinson, who was the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights visited East Timor in 1999 reported that even during the 1990s:

> There was overwhelming evidence that there had been a deliberate, vicious and systematic campaign of gross violations of human rights in East Timor, including mass killings, forcible expulsions, violence against women and a breakdown of law and order. The extreme violence … was initiated by different militia groups, in which elements of security forces were also involved.[106]

The legislation in place is wholly insufficient. Even the limited laws that are in place are now being ignored in the "War on Terror". The military ban on training to Indonesia was retained by Congress under the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, but a last minute addition to the 2002 Defence Department Appropriations Act included $17.9 million to establish a Regional Defence and Counter-Terrorism Fellowship Programme.[107] Lumpe notes, "Since this new programme is outside the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations Act and contains no

---

[102] Lumpe, p.19.
[103] Priest, *The Mission*, pp.219-222.
[104] Ibid. p.219 and 223.
[105] Lumpe, p.5.
[106] United Nations, *Press Release Hr/CN/975, Commission of Human Rights Opens Special Session on East Timor,* (New York: United Nations Organisation, 24 September 1999), <http://www.un.org/index.html>
[107] Lumpe, p.19.

restrictions on which countries can participate, it allows training for Indonesia."[108] Indonesia received $600,000 worth of IMET training in 2004.[109] If the US administration were genuinely committed to ensuring that foreign military training assists in improving human rights, the loopholes that enable the laws to be circumvented would be closed; training would not be offered to countries with poor human rights records, and US Special Forces would not be assisting military forces implicated in human rights abuses to develop close-quarters urban warfare and psychological operations.

Counterinsurgency training

While WHINSEC no longer has repressive CI training, the US continues to send Mobile Training Teams overseas to deliver CI training. The list of Programmes in the 2005 FMTR includes "MTT [Mobile Training Team] -Counterinsurgency" but in the lists of Country Training Activities in the FMTR, there are no references to provision of this.[110] This may be because the information is classified, and therefore only included in volumes II and III of the FMTR, which are classified. Nevertheless, there are a number of references to unspecified training provided by MTTs in the Country Training Activities list. It is not clear why this is unspecified, since nearly all other types of training listed are specified. Given the origin of the MTT's involved, however, it is likely that the training involved CI or counter-terror operations. For example, 180 Colombians received unspecified training from MTTs of US Special Forces.[111] The US Special Forces Command, according to its mission statement "leads, plans, synchronises, and as directed, executes global operations against terror networks" and "trains, organises, equips and deploys combat ready special operations forces to combatant commands."[112] Its 2006 Posture Statement states that the abilities of the Special Forces, through its Unconventional Warfare, which includes CI warfare, Psychological Operations, Foreign Internal Defence, Special Reconnaissance, and Civil Affairs, "will become increasingly vital to the Global War on Terrorism".[113] It is therefore safe to assume that the training given to those Colombians related to these sorts of operations. Similarly, 30 Egyptian personnel received "MTT – Other" training in 2005, with the MTTs sent from Fort

[108] Ibid. p.19.
[109] US Department of State, FY2004: Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations – Military Assistance, p.154.
[110] FMTR, 2005, Part II, Description of Programmes.
[111] FMTR, 2005, Part IV, p.259.
[112] US Department of Defense, 'United States Special Operations Command Mission', <http://www.socom.mil/Docs/Command_Mission-060214.pdf>
[113] US Department of Defense, 'US Special Forces Posture Statement', 2006, <http://www.socom.mil/Docs/2006%20USSOCOM%20Posture%20Statement%20final.pdf>

Bragg, the home of US Special Forces.[114] Again, 360 Afghan personnel received "MTT – Other" training, and once again the MTT came from Fort Bragg.[115]

There is no information available on the nature of the CI training given by MTT's, but the CI manuals for US forces provide some insight into current US CI doctrine. Up until 2004 the Army's *Counterguerrilla Operations* manual was the main document relating to US CI activities. It was first published in 1986, and was updated in 2004.[116] In 2004, the US published its first CI manual, in light of its operations in Iraq following the 2003 invasion and occupation, which it circulated to all US officers.[117] As Eric Herring and Glen Rangwala note, US counterinsurgency actions in Iraq are based on coercion, despite US doctrine which states that CI involves "a full range of measures used by a government to free and protect its society" and that success "depends on the willing support and cooperation of the populations directly involved."[118] The *Counterguerrilla Operations* manual states:

> Commanders must be prepared to operate in a broad range of political atmospheres. The host country's form of government may be anything from an absolute, and not too benevolent, dictatorship to a democracy struggling to establish itself, or anything in between […] No matter what political atmosphere prevails in the host country, the brigade commander must engage the guerrilla with every asset at the commander's disposal. He must realise that democratic principles may not be immediately applicable.[119]

Herring and Rangwala correctly note that there is a contradiction between "endorsing potential armed support for an absolute, malign dictatorship and the doctrinal claim that the core mission of counterinsurgency is backing a government's efforts to promote a free society."[120] This also indicates that despite the democracy promotion rhetoric, little has changed in US CI strategy since the Cold War. It continues to legitimise support for repressive regimes in pursuit of its ends.

US CI doctrine also continues to view entirely legitimate activities as evidence of actual and emergent insurgent activity, just as it did during the Cold War. The *Counterinsurgency Operations* manual contains an appendix which lists indicators of what it considers to be "enemy activity". These include, "New faces in a rural community", "Unusual gatherings among the population", "Increase of disaffected youth gatherings", "Appearance of many new members in existing organizations such as labour unions", "Appearance of new

---

[114] FMTR, 2005, Part IV, p.141.
[115] Ibid, p.206.
[116] US Department of Defense, *US Army Counterguerrilla Operations Handbook*, (Guildford, CT: Lyons Press, 2004).
[117] US Department of Defense, 'Counterinsurgency Operations (Field Manual-Interim FMI 3-07.22)', 2004, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-07-22/index.html>
[118] US Department of Defense, 'Counterinsurgency Operations', pp.viii, 2(2)-2(3), 4(1).
[119] US Department of Defense, *US Army Counterguerrilla Operations*, pp.1(1), 3(6).
[120] Herring Eric and Glen Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments: The Occupation and its Legacy*, (London: C. Hurst and Co, 2006), chapter 4.

organizations stressing grievances or interests of repressed or minority groups", "Reports of large donations to new or revamped organizations", "Refusal of population to pay or unusual difficulty to collect rent, taxes, or loan payments", "Increase in the number of entertainers with a political message", "Increase of political themes in religious services", "Increase of agitation on issues for which there is no identified movement or organization", "Circulation of petitions advocating opposition or dissident demands", "Appearance of opposition slogans and pronouncements by word-of-mouth, graffiti, posters, leaflets, and other methods", "Nationwide strikes called to demonstrate the strength of the opposition movements", "Attempts to discredit or ridicule national or public officials", "Characterization of government leaders as puppets and tools of foreign intervention forces", "Agitation against government projects and plans", "Distribution of clothing to underprivileged or minority classes by organizations of recent or suspect origin".[121]

Of course insurgents might engage in some of these activities, but the manual fails to note that all of these activities could also be regarded, as Herring and Rangwala note, "as entirely legitimate activities in a free or unfree society".[122] Instead, they add, "they are interspersed among a long list of indicators of a developing armed insurgency, such as 'receiving military training in foreign countries' […] 'terrorist acts' […] attacks on patrols."[123] In this sense, as in the Cold War, CI strategy continues to emphasise monitoring entirely legitimate activities, and considers these a source of potential insurgent activity, even though they constitute the activities one would expect to encounter in the free societies the US claims its CI campaigns are intended to build.

Conclusion

US training of military forces from the South has boomed since the end of the Cold War, with 50,000 foreign personnel from over 150 countries now receiving training in tens of thousands of exercises every year, at a total value of over $400 million, and particularly since 9/11. This is entirely consistent with US foreign policy strategy more broadly. While US foreign policy strategy in the South since the Cold War underwent a significant shift, with legitimation the dominant trend, the same cannot be said of US training of military forces from the South. The majority of the training continues to lack transparency, with little evidence of any credible commitment to promoting respect for human rights. By getting round legislation which bans countries from receiving training because of their poor human

[121] US Department of Defense, 'Counterinsurgency Operations (Field Manual-Interim FMI 3-07.22)', US Department of Defense, Army, 2004, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-07-22/index.html>
[122] Herring and Rangwala, *Iraq in Fragments*, chapter 4.
[123] Ibid.

rights records, the message sent to recipient countries of such illegitimate training is one of contempt for legal processes and for civilian control of the military. Furthermore, legislation put in place ostensibly to protect civilian populations in the South from repression by their own militaries, is being torn up by the Bush administration, and countries whose militaries continue to be implicated in human rights abuses are again receiving training in activities that may well be used against those civilian populations to ill effect.

Whereas SOA was not anathema to, but entirely consistent with broader US military and intelligence training during the Cold War, WHINSEC has been out of step with the remainder of the training. It represents a tiny fraction of US foreign military training, but extraordinary measures have been taken to overhaul the institution following its murky past, largely thanks to the efforts of the SOAW campaign. WHINSEC human rights training is both positive and exemplary, and ought to be emulated across the US military, both for foreign and domestic forces, although a question remains over whether it is really appropriate for military personnel to be undertaking roles that could be performed by non-military organisations within civil society. This is not to say that if WHINSEC training were emulated across all training, human rights abuses at the hands of US-trained domestic and foreign forces would cease. Indeed, the potential for violations of international law as a result of the self-defence principle on which the Rules of Engagement and Standing Rules of Engagement of the US military are predicated, continues to be cause for concern. Changes at WHINSEC are a step in the right direction.

The developments at WHINSEC are not reflected in the majority of US training of military forces from the South, and indeed of domestic forces, which continues to be unaccountable, and does not appear to have been overhauled to include the significant human rights training programmes that have been developed for WHINSEC. It also continues to involve CI training, and while there is little information available on its content, early indications based on US CI practice since the invasion and occupation of Iraq are that CI strategy has changed little since the Cold War. The rest of the training represents one of a number of coercive tools of US foreign policy strategy, aimed at spreading global capitalism in the South. Even at WHINSEC there are signs that it too may become less transparent and that the pressure to maintain high level human rights training and accountability is waning as a result of White House intervention in the selection of the Board of Visitors. SOAW continues to focus its attentions on WHINSEC, and in light of this turn of events, this may be appropriate. This also suggests that the efforts to overhaul the institution have failed to curtail opposition. Nevertheless, an unintended but beneficial outcome for the Department of Defense of the sustained campaign against WHINSEC, is that the spotlight remains firmly on WHINSEC, the Department of Defense's showpiece. This conveniently diverts attention away from the

remainder of the training, domestic and foreign, which, given the lack of accountability and absence of credible human rights promotion strategies, is a concern, particularly in light of increasing support for repression by the US in the “War on Terror”.

CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

In order to understand whether US training of military forces from the South has resulted in the use of repression or improvements in human rights, we need to situate the training within the broader context of US foreign policy objectives and the strategies that the US uses to achieve them. The main aims of US foreign policy are to maintain the dominant global position of the US and to ensure access to resources and markets in the South, primarily for US elites. These objectives are being achieved through an emerging, US-led transnational state, in which the US is the dominant player and primary beneficiary, using the instruments of legitimation at least as much as repression. This contrasts with the Cold War, during which US interests were defined much more narrowly, and US foreign policy strategy towards the South emphasised repression to an extraordinary degree.

This concluding chapter outlines the purposes of US training of military forces from the South in relation to its impact on incidents of repression, and its potential to bring about respect for human rights, and establishes what the connections are between the training and broader US foreign policy objectives and strategies. This involves assessing how those objectives and strategies have shaped the training, but also how the successes and failures of the training have fed back into the exercise of US foreign policy. The chapter demonstrates that during the Cold War, US training of military forces from the South played an important role as part of a US-led network of cooperation in the service of US foreign policy objectives, but since the end of the Cold War that network is no longer the primary mechanism through which the US seeks to achieve its objectives. Since the end of the Cold War, when US foreign policy began to emphasise legitimation, reliance on repression diminished, and it was subsumed within the emergent transnational state. In line with this shift in US foreign policy strategy, some aspects of the training began to be characterised by the promotion of legitimation, and in the wake of 9/11, the US intensified its activities in both spheres.

The chapter concludes with an evaluation of the limitations of the research, outlining what a future research agenda should focus on, followed by a discussion of the implications of the research for academics, policy-makers and activists. For activists suggestions are made in relation to the strategies that they use to challenge US foreign policy. For policy-makers this includes a reflection on the normative implications of the thesis particularly in relation to repression. The normative implications are also relevant to academics, specifically in terms of the marginalisation of normative approaches from IR. As I will argue, such approaches are both pertinent and necessary.

US training of military forces from the South in context

The Cold War

US training of military forces from the South was consistent with broader US foreign policy strategies during the Cold War. These were characterised primarily by support for and use of state terrorism and involved interventions in nearly every Latin American state. The US orchestrated coups and invasions, and backed repressive regimes by sharing intelligence and providing military training and arms. These activities were justified as necessary to contain communism. In reality they were aimed at quelling movements, including democratic ones, that would threaten US control of resources and markets in the South. Support for and use of repression by the US was not limited to Latin America. In Indochina the US engaged in wars in which millions of civilians were killed, many as a consequence of extensive US CI campaigns.[1]

The purpose of US training of military forces from the South during the Cold War was to establish those forces as US allies in pursuit of its objectives, equipped to crush movements that threatened US control of material assets and markets in the South. The training was dominated by a particular form of CI instruction which advocated repression. Despite defeat in the Vietnam War, tactics used in the Phoenix Programme were integrated into US military training for its own and for foreign military personnel. As training manuals used among military and intelligence personnel show, the US advocated the assassination of suspected insurgents, betrayal of intelligence agents no longer considered useful, terrorising family members of suspected insurgents, prolonged imprisonment, and torture during interrogation. It was not simply suspected insurgents that were at risk of such treatment. The manuals also encouraged targeting members of social groups who it was assumed might become politicised and therefore be at risk of embracing the insurgency. Repression was thereby intended primarily as a tool to instil fear in local populations, rather than for securing intelligence.

Towards the end of the Cold War, US complicity in repression was uncovered, partly as a result of the leaking of training manuals that had been used at the School of the Americas (SOA), and among Mobile Training Teams of Special Forces that went to countries in Latin America to provide training. This resulted in significant public protest on the part of human rights NGO

[1] As discussed in chapter four CI doctrine emphasises overcoming insurgencies not simply through military means, but also through political, economic, psychological and civic actions. A central element of CI is to secure support from the public for the campaign, and to deter them from lending support to, or joining, the insurgency. Tactics include spreading anti-insurgent propaganda and gathering intelligence in order to pre-empt and thwart insurgent activity. They also involve infrastructure development. It is therefore not inherently or necessarily repressive. Indeed, US CI manuals emphasise that legitimation should take precedence over repression, that coercive CI will ultimately fail, and that it is, at best, a holding measure until legitimation efforts take root. Nevertheless, CI as practised and advocated by the US during the Cold War encouraged repression.

School of Americas Watch (SOAW), leading to an overhaul of SOA which fed into and reflected the shift in US foreign policy strategy at the end of the Cold War towards legitimation.

The Post-Cold War Years

Since the end of the Cold War, legitimation efforts have operated alongside repression in US foreign policy in the South. This has involved US organisations such as the National Endowment for Democracy and USAID working in states in the South to establish democracy, but also to ensure that local elites are co-opted, and that groups that may threaten US dominance of resources and markets in the South are marginalised. These organisations cooperate with institutions of the emergent transnational state, including the IMF, World Bank, and WTO. As a result, many states in the South that were previously controlled by repressive regimes are now democratic.

Nevertheless, the US has used repression in cases where individuals and governments that are perceived to threaten its interests are elected, as in Haiti in 1991 and 2004, and in Venezuela in 2002. The democratically elected leaders in both states implemented reforms which included the redistribution of land, and in Venezuela, the re-nationalisation of oil and the establishment of thousands of small cooperatives. Because this impeded US control of resources and markets, the US endorsed coups in both states.

Although since 9/11 legitimation efforts in the South have increased, there has also been a resurgence of repression in US foreign policy strategy. This is most evident in US treatment of detainees in the "War on Terror". The US has held terror suspects in secret prisons without legal representation and without bringing any charges against them; prisoners were tortured by US military and intelligence personnel at the Abu Ghraib prison, Guantanamo Bay and in other detention facilities; senior figures in the Bush administration have sought to circumvent international law in relation to torture; and the US has implemented a policy of extraordinary rendition, whereby detainees are secretly transported to, and imprisoned in, states known to use torture.

US training of military forces from the South since the end of the Cold War has been extensive, with over 50,000 military and police personnel from over 150 countries receiving training annually. Its precise role in the "War on Terror" is unclear, although since 9/11 the US has increased its training of foreign military forces, and has offered it to countries that Congress had previously banned from receiving training because of their poor human rights records, including Indonesia, Guatemala, and Pakistan.

When SOA was re-launched as WHINSEC in 2001, following the leaking of the manuals that advocated repression, all CI training was removed from the curriculum. The institution was made subject to external oversight by a Board comprising civilians, including human rights lawyers, as well as military and government officials. Human rights training was introduced into every course and has been of a high standard. Of course, WHINSEC also serves an important public relations function, as interested parties can be directed to WHINSEC, the Department of Defense's showcase. WHINSEC accounts for just one percent of all US training of foreign military forces. The rest of the training, both for foreign forces and for US military personnel, is less transparent and places little emphasis on human rights. Department of Defense officials indicated that training for US forces contains only minimal content on the Laws of Armed Conflict. They also claimed that US forces do not need the level of human rights training that WHINSEC students, mostly from Latin America, receive, because growing up in the US has given them an innate respect for human rights. They also stated that most US training for foreign military personnel does not contain human rights components because that is not its function. The stated aims of the training are to improve military competence and to guarantee synergy between military forces in the South and the US armed forces. A secondary aim is to establish appropriate civil military relations and professionalism. Looked at in broader terms, however, the training is intended to help ensure dominant access for the US to resources and markets in the South. Promotion of human rights has only ever been secondary to this objective. The changes at WHINSEC can only have a marginal effect when so little emphasis is placed on human rights in the remainder of the training, including for US forces.

The Limitations of the research and future research agendas

While the research has made significant contributions to our understanding of the nature, functions and outcomes of the training in relation to wider US foreign policy objectives and strategies, there are two main limitations. The first relates to the scope of the study. The work focused primarily on training by US state forces of state forces in the South. This was much needed, as there is so little recent research in this area. Nevertheless, the research did not analyse training which is increasingly being subcontracted to private military companies, for military and paramilitary forces from the South. This is a significant development, and, while there are likely to be difficulties relating to acquisition of data, demands further research. This is particularly important in terms of ascertaining the human rights implications of such training, especially as it gives rise to questions in relation to the accountability of such contractors under the Laws of Armed Conflict.

The second main limitation of the research relates to the factors that would influence individuals who have received training to commit human rights abuses. As I have shown throughout,

establishing the causes behind an individual's participation in human rights abuses is not straightforward, and certainly cannot simply be attributed to the training they received. A whole set of factors relating to upbringing, culture, military culture, an individual's character and psychology, and to the specific circumstances of the event may have contributed to the individual's actions. Establishing the influences on individuals that committed human rights abuses is likely to be extremely difficult, not least because of lack of access. Nevertheless, one way in which the research could be developed is through interviewing students that had received training, particularly at the height of the Cold War when repressive CI strategies dominated, in order to develop an understanding of their own perceptions of what might cause individuals to commit abuses. Such questions are suggestive of collaborative research with psychologists and sociologists, and would be extremely useful for deepening our understanding of political violence.

Implications for activists, academics and policy-makers

This research has important implications for activists, policy-makers and academics. For activists, the focus to date on SOA/WHINSEC is inadequate for addressing the wider impacts of US military training on the incidence of repression. In policy terms, repression is usually justified as a means of increasing security against specific threats. Yet most repression has little to do with security and is instead primarily, and illegitimately, a means of protecting the interests of elites. For academics, the research demonstrates the importance of normative approaches, and shows that there is a need for reform in the way in which security tends to be studied.

SOAW helped uncover US complicity in state terrorism in the South, but its efforts have remained focused on WHINSEC, despite the positive changes that have taken place. That WHINSEC poses a threat to human rights is accurate only in the sense that it is a part of a much broader set of strategies, including repressive ones, that the US uses to secure dominant access to Southern assets and economies. Given that we know so little about the role of the training beyond WHINSEC in these processes, SOAW should subject the rest of the training to scrutiny. WHINSEC should still be monitored, especially given the recent appointment of a significantly more right-wing oversight Board than previously, which may result in a reduced commitment to ensuring high standards in, and levels of, human rights training. Similarly the effectiveness of the human rights training has not been proven, so there is scope for demanding that the Department of Defense demonstrate precisely how the training positively impacts upon the realisation of human rights.

This research also has significant policy implications with regard to repression and human rights. The models developed in the thesis to account for the use of torture provide a comprehensive basis on which to challenge repression, for they expose its true functions and its consequences. Torture is usually justified as a means by which to secure intelligence that will help prevent terrorist acts. Most torture actually has little to do with intelligence gathering, and more to do with countering actual or potential threats to elite interests. Torture may occasionally be effective for securing credible intelligence, but its associated costs – the high chances of torturing individuals who are innocent; the likelihood of acquiring false information; and the danger of torture spreading to the point that it is used indiscriminately for reasons that have nothing to do with security – are shown to be very high. Repression was used within authoritarian states throughout the Cold War as a means of neutralising political opposition, often with US backing. This was intended to help establish the stable conditions required by elites to ensure control of materials and markets. This stability is illegitimate because it is founded on repression. Finally, torture, and specifically claiming the right to use it, has also been a means by which those seeking to claim that right secure their own legitimacy. They try to achieve this by seeking to portray themselves as legitimate and trustworthy to use torture, and those against whom they seek that right as evil, dangerous enemies deserving of torture. Legitimacy based on torture is as illegitimate as stability based on repression. Many policy-makers would accept these two propositions. However, the US-led transnational state will only relinquish repressive means either when it gives up trying to control the South, or when it exerts that control through legitimation.

This research also has important implications for IR academics. Firstly, the way in which definitions of terrorism are applied has led to the near absence from academic debate of the issue of Northern state terrorism, which is one of a number of tools of repression used by Northern powers, and the US in particular. Terrorism is usually assumed to constitute activities by non-state actors, often located in the South, against Northern democracies and their interests, and state terrorism is assumed to constitute support for terrorists by "rogue" states. This research shows that some Northern democracies, especially the US, have been responsible for widespread terrorism against populations in the South. This exclusion of state terrorism from current usage of the term "terrorism" means that academics are playing into certain political agendas, specifically those of the current US administration and its allies in the "War on Terror". They are reinforcing certain political assumptions about what constitutes terrorism, which in turn reinforces the false notion of Northern powers, especially the US, as simply upholding liberal values and protecting Northern populations from threats. The term "terrorism" should be reclaimed as an analytical tool, rather than a political tool, in the service of elite power.

The second implication for academics relates closely to the first. Generally speaking, explicitly normative approaches to foreign policy have been marginalised within IR scholarship. This research has carefully critiqued the dominant interpretation of US foreign policy – that it is benign in character – and has analysed the practices of US foreign policy and its outcomes within the broader context of the global capitalist system, of which the US is the greatest champion. This has been with the specific, normative aim of offering suggestions for the emancipation of people in the South from the oppressive practices of the US state and its elite allies. The research does not simply accept the system as a given, but has critiqued its foundations, as well as the repressive strategies that are instituted in order to maintain and entrench that system. Normative approaches of this kind are necessary for the development of IR scholarship for two reasons. Firstly, they enable us to overcome certain biases in the field, including the selective application of terms such as "terrorism" which serve to fortify rather than confront illiberal practices. Secondly, they help to diversify and broaden debate beyond the narrow parameters set by the dominant, realist and liberal approaches. This will help us to generate knowledge which can challenge not only repressive practices, but the systems which generate them and which they are intended to reinforce.

The US state and its allies should be held to account for their repressive policies. One way in which to do this is by continuing to scrutinise the training that the US gives to tens of thousands of military forces from the South every year. This will only be effective if the training is understood within the wider context of US foreign policy objectives, and if those objectives are themselves challenged, because they dictate the nature of the training. The US is determined to ensure dominant access to assets and economies in the South, and while this may benefit other players in the emergent transnational state, the goal is to ensure that US elites are the primary beneficiaries. While legitimation is one means of achieving this, the objective has always taken precedence over the means, and if repressive strategies are deemed most likely to secure control, they will continue to feature in US foreign policy strategy, including in US training of military forces from the South.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles

Abbott, Elizabeth, Haiti. An Insider's History of the Rise and Fall of the Duvaliers, (New York: Touchstone, 1988).

Aguero, Felipe, 'Legacies of Transitions: Institutionalisation, the Military, and Democracy in South America', *Mershon International Studies Review*, vol.42, (1998), pp.383-404.

Ajchenbaum, Yves Marc (ed), Les Etats-Unis, Gendarmes du Monde. Pour le Meilleur et le Pire, Edited by Le Monde, (Paris: Librio, 2003).

Amin, Samir, The Liberal Virus. Permanent War and the Americanization of the World, (London: Pluto Press, 2004).

Amoore, Louise (ed.), *The Global Resistance Reader*, (London: Routledge, 2005).

Anathangelou, Anna, and Ling, LHM, 'Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol.48, no.3, (2004), pp.517-538.

Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966).

Associación Madres de Plaza de Mayo, *Historia de las Madres de Plaza de Mayo*, (Buenos Aires: Associación Madres de Plaza de Mayo, 1996).

Avant, Deborah, The Market for Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Badiou, Alain, 'Philosophy and the "War Against Terrorism"', in Badiou, Alain (ed.), *Infinite Thought*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2003), pp.141-164.

Ballard, John, Upholding Democracy. The United States Military Campaign in Haiti, 1994-1997, (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1998).

Barkawi, Tarak, 'Connection and Constitution: Locating War and Culture in Globalisation Studies', *Globalisations*, vol.1, no.2, (2004), pp.155-170.

Barkawi, Tarak, 'Democratic States and Societies at War: The Global Context', *The Comparative Study of Conscription in the Armed Forces*, vol.20, (2002), pp.361-376.

Barkawi, Tarak, *Globalization and War*, (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2006).

Barkawi, Tarak, 'On the Pedagogy of Small Wars', *International Affairs*, vol.80, no.1, (2004), pp.19-37.

Barkawi, Tarak, and Laffey, Mark, 'The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalisation', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol.5, no.4, (1999), pp.403-434.

Barkawi, Tarak, and Laffey, Mark, 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies', *Review of International Studies*, vol.32, no.2, (2006), pp.329-352.

Barkawi, Tarak, and Laffey, Mark, 'Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations', *Millennium*, vol.31, no.1, (2002), pp.109-127.

Barnet, Richard, Intervention and Revolution: The United States in the Third World, (London: Paladin, 1972).

Barnett, Michael, and Duvall, Raymond (eds.), *Power in Global Governance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Beccaria, Cesare, *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*, Translated by Richard Davies, Edited by Richard Bellamy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1764] 1995).

Beitz, Charles, *Political Theory and IR*, (New Jersey: Princton Uni Press, 1979).

Belkin, Aaron; Clark, Michael; Gokcek, Gulriz; Hinkley, Robert; Knecht, Thomas; and Patterson, Eric, 'When is Strategic Bombing Effective? Domestic Legitimacy and Aerial Denial', *Security Studies*, vol.11, no.4, (2002), pp.51-88.

Bell, Judith, *Doing Your Research Project*, Third Edition, (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999).

Bellamy, Alex, 'Humanitarian Responsibilities and Interventionist Claims in International Society', *Review of International Studies*, vol.29, no.3, (2003), pp.321-340.

Bellamy, Alex, 'No Pain, No Gain? Torture and Ethics in the War on Terror', *International Affairs*, vol.82, no.1, (2006), pp.121-148.
Bialke, Joseph, 'Al-Qaeda and Taliban Unlawful Combatant Detainees, Unlawful Belligerency, and the International Laws of Armed Conflict', *Air Force Law Review*, vol.5, Spring 2004, <http://www.defenddemocracy.org/usr_doc/Pages_from_Air_Force_Law_Review_Volume_55_(Fall_2004)_(6)_2.pdf>
Bjork, Kjell, and Jones, Richard, 'Overcoming Dilemmas Created by the 21st Century Mercenaries: Conceptualising the Use of Private Security Companies in Iraq', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, no.4-5, (2005), pp.777-796.
Blakeley, Ruth, 'Still Training to Torture? US Training of Military Forces from Latin America', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.27, no.8, (2006), forthcoming.
Blum, William, Killing Hope. US Military and CIA interventions since World War II, (London: Zed Books, 2003).
Booth, Ken (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, (London: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2005).
Booth, Ken, 'Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist', in Krause, Keith and Williams, Michael (eds.), *Critical Security Studies*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), pp.83-118.
Booth, Ken, and Dunne, Tim (eds.), *Worlds in Collision. Terror and the Future of Global Order*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
Boswell, Terry, 'Mini-Symposium: Peter Gowan and the "Capitalist World-Empire": American World Empire or Declining Hegemony', *Journal of World-Systems Research*, vol.10, no.2, (2004), pp.516-524.
British Sociological Association, *Statement of Ethical Practice*, (Durham: British Sociological Association, 1993).
Brodie, Bernard, *War and Politics*, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1973).
Bromley, Simon, 'The Logic of American Power in the International Capitalist Order', in Colas, Alex and Saull, Richard (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2006), pp.44-64.
Brooks, Stephen, and Wohlforth, William, 'From Old Thinking to New Thinking in Qualitative Research', *International Security*, vol.26, no.4, (2002), pp.93-111.
Brophy, Robert, and Zirnite, Peter, 'US Military Training for Latin America', *Foreign Policy in Focus*, vol.2, no.48, (October 1997), <http://www.foreignpolicy-infocus.org/briefs/col2/v2n48mil.html>
Brown, Cynthia, With Friends Like These: The Americas Watch Report on Human Rights and US Policy in Latin America, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985).
Brown, Seyom, 'Why Nations Fight Wars: Their Standard Justifications', in *The Causes and Prevention of War*, (New York: St Martin's, 1994), pp.48-64.
Buergenthal, Thomas, 'The United Nations Truth Commission for El Salvador', *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, vol.27, no.3, (1994), pp.497-544.
Burbach, Roger, and Tarbell, Jim, *Imperial Overstretch. George W Bush and the Hubris of Empire*, (London: Zed Books, 2004).
Burchill, Scott, and Linklater, Andrew (eds.), *Theories of IR*, (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1995).
Burnett, Jonny, and Whyte, Dave, 'Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism', *Journal for Crime Conflict and the Media*, vol.1, no.4, (2005), pp.1-18.
Buzan, Barry, and Herring, Eric, *The Arms Dynamic in World Politics*, (London: Lynne Reinner, 1998).
Bybee, Jay, 'Memorandum for Alberto R Gonzales, Counsel to the President. Re: Standards of Conduct for Interrogation under 18 USC 2340-2340A (US Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel)', in Greenberg, Karen and Dratel, Joshua, (eds.), *The Torture Papers. The Road to Abu Ghraib*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1 August 2002), pp.172-214.
Callinicos, Alex, *The New Mandarins of American Power*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003).
Cammack, Paul, 'Attacking the Poor', *New Left Review*, vol.13, (2002), pp.125-134.

Cammack, Paul, 'Review Article: Bringing the State Back In?', *British Journal of Political Science*, vol.19, no.2, (1989), pp.261-290.
Campaign Against Criminalising Communities (CAMPACC), *A Permanent State of Terror?*, (London: Campaign Against Criminalising Communities in Association with Index on Censorship, 2003).
Campbell, David, *Writing Security: US Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, (Minneapolis and Manchester: University of Minnesota Press and Manchester University Press, 1998).
Cannon, Barry, 'Venezuela, April 2002: Coup or Popular Rebellion? The Myth of a United Venezuela', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol.23, no.3, (2004), pp.285-302.
Carothers, Thomas, *Aiding Democracy Abroad. The Learning Curve*, (Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999).
Carothers, Thomas, In the name of democracy. US Policy towards Latin America in the Reagan Years, (California: University of California Press, 1991).
Central American University, 'Economic Policies and Staple Grains', *Proceso*, (published by the Centre for Information, Documentation and Research Support), no.649, (1995.), pp.1-3.
Chamberlain, Greg, 'Haiti's 'Second Independence'. Aristide's Seven Months in Office', in McFadyen, Deidre, LaRamée, Pierre, Fried, Mark and Rosen, Fred (eds.), *Haiti. Dangerous Crossroads*, (Boston: South End Press, North American Congress on Latin America, 1995), pp.51-56.
Chomsky, Noam, *American Power and the New Mandarins*, Second Edition, (New York: The New Press, 2002).
Chomsky, Noam, 'Commentary: Moral Truisms, Empirical Evidence, and Foreign Policy', *Review of International Studies*, vol.29, no.4, (2003), pp.605-620.
Chomsky, Noam, *The Culture of Terrorism*, (London: Pluto Press, 1989).
Chomsky, Noam, *Deterring Democracy*, Second Edition, (London: Vintage Books, Verso, 1992).
Chomsky, Noam, 'International Terrorism: Image and Reality', in George, Alexander (ed.), *Western State Terrorism*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), pp.12-38.
Chomsky, Noam, *The New Military Humanism*, (Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1999).
Chomsky, Noam, *Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship*, Third Edition, (New York: The New Press, 2003).
Chomsky, Noam, *Rogue States*, (London: Pluto Press Ltd, 2000).
Chomsky, Noam, Turning the Tide. US Intervention in Central America and the Struggle for Peace, (Boston: Pluto Press, 1985).
Chomsky, Noam, *World Orders Old and New*, Second Edition, (New York: Colombia University Press, 1994).
Chomsky, Noam, *Year 501*, (Boston: South End Press, 1993).
Chomsky, Noam, and Herman, Edward, The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism: The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol I, (Boston: South End Press, 1979).
Chomsky, Noam, and Herman, Edward, After the Cataclysm. Postwar Indochina and the reconstruction of imperial ideology. The Political Economy of Human Rights, vol II, (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1979).
Chomsky, Noam; Steele, Jonathan; and Gittings, John, *Superpowers in Collision. The New Cold War of the 1980s*, Second Edition, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1984).
Clapham, Christopher, 'The Challenge to the State in a Globalized World', *Development and Change*, vol.33, no.5, (2002), pp.775-796.
Cockburn, Alexander, and Clair, Jeffrey St., *Whiteout: The CIA, Drugs and the Press*, (London: Verso, 1998).
Cockcroft, James, *Latin America. History, Politics and US Policy*, (Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1989).
Cohen, Stanley, States of Denial. Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001).
Cohn, Carol, 'Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defence Intellectuals', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol.12, no.4, (1987), pp.687-718.
Colas, Alex, and Saull, Richard (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2006).

Conroy, John, Unspeakable Acts, Ordinary People. The Dynamics of Torture, (London: Vision Paperbacks, 2001).
Conry, Barbara, 'Loose Cannon: The National Endowment for Democracy', *Cato Foreign Policy Briefing*, vol.27, (1993), <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb-027.html>
Cope, John, 'International Military Education and Training: An Assessment', Institute for National Strategic Studies, *McNair Papers*, no.44, (1995), <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/macnair/mcnair44/m44cont.html>
Cox, Michael, 'The Imperial Republic Revisited: the US in the Era of Bush', in Colas, Alex and Saull, Richard (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2006), pp.114-130.
Cox, Michael, 'Western Capitalism and the Cold War System', in Shaw, Martin (ed.), *War, State and Society*, (New York: St Martin's Press, 1984), pp.136-194.
Cox, Robert, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, vol.10, no.2, (1981), pp.126-155.
Cox, Robert, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', in Keohane, Robert (ed.), *Neorealism and its Critics*, (New York: Colombia University Press, 1986), pp.204-249.
Crandall, Russell, 'Clinton, Bush and Plan Colombia', *Survival*, vol.44, no.1, (2002), pp.159-172.
Cryer, Pat, *The Research Student's Guide to Success*, Second Edition, (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2002).
Cumings, Bruce, *North Korea*, (New York: The New Press, 2004).
Cumings, Bruce, The Origins of the Korean War, Volume II: The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990).
Davenport, Christian (ed.), *Paths to State Repression. Human Rights Violations and Contentious Politics*, (Lanham: Roman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2000).
Davidson, Julia O'Connell, and Layder, Derek, *Methods, Sex and Madness*, (London: Routledge, 1994).
Davis, Mike, 'Planet of Slums. Urban Involution and the Informal Proletariat', *New Left Review*, vol.26, (2004), pp.5-34.
Devetak, Richard, 'The Gothic Sense of International Relations: Ghosts, Monsters, Terror and the Sublime after September 11', *Review of International Studies*, vol.31, no.4, (2005), pp.621-643.
Diskin, Martin, Trouble in Our Backyard: Central America and the United States in the Eighties, (New York: Pantheon, 1983).
Dobrianasky, Paula, and Carothers, Thomas, 'Democracy Promotion', *Foreign Affairs*, vol.82, no.3, (2003), <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20030501faresponse11226/paula-j-dobriansky-thomas-carothers/democracy-promotion.html>
Dobson, Alan, 'The Danger of US Interventionism', *Review of International Studies*, vol.28, no.3, (2002), pp.577-597.
Domhoff, William, 'Studying Power', April 2005, <http://sociology.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/theory/studyingpower.html>
Domhoff, William, 'The Four Networks Theory of Power: A Theoretical Home for Power Structure Research', April 2005, <http://sociology.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/theory/four_networks.html>
Doswald-Beck, Louise, and Vite, Sylvain, 'International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Law', *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol.293, (1993), pp.94-119.
Duffield, Mark, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, (London: Zed Books, 2001).
Dunleavy, Patrick, Authoring a PhD: How to Plan, Draft, Write and Finish a Doctoral Thesis or Dissertation, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003).
Dunleavy, Patrick, and O'Leary, Brendan, *Theories of the State. The Politics of Liberal Democracy*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1987).
Dunne, Michael, 'US Foreign Relations in the Twentieth Century: From World Power to Global Hegemony', *International Affairs*, vol.76, no.1, (2000), pp.25-40.
Dupuy, Alex, *Haiti in the New World Order*, (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1997).
Elman, Colin; Elman, Miriam Fendius; and Schroeder, Paul, 'Correspondence', *International Security*, vol.20, no.1, (1995), pp.182-195.

Enloe, Cynthia, 'Margins, Silences and Bottom Rungs: How to Overcome the Underestimation of Power in the Study of International Relations', in Smith, Steve, Booth, Ken and Zalewski, Marysia (eds.), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.186-202.
Fanon, Franz, *The Wretched of the Earth,* (London: Penguin, [1961] 1967).
Farmer, Paul, *The Uses of Haiti*, (Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press, 1994).
Farrell, Theo, 'Transnational Norms and Military Development: Constructing Ireland's Professional Army', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol.7, no.1, (2001), pp.63-102.
Fearon, James, and Laitin, David, 'Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity', *International Organisation*, vol.54, no.4, (2000), pp.845-877.
Ferguson, James, *Papa Doc, Baby Doc. Haiti and the Duvaliers*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1987).
Fishel, John, and Fishel, Kimbra, 'The Impact of the US Army School of the Americas on Host Nation Militaries: An Effective Instrument of Policy or Merely a Scapegoat?' *Low Intensity Conflict and Law Enforcement*, vol.7, no.1, (1998), pp.47-70.
Fiske, Susan; Harris, Lasana; and Cuddy, Amy, 'Why Ordinary People Torture Enemy Prisoners', *Science*, vol.306, (2004), pp.1482-1483.
Fitch, John Samuel, *The Armed Forces and Democracy in Latin America*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, Translated by Alan Sheridan, (London: Penguin Books, 1977).
Frésard, Jean-Jacques, 'Des Laboratories de Milgram aux Champs de Bataille: Quelques Elements de Compréhension du Comportement des Combattants', *Revue Internationale de la Croix-Rouge*, vol.86, no.853, (2004), pp.147-168.
Frost, Mervyn, *Towards a Normative Theory of IR*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
Fukuyama, Francis, 'The End of History?' *The National Interest*, vol.16, (1989), pp.3-18.
Fundaciòn Flor de Izote, 'Economic Programmes and the Need for a National Agenda', *El Salvador in Perspective*, vol.1, no.4, (1995), pp.1-2.
Galeano, Eduardo, *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*, 1997, Twenty-fifth Anniversary Edition, (New York: Monthly Press Review, 1973).
Gareau, Frederick, State Terrorism and the United States. From Counterinsurgency to the War on Terrorism, (London: Zed Books, 2004).
George, Alexander, 'Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured Focused Comparison', in Gordon, Lauren (ed.), *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy*, (New York: Simon And Schusster, 1979), pp.43-68.
George, Alexander, *Western State Terrorism*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
Gilbert, Nigel (ed), *Researching Social Life*, (London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2001).
Gill, Lesley, The School of the Americas. Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas., (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).
Gill, Stephen, *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003).
Gills, Barry; Rocamora, Joel; and Wilson, Richard (eds.), *Low Intensity Democracy: Political Power in the New World Order*, (London: Pluto, 1993).
Giroux, Henry, 'Education After Abu Ghraib. Revisiting Adorno's Politics of Education', *Cultural Studies*, vol.18, no.6, (2004), pp.779-815.
Gowan, Peter, 'The Bush Turn and the Drive for Primacy', in Colas, Alex and Saull, Richard (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War,* (Oxford: Routledge, 2006), pp.131-154.
Gowan, Peter, 'A Calculus of Power', *New Left Review*, vol.16, (2002), <http://www.newleftreview.net/NLR25003.shtml>
Gowan, Peter, The Global Gamble. Washington's Faustian Bid for World Dominance, (London: Verso, 1999).
Gowan, Peter, 'US: UN', *New Left Review*, vol.24, (2003), pp.5-28.

Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971).
Graves, Ernest, and Hildreth, Steven, *US Security Assistance. The Political Process*, (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1985).
Greenberg, Karen, and Dratel, Joshua (eds.), *The Torture Papers. The Road to Abu Ghraib*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
Grix, Jonathan, *Demystifying Postgraduate Research, From MA to PhD*, (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2001).
Hamamoto, Darrell, 'Empire of Death: Militarized Society and the Rise of Serial Killing and Mass Murder', *New Political Science*, vol.24, no.1, (2002), pp.105-120.
Hardt, Michael, and Negri, Antonio, *Empire*, (New York: Harvard University Press, 2000).
Harris, Jerry, 'The US Military in the Era of Globalisation', *Race and Class*, vol.44, no.2, (2002), pp.1-22.
Hartmann, Hauke, 'Carter's Human Rights Policy in Operation: the Case of El Salvador,' Paper presented at the British International Studies Association Annual Conference, London School of Economics, December 2002.
Harvey, David, *The New Imperialism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
Haugaard, Lisa, 'Textbook Repression: US Training Manuals Declassified', *Covert Action Quarterly*, vol.61, (1997), pp.1-9.
Hay, Colin, *Political Analysis. A Critical Introduction*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).
Heisbourg, Francois, 'American Hegemony? Perceptions of the US Abroad', *Survival*, vol.41, no.4, (1999-2000), pp.5-19.
Held, David, 'Farewell Nation State', *Marxism Today*, (1988), pp.12-17.
Held, David, and McGrew, Anthony, 'The End of the Old Order? Globalisation and the Prosects for World Order', *Review of International Studies*, vol.24, no.2, (1998), pp.219-243.
Herman, Edward, *The Real Terror Network*, Second Edition, (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1985).
Herman, Edward, and O'Sullivan, Gerry, The "Terrorism" Industry: The Experts and Institutions that Shape Our View of Terror, (New York: Pantheon, 1989).
Herring, Eric, 'Wiping the State Clean: How British IR Academia Can Contribute to Emancipatory Practice in World Politics,' Paper presented at the British International Studies Association Annual Conference, University of Edinburgh, December 2001. <http://www.naspir.org.uk/members/eric_herring/wiping_the_state_clean.htm>
Herring, Eric, and Rangwala, Glen, *Iraq in Fragments: The Occupation and its Legacy*, (London: C. Hurst and Co, 2006), forthcoming.
Herring, Eric, and Rangwala, Glen, 'Iraq, Imperialism and Global Governance', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, no.4-5, (2005), pp.667-683.
Herring, Eric, and Robinson, Piers, 'Too Polemical or Too Critical for the Mainstream? Chomsky on the Study of the News Media and US Foreign Policy', *Review of International Studies*, vol.29, no.4, (2002), pp.553-568.
Hersh, Seymour, Chain of Command. The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib, (London: Penguin Books, 2004).
Heymann, Philip, *Terrorism, Freedom, and Security. Winning Without War*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2003).
Huggins, Martha, *Political Policing. The United States and Latin America*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).
Huggins, Martha; Haritos-Fatouros, Mika; and Zimbardo, Philip, *Violence Workers. Police Torturers and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
Hunter-Wade, Robert, 'What Strategies are Viable for Developing Countries Today? The World Trade Organisation and the Shrinking of "Development Space"', *Review of International Political Economy*, vol.10, no.4, (2003), pp.621-644.
Huntington, Samuel, *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*, (London: Simon and Schuster UK Ltd, 1997).
Huntington, Samuel, 'Reforming Civil-Military Relations', *Journal of Democracy*, vol.6, no.4, (1995), pp.9-17.

Huntington, Samuel, *The Soldier and the State*, (New York: Random House, 1957).
Huntington, Samuel; Ajami, Fouad; Bartley, Robert; Binyan, Liu; Kirkpatrick, Jeane; Mahbubani, Kishore; Piel, Gerard; and Weeks, Albert, 'Samuel Huntington's The Clash of Civilisations? The Debate', *Foreign Affairs*, 1996.
Huysmans, Jef, 'Defining Social Constructivism in Security Studies: The Normative Dilemma of Writing Security', *Alternatives*, vol.27, (2002), pp.41-62.
Ignatieff, Michael, Empire Lite: Nation Building in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, (London: Vintage, 2003).
Isacson, Adam, 'Militarizing Latin American Policy', *Foreign Policy in Focus*, vol.6, no.21, (2001).
Jackson, Richard, 'The Social and Political Construction of Torture in the War on Terrorism,' Paper presented at the British International Studies Association Annual Conference, University of St Andrews, 2005.
Jackson, Richard, Writing the War on Terrorism. Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).
Jessop, Bob, 'Globalisation and the National State', Department of Sociology, University of Lancaster, 2003, <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Jessop-Globalization-and-the-National-State.pdf>
Johnson, Chalmers, *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*, (London: Little, Brown and Company, 2000).
Johnson, Theresa Pelton, 'Writing for International Security', *International Security*, vol.16, no.2, (1991), pp.171-180.
Jordan, Amos; Taylor, William; and Korb, Lawrence, *American National Security. Policy and Process*, (Baltimore: Baltimore, 1993).
Kaldor, Mary, 'America Power: From 'Compellance' to Cosmopolitanism?' *International Affairs*, vol.79, no.1, (2003), pp.1-22.
Kaldor, Mary, *New and Old Wars. Organised Violence in a Global Era*, Second Edition, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2001).
Kaldor, Mary, and Eide, Asbjorn, *The World Military Order*, (London and Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1979).
Kaldor, Mary, and Luckham, Robin, 'Global Transformations and New Conflicts', *IDS Bulletin*, vol.32, no.2, (2001), pp.48-69.
Kalyvas, Stathis, '"New" and "Old" Civil Wars. A Valid Distinction?' *World Politics*, vol.54, (2001), pp.99-118.
Keck, Margaret, and Sikkink, Kathryn, *Activists Beyond Borders. Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).
Kennan, George, 'The Sources of Soviet Conduct', *Foreign Affairs*, (1947), <http://www.historyguide.org/europe/kennan.html>
Kifer, Martin, 'NGO Action and Governmental Receptivity: The Debate Over US Army School of the Americas, The Role of Human Rights Rhetoric, and Changes in US Training of Members of Foreign Militaries,' Paper presented at the International Studies Association Conference, Montreal, 2004, <http://archive.allacademic.com/publication/getfile.php?file=docs/isa_proceeding/2004-03-14/15235/isa_proceeding_15235.pdf&PHPSESSID=270167bd7ef6450b3e8460d222514504>
Kimmel, Michael, 'Globalisation and its Mal(e)contents: The Gendered Moral and Political Economy of Terrorism', *International Sociology*, vol.18, no.3, (2003), pp.603-620.
King, Gary; Keohane, Robert; and Verba, Sidney, 'Review of: Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research', *American Political Science Review*, vol.89, no.2, (1995), pp.454-481.
Kirkpatrick, Jeanne, 'Dictators and Double Standards', *Commentary*, vol.68, no.5, (1979), pp.34-45.
Klare, Michael (ed.), Low Intensity Warfare: Counterinsurgency, Proinsurgency, and Anti-Terrorism in the 1980s, (New York: Pantheon, 1988).
Klare, Michael, 'Subterranean Alliances: America's Global Proxy Network', *Journal of International Affairs*, vol.43, no.1, (1989), pp.97-118.

Klare, Michael, and Arnson, Cynthia, 'Exporting Repression: US Support for Authoritarianism in Latin America', in Fagen, Richard (ed.), *Capitalism and the State in US-Latin American Relations*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979), pp.138-170.
Knapke, Margaret (ed.), *From Warriors to Resisters: US Veterans on Terrorism*, (Washington DC: SOA Watch, 2002).
Kolko, Gabriel, *Another Century of War?*, (New York: The New Press, 2002).
Kolko, Gabriel, Confronting the Third World. United States Foreign Policy 1945-1980, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988).
Koonings, Kees, and Kruijt, Dirk (eds.), *Armed Actors. Organised Violence and State Failure in Latin America*, (London: Zed Books, 2004).
Koonings, Kees, and Kruijt, Dirk, 'Latin American Political Armies in the Twenty-first Century', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol.22, no.3, (2003), pp.371-384.
Kordon, Diana; Edelman, Lucila; Lagos, Dario; and Nicoletti, Elena, *Psychological Effects of Political Repression*, (Buenos Aires: Sudamerica/Planeta, 1988).
Krasner, Stephen, 'Compromising Westphalia', *International Security*, vol.20, no.3, (1995), pp.115-151.
Kucera, Joshua, 'US Law Makes an Impact On Training Programmes', *Jane's Defence Weekly*, (2005), p.10.
Kull, Steven, Minds at War. Nuclear Reality and the Inner Conflicts of Defence Policymakers, (New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1988).
Kull, Steven; Ramsay, Clay; and Lewis, Evan, 'Misperceptions, the Media and the Iraq War', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol.118, no.4, (2003-2004), pp.569-598.
Kurth-Cronin, Audrey, 'Behind the Curve: Globalisation and International Terrorism', *International Security*, vol.27, no.3, (2002-2003), pp.30-58.
Laffey, Mark, and Weldes, Jutta, 'Policing and Global Governance', in Barnett, Mike and Duvall, Raymond, (eds.), *Power in Global Governance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp.59-79.
The Lancet, 'How Complicit are Doctors in Abuses of Detainees?' *The Lancet*, vol.364, (2004), pp.637-638. <http://download.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/0140-6736/PIIS0140673604169043.pdf>
Lawler, Peter, 'The Good State: In Praise of "Classical" Internationalism', *Review of International Studies*, vol.31, no.3, (2005), pp.427-449.
Lee, Raymond, *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics*, (London: Sage, 1993).
Leuer, Joseph, 'A Half Century of Professionalism: The US Army School of the Americas', *Adelante* (Journal of the School of the Americas), Edition to mark the closure of SOA, (2000), pp.6-35.
Levinson, Sanford (ed.), *Torture. A Collection*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
Lindsay-Poland, John, 'US Military Bases in Latin America and the Caribbean', *Foreign Policy in Focus*, vol.6, no.35, (2004), <http://www.fpif.org/briefs/vol9/v9n03latammil_body.html>
Lipset, Seymour, 'Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy', *The American Political Science Review*, vol.53, no.1, (1959), pp.69-105.
Loeffke, Bernard, *And the Least Beastly of Us Should Be Doing It*, (Columbus, Georgia: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, 2000).
MacMaster, Neil, 'Torture: From Algiers to Abu Ghraib', *Race and Class*, vol.46, no.2, (2004), pp.1-21.
Malkki, Liisa, *Purity and Exile*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
Mann, Michael, 'Globalisation and September 11', *New Left Review*, vol.12, (2001), pp.51-72.
Maoz, Zeev, 'Framing the National Interest: The Manipulation of Foreign Policy Decisions in Group Settings', *World Politics*, vol.43, no.1, (1990), pp.77-110.
Maoz, Zeev, Paradoxes of War. On the Art of National Self-Entrapment, Studies in International Conflict, vol III, (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990).
Maoz, Zeev, and Russett, Bruce, 'Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986', *American Political Science Review*, vol.87, no.3, (1993), pp.624-638.
Marcella, Gabriel, 'The Latin American Military: Low Intensity Conflict and Democracy', *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, vol.32, no.1, (1990), pp.45-82.

McClintock, Michael, The American Connection, Volume One: State Terror and Popular Resistance in El Salvador, (London: Zed Books Ltd, 1985).
McClintock, Michael, *Instruments of Statecraft*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992).
McClintock, Michael, 'The United States and Operation Condor: Military Doctrine in an Unconventional War,' Paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association Conference, Washington DC, September 2001.
McCoy, Alfred, A Question of Torture. CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror, (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006).
McCoy, Katherine. 'Trained to Torture: A Statistical Analysis of Human Rights Violations Committed by Graduates of the US Army School of the Americas, 1960-2000', (University of Wisconsin, Master of Science Thesis, 2003).
Miles, Steven, 'Abu Ghraib: Its Legacy for Military Medicine', *The Lancet*, vol.364, (2004), pp.725-729. <http://download.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/0140-6736/PIIS014067360416902X.pdf>
Milgram, Stanley, *Obedience to Authority*, (London: Tavistock Publications, 1974).
Miller, David (ed.), Tell Me Lies. Propaganda and Media Distortion in the Attack on Iraq, (London: Pluto Press, 2004).
Millett, Richard, 'The US and Latin America's Armed Forces: A Troubled Relationship', *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs*, vol.39, no.1, (1997), pp.121-136.
Molloy, Ivan, *Rolling Back Revolution*, (London: Pluto Press, 2001).
Morgenthau, Hans, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Fifth Revised Edition, (New York: Alfed A. Knopf, 1978).
Mossallanejed, Ezat, *Torture in the Age of Fear*, (Hamilton, Ontario: Seraphim Editions, 2005).
Mueller, John, 'Public Opinion as a Constraint on US foreign policy: Assessing the perceived value of American and Foreign Lives,' Paper presented at the National Convention of the International Studies Association, Los Angeles, 2000.
Murray, Kevin; Coletti, Ellen; Spence, Jack; Curtis, Cynthia; Cheff, Garth; Ramos, René; Chacón, José; and Thompson, Mary (eds.), *Rescuing Reconstruction: The Debate on Post-War Economic Recovery in El Salvador*, (Cambridge, MA: Hemisphere Initiatives, 1994).
Nardin, Terry, and Mapel, David (eds.), *Traditions of International Ethics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge, 1992).
Nelson-Pallmeyer, Jack, *School of Assassins*, (New York: Orbis Books, 1997).
Nelson-Pallmeyer, Jack, *School of Assassins: Guns, Greed and Globalisation*, Second Edition, (New York: Orbis Books, 2001).
Newman, Edward, 'The "New Wars" Debate: A Historical Perspective is Needed', *Security Dialogue*, vol.35, no.2, (2004), pp.173-189.
Nyerere, Julius, 'South-South Option', Text of the Third World Lecture, delivered in New Delhi, 22 February 1982', in Gauhar, Altaf, (ed.), *South-South Strategy*, (London: Third World Foundation, 1983), pp.9-16.
Olson, Mancur, 'Rapid Growth as a Destabilising Force', *The Journal of Economic History*, vol.23, no.4, (1963), pp.529-552.
Pala, Antonio, 'The Increased Role of Latin American Armed Forces in UN Peacekeeping: Opportunities and Challenges', *Airpower*, US Air Force, 1995, <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/pala.html>
Panitch, Leo, and Gindin, Sam, 'Finance and American Empire', *Socialist Register*, (2005), pp.46-81.
Panitch, Leo, and Gindin, Sam, 'Global Capitalism and American Empire', *The Socialist Register 2004*, (2003), pp.1-43.
Panitch, Leo, and Gindin, Sam, 'Superintending Global Capital', *New Left Review*, (2005), pp.101-123.
Panitch, Leo, and Gindin, Sam, 'The Unique American Empire', in Colas, Alex and Saull, Richard (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2006), pp.24-43.
Parmar, Inderjeet, 'American Foundations and the Development of International Knowledge Networks', *Global Networks*, vol.2, no.1, (2002), pp.13-30.

Parmar, Inderjeet, 'Institutes of International Affairs,' in Diane Stone, Andrew Denham, (eds.), *Think Tank Traditions,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).
Perkins, Dexter, *The Monroe Doctrine 1823-1826, vol I*, (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927).
Peters, Edward, *Torture*, (New York: Basil Blackwell Inc, 1985).
Philo, Greg, and Miller, David, 'Media / Cultural Studies and Social Science', in Philo, Greg and Miller, David (eds.), *Market Killing,* (London: Longman, 2001), pp.3-79.
Pilger, John, *Hidden Agendas*, (London: Vintage, 1998).
Poulantzas, Nicos, *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*, (London: New Left Books, 1975).
Poulantzas, Nicos, *Political Power and Social Classes*, Translated by Timothy O'Hagan, (London: Verso, [1968] 1987).
Priest, Dana, The Mission. Waging War and Keeping Peace with America's Military, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2004).
Prince, Rod, *Haiti Family Business*, (London: Latin American Bureau, 1985).
Pupavac, Vanessa, 'Human Security and the Rise of Global Therapeutic Governance', *Conflict, Security and Development*, vol.5, no.2, (2005), pp.161-181.
Pye, Lucien, *Aspects of Political Development*, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966).
Ramsbotham, Oliver, 'Humanitarian Intervention 1990-95', *Review of International Studies*, vol.23, no.4, (1997), pp.445-468.
Ramsey, Maureen, 'Can the Torture of Terrorist Suspects be Justified?' *The International Journal of Human Rights*, vol.10, no.2, (2006), pp.103-119.
Rejali, Darius, 'How Not to Talk About Torture: Violence, Theory and the Problems of Explanation', in Huggins, Martha, (ed.), *Vigilantism and the State in Modern Latin America: Essays in Extralegal Violence*, (New York: Praeger, 1991), pp.127-144.
Rejali, Darius, Torture and Modernity. Self, Society and State in Modern Iran, (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1994).
Renzatti, Claire, and Lee, Raymond, *Researching Sensitive Topics*, (London: Sage, 1993).
Rieff, David, A Bed for the Night. Humanitarianism in Crisis, (London: Vintage, 2002).
Robertson, Geoffrey, Crimes Against Humanity: The Struggle for Global Justice, (London: Penguin, 1999).
Robinson, Piers, 'The CNN effect: Can the News Media Drive Foreign Policy?' *Review of International Studies*, vol.25, (1999), pp.301-309.
Robinson, William, 'Global Capitalism: The New Transnationalism and the Folly of Conventional Thinking', *Science and Society*, vol.69, no.3, (2005), pp.316-328.
Robinson, William, 'Global Crisis and Latin America', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol.23, no.2, (2004), pp.135-153.
Robinson, William, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention, and Hegemony*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
Robinson, William, 'Social Theory and Globalisation: The Rise of a Transnational State', *Theory and Society*, vol.30, (2001), pp.157-200.
Robinson, William, A Theory of Global Capitalism. Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).
Robinson, William, Transnational Conflicts. Central America, Social Change, and Globalisation, (London: Verso, 2003).
Robinson, William, 'What to Expect from US "Democracy Promotion" in Iraq', *New Political Science*, vol.26, no.3, (2004), pp.441-447.
Robison, Richard, 'Toward a Class Analysis of the Indonesian Military Bureaucratic State', *Indonesia*, vol.25, (1978), pp.17-40. <http://cip.cornell.edu/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/seap.indo/1107119888>
Rogers, Paul, *Losing Control. Global Security in the 21st Century*, Second Edition, (London: Pluto Press, 2002).
Rose, David, *Guantanamo: America's War on Human Rights*, (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 2004).
Roth, Kenneth, and Worden, Minky (eds.), *Torture: Does It Make Us Safer? Is It Ever OK? A Human Rights Perspective*, (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2005).

Rubin, Herbert, and Rubin, Irene, *Qualitative Interviewing. The Art of Hearing Data*, (London: Sage Publications, Inc, 1995).
Rubin, Trudy, *Willfull Blindness. The Bush Administration and Iraq*, (Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Inquirer, 2004).
Rupert, Mark, and Smith, Hazel (eds.), *Historical Materialism and Globalisation*, (London: Routledge, 2002).
Russ, Shannon, Did Training at the US Army School of the Americas Have an Effect on the Level of Human Rights Abuse Allegations in Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Peru?', (US Department of Defense, Washington DC, 2004).
Russell, Bertrand, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, (London: Allen and Unwin, 1938).
Sagan, Scott, 'Why do States Build Nuclear Weapons?' *International Security*, vol.21, no.3, (1996), pp.54-86.
Said, Edward, Reflections on Exile and Other Essays, The Clash of Definitions, (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2000).
Saull, Richard, 'Reactionary Blowback: the Uneven Ends of the Cold War and the Origins of Contemporary Conflict in World Politics', in Colas, Alex and Saull, Richard (eds.), *The War on Terrorism and American 'Empire' After the Cold War*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2006), pp.65-90.
Schlessinger, Arthur, 'The Origins of the Cold War', *Foreign Affairs*, vol.46, (1967), pp.22-52.
Schmidt, Jeff, *Disciplined Minds*, (Lanham, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000).
Schoultz, Lars, *Beneath the United States*, (London and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998).
Schoultz, Lars, *National Security and US Policy toward Latin America*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987).
Schroeder, Paul, 'Historical Reality vs Neo-realist Theory', *International Security*, vol.19, no.1, (1994), pp.108-148.
Schroeder, Paul, 'History and IR Theory', *International Security*, vol.22, no.1, (1997), pp.64-74.
Seton-Watson, Hugh, Neither War Nor Peace: The Struggle for Power in the Post-War World, (New York: Praeger, 1969).
Sewell, John; Feinberg, Richard; and Kallab, Valeriana, *US Foreign Policy and the Third World: Agenda 1985-86*, (Washington DC: Overseas Development Council, 1985).
Shamsie, Yasmine, 'Building "Low-Intensity" Democracy in Haiti: The OAS Contribution', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.25, no.2, (2004), pp.1097-1115.
Shank, Gregory, 'Not a Just War, Just a War - NATO's Humanitarian Bombing Mission', *Social Justice*, vol.26, no.1, (1999), pp.4-48.
Sharma, Sohan, and Kumar, Surinder, 'The Military Backbone of Globalisation', *Race and Class*, vol.44, no.3, (2003), pp.23-39.
Shoup, Lawrence, and Minter, William, Imperial Brain Trust: The Council on Foreign Relations and United States Foreign Policy, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977).
Sinclair, Adriana, 'Re-conceptualising Law and its Emancipatory Potential,' Paper presented at the British International Studies Association Annual Conference, University of Birmingham, December 2003.
Sklair, Leslie, *Globalisation, Capitalism and its alternatives*, Third Edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Slack, Keith, 'Operation Condor and Human Rights: A Report from Paraguay's Archive of Terror', *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol.18, no.2, (1996), pp.492-506.
Slaughter, Anne-Marie, 'The Real New World Order', *Foreign Affairs*, vol.76, no.5, (1997), pp.183-197.
Smith, Gordon Connell, *The Inter-American System*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).
Smith, Nicaragua: Self-Determination and Survival, (London: Pluto Press, 1993).
Smith, Neil, 'The Satanic Geographies of Globalisation: Uneven Development in the 1990s', *Public Culture*, vol.10, no.1, (1997), pp.169-189.
Smith, Steve, 'The Discipline of International Relations: Still An American Social Science?' *British Journal of Political and International Relations*, vol.2, no.3, (2000), pp.374-402.
Smith, Steve, 'Singing Our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol.48, no.3, (2004), pp.499-515.

The South Commission, *The Challenge to the South. The Report of the South Commission*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
Stahler-Sholk, Richard, 'El Salvador's Negotiated Transition: From Low-Intensity Conflict to Low Intensity-Democracy', *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs*, vol.36, no.4, (1994), pp.1-59.
Stiglitz, Joseph, *Globalisation and its Discontents*, (London: Penguin Books, 2002).
Stohl, Michael, and Lopez, George (eds.), *The State as Terrorist: The Dynamics of Governmental Violence and Repression*, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984).
Stokes, Doug, *America's Other War*, (London: Zed Books, 2005).
Stokes, Doug, 'Better Lead than Bread? A Critical Analysis of the US' Plan Colombia', *Civil Wars*, vol.4, no.2, (2001), pp.59-78.
Stokes, Doug, 'Countering the Soviet Threat? An Analysis of the Justifications for US Military Assistance to El Salvador from 1979-1992', NASPIR, 2003, <http://www.naspir.org.uk/members/doug/cold_war_history.doc>
Stokes, Doug, 'Gluing the Hats on: Power, Agency and Reagan's Office of Public Diplmoacy', NASPIR, <http://www.naspir.org/members/doug/doug_stokes.htm>
Stokes, Doug, 'The Heart of Empire? Theorising US Empire In An Era Of Transnational Globalisation', *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, no.2, (2005), pp.217-236.
Stokes, Doug, '"Iron Fists in Iron Gloves": The Political Economy of US Terrorocracy Promotion in Colombia', *British Journal of Political and International Relations*, vol.8, (2006), pp.368-387.
Stokes, Doug, 'Why the End of the Cold War Doesn't Matter: the US War of Terror in Colombia', *Review of International Studies*, vol.29, no.4, (2003), pp.560-585.
Strawson, John (ed.), *Law After Ground Zero*, (London: Glasshouse Press, 2002).
Stubbs, Richard, and Underhill, Geoffrey, *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, Second Edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
Sussman, David, 'What's Wrong With Torture?' *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol.33, no.1, (2005), pp.1-33.
Valentine, Douglas, *The Phoenix Program*, Second Edition, (Lincoln: Authors Guild BackinPrint.Com, 2000).
Van Evera, Stephen, 'Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science', *Defence and Arms Control Studies Programme*, (1996).
Van Evera, Stephen, 'Wars of Intervention: Why They Shouldn't Have A Future, Why They Do', *Defense and Disarmament Alternatives*, vol.3, no.3, (1990), pp.1-8. Vidal-Naquet, Pierre, *La Torture Dans la République*, (Paris: Editions François Maspero, 1972).
Vidal-Naquet, Pierre, *Torture: Cancer of Democracy*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963).
Von-Hippel, Karin, Democracy by Force: US Military Intervention in the Post-Cold War World, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
Wallace, William, 'Truth and Power, Monks and Technocrats: Theory and Practice in International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, vol.22, no.3, (1996), pp.301-321.
Waltz, Kenneth, 'The Emerging Structure of International Politics', in Michael Brown (ed.), *The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security*, (Cambridge, Massachussetts: MIT Press, 1995), pp.42-77.
Walzer, Michael, *Just and Unjust Wars*, Third Edition, (New York: Basic Books, 2000).
Watkins, Susan, and Editorial, 'A Weightless Hegemony', *New Left Review*, vol.25, (2004), pp.5-33.
Weber, Cynthia, 'Flying 'Planes can be dangerous', *Millennium*, vol.31, no.1, (2002), pp.129-147.
Weber, Cynthia, 'Globalisation: Are we at the end of History?' in *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), pp.103-124.
Weber, Cynthia, 'Reconsidering Statehood: Examining the Sovereignty/Intervention Boundary', *Review of International Studies*, vol.18, no.3, (1992), pp.199-216.
Weiss, Linda, 'Globalisation and the Myth of the Powerless State', *New Left Review*, vol.225, (1997), pp.3-27.
Weissman, Stephen, *American Foreign Policy in the Congo, 1960-1964*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1974).

Weldes, Jutta, 'Constructing National Interests', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol.2, no.3, (1996), pp.275-318.
Weldes, Jutta, Constructing National Interests. The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis, (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).
Weldes, Jutta; Laffey, Mark; Gusterson, Hugh; and Duvall, Raymond, *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*, (Minneapolis: University of Minesota Press, 1999).
Weller, Marc, 'Undoing the Global Constitution: UN Security Council action on the International Criminal Court', *International Affairs*, vol.78, no.4, (2002),
Wendt, Alexander, and Barnett, Michael, 'Dependent State Formation and Third World Militarisation', *Review of International Studies*, vol.19, no.4, (1993), pp.321-347.
Wheeler, Nicholas, 'Guardian Angel or Global Gangster? A Review of Ethical Claims on the Society of States', *Political Studies*, vol.44, no.2, (1996), pp.123-135.
Wilkinson, Paul, 'International Terrorism: New Risks to World Order', in Baylis, John and Rengger, Nick (eds.), *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World*, (London: Clarenden Press, 1992), pp.228-257.
Wilks, Michael, 'A Stain on Medical Ethics', *The Lancet*, vol.366, (2005), pp.429-431. <http://download.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/0140-6736/PIIS0140673605670353.pdf>
Windsor, Jennifer, 'Democracy and Development: The Evolution of US Foreign Assistance Policy', *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, vol.27, no.2, (2003), pp.141-150.
Wood, Elisabeth, *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
Zalewski, Marysia, '"All These Theories Yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up": Theory, Theorists, Theorising', in Smith, Steve, Booth, Ken and Zalewski, Marysia, (eds.), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.340-353.

Official Documents

Bowles, Chester, Reply to President Kennedy's Memorandum No. 88 on Training for Latin American Armed Forces (with enclosures: Memorandum regarding Counter-Subversion Training for Latin American Police Forces and Memorandum, to the Secretary, August 17, 1961, re. A Coordinated Approach to Rural Development), (US Department of Defense, Washington DC: National Security Archives, 1961).
Burger, Kim, 'Army Secretary, DoD Back 'Serious Reform' at the School of the Americas', US Department of Defense, *Inside the Army*, June 5 2000, <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usamhi/usarsa/main.htm>
Bush, George W. (President), 'Order signed by the President on the Treatment of Detainees', Complete Text, Associated Press, 7 February 2002, <http://www.kron.com/global/story.asp?s=1962000&ClientType=Printable>
Bush, George W. (President), *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, (Washington DC: The White House, 2002).
Central Intelligence Agency, *Human Resource Exploitation Manual*, (Washington DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 1982, Manual acquired by National Security Archives, under the Freedom of Information Act).
Central Intelligence Agency, *Kubark Counterintelligence Interrogation*, (Washington DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 1963, Manual acquired by National Security Archives, under the Freedom of Information Act).
Central Intelligence Agency, 'Memorandum to all Staff Officers. Subject: Selection of Individuals for Disposal by Junta Group', 31 March 1954 (Memorandum obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and is document 3 of 5 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 4), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/cia-guatemala3_1.html>

Central Intelligence Agency, 'Memorandum to Chief of Staff. Subject: Guatemalan Communist Personnel to be disposed of during Military Operations of Calligeris', Origin and Date Deleted (Memorandum obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and document 4 of 5 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, in NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 4), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/cia-guatemala4_1.html>

Central Intelligence Agency, 'Report of Investigation: Selected Issues Relating to CIA Activities in Honduras in thw 1980s, and Related Documents', CIA Inspector General, 27 August 1977, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 4 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 27), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB27/index.html>

Central Intelligence Agency, 'Report on CIA and Chilean Task Force Activities, 15 September to 3 November 1970', 18 November 1970, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 8), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB8/nsaebb8.htm>

Clinton, Bill, 'A National Security Strategy for a New Century', The White House, 1998, <http://clinton2.nara.gov/WH/EOP/NSC/html/documents/nssr.pdf>

Council of Europe, 'Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms as amended by Protocol No. 11', 1 November 1998, <http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/005.htm>

Covey, Oliver, 'Confidential Information Memorandum to the Acting Secretary of State: Mexican Situation', US Department of State, 3 October 1968, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 37 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 99), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB99/Doc37.pdf>Cullather, Nicholas, 'Operation PBSUCCESS. The United States and Guatemala, 1953-1954', Centre for the Study of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency, 1994. (Cullather worked on contract for the CIA for one year, where he was given access to thousands of agency records and secret operational files to produce an overview of the CIA's involvement in the coup. This account was itself declassified and released to the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and is document 5 of 5 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 4), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/cia-guatemala5_a.html>

Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Foreign Military Financing', 2003, <http://www.disam.dsca.mil/itm/Legislation/FY03_Allocations.pdf>

Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts. As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, 2003, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf>

Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'IMET Programme Deliveries', 30 September 2001, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20IMETPrgDel.xls>

Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Summary of Students Trained Under IMET', 30 September 2001, <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20Students.xls>

Gordon, Lincoln, 'Secret Cable from Ambassador Gordon to the State Department', US Department of State, 27 March 1964, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 2 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 118), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB118/bz03.pdf>

International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.' 12 August 1949, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/6fef854a3517b75ac125641e004a9e68>

International Committee of the Red Cross, Escalada de la Violencia: Situación Hipotética (Escalation of Violence: Hypothetical Scenario - Training material used at WHINSEC by ICRC representative on Command and General Staff Officers course), (Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross, 2004).
International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Guantanomo Bay: Overview of the ICRC's Work for Internees', 30 January 2004, <http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/iwpList74/951C74F20D2A2148C1256D8D002CA8DC>
International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Human Rights and the ICRC: International Humanitarian Law', 1993, <http://www.icrc.org/WEB/ENG/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/p0542?OpenDocument&style=Custo_Final.4&View=defaultBody2>
International Committee of the Red Cross, 'International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law: Similarities and Differences', January 2003, <http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/57JR8L/$FILE/IHL_and_IHRL.pdf?OpenElement>
International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I).' 8 June 1977, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/f6c8b9fee14a77fdc125641e0052b079?OpenDocument>
International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II)', 8 June 1977, <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/d67c3971bcff1c10c125641e0052b545?OpenDocument>
International Committee of the Red Cross, 'Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on the Treatment by the Coalition Forces of Prisoners of War and Other Protected Persons by the Geneva Conventions in Iraq During Arrest, Internment and Interrogation', 2004, <http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/redcrossabuse.pdf>
International Court of Justice, Case Concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States of America), (The Hague: International Court of Justice, 1986).
International Monetary Fund, 'IMF Members' Quotas and Voting Power, and IMF Board of Governors', 31 March 2006, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/memdir/members.htm>
Kennedy, John F. (President), 'National Security Action Memorandum No. 88 to the Secretary of Defence: Training for Latin American Armed Forces', The White House, 1961, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC).
Kissinger, Henry, 'Memorandum for the President, from National Security Council Meeting, 6 November, Chile', The White House, 6 November 1970, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 2 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 110), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB110/chile02.pdf>
Kissinger, Henry, 'Staff Meeting Transcripts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger', US Department of State, 26 March 1976, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document , NSA Electronic Briefing Book 185), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB185/index.htm>
LaPlante, Kenneth, *Memo for the Record*, (Fort Benning, Georgia, US: WHINSEC, 2003).
Lee, Barbara, 'Letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell', 11 February 2004, <http://www.haitiaction.net/News/bl2_24_4.html>
Levin, Daniel, 'Memorandum for James B. Comey, Deputy Attorney General, from Daniel Levin, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Re: Legal Standards Applicable Under 18 USC, 2340-2340A', Office of Legal Counsel, US Department of Justice, 30 December 2004, <http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/dagmemo.pdf>

Manningham-Buller, Eliza, 'Statement of Eliza Manningham-Buller on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in the House of Lords on Appeal from Her Majesty's Court of Appeal in the case of Mohammed Meguerba', The Security Service, Thames House, obtained by Channel 4 News, 2005, <http://www.channel4.com/news/media/2005/10/week_3/20_mi5.pdf>

Nixon, Richard (President), US Foreign Policy for the 1970s. Building for Peace. Report to the Congress, (Washington DC: US Congress, 1971).

Nixon, Richard (President), and Zeigler, Ron, 'White House Audio Tape, President Richard Nixon and White House Press Secretary Ron Zeigler', 23 March 1972, (Declassified audio tape, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 110), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB110/index.htm>

North, Oliver, 'National Security Memorandum from Oliver North to Robert McFarlane: Fallback Plan for the Nicaraguan Resistance', 16 March 1985, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 1 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 210), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/4-North%20Fallback%20memo%203-16-85%20(IC%2000952).pdf>

North, Oliver, 'Notebook Entries on Manuel Noriega', National Security Council, 24 August and 22 September 1986, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 1 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 210), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/9-North%20notes%208-24-86.pdf>

Pace, Peter, 'Written Statement by Lieutenant General Peter Pace to the Senate Armed Services Committee', United States Senate, 6 September 2000, <http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2000/000906pp.pdf>

Raimondo, Antonio, *WHINSEC Democracy and Human Rights Programme Briefing*, (Columbus, Georgia: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, 2004).

Reagan, Ronald (President), 'Presidential Finding on Covert Operations in Nicaragua, (with attached scope note)' The White House, 19 September 1983, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 1 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 210), < http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/1-Reagan%20Finding%209-19-83%20(IC%2000203).pdf>

Richardson, James, 'Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents (vol II): The Monroe Doctrine', 1907, <http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/50.htm>

Rumsfeld, Donald, Working Group Report on Detainee Interrogations in the Global War on Terrorism: Assessment of Legal, Historical, Policy and Operational Considerations, (Washington DC: Office of the Secretary of Defence, 4 April 2003).

Rusk, Dean, 'Outgoing Telegram from the Department of State to Ambassador Gordon', US Department of State, 31 March 1964, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 5 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 118), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB118/bz05.pdf>

Ryan, Patrick, 'Navy Section, United States Military Group, Chile, Situation Report Number 2', US Department of Defense, 1 October 1973, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 8), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB8/nsaebb8.htm>

Scherrer, Robert, 'Operation Condor Cable, 28 September 1976', FBI, 28 September 1976, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 8), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB8/ch23-01.htm>

Silverio-Marques, Jose, 'Operationalising Pro-Poor Growth. A Country Case Study on El Salvador', Joint Initiative of AFD (GTZ, KFW Development Bank), Department for

International Development and the World Bank, 2004, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/oppgelsalvador.pdf>
Taguba, Antonio (Major General), *Article 15-6 Investigation of the 800th Military Police Brigade*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 2004).
Truman, Harry, 'The Truman Doctrine', The White House, 12 March 1947, <http://www.wam.umd/edu/~tcast/documents157/trumandoctrine.htm>
UK Parliament, 'Human Rights Act 1998', 1998, <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts1998/19980042.htm>
United Nations, Ad Hoc Working Group on Human Rights in Chile, Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/10285), (New York: United Nations, 1975).
United Nations, 'Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment', 1985, <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cat.html>
United Nations, 'Haiti: Background Summary', United Nations Support Mission in Haiti, 1995, <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unmihbackgr1.html>
United Nations, 'United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, Background', United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, 1995, <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/onusalbackgr2.html>
United Nations Development Programme, 'Forging a Global South: 25 Years After the Buenos Aires Conference on Technical Global Cooperation Among Developing Countries', May 2003, <http://tcdc.undp.org/HLC%20decisions/Global%20South-web.pdf>
United Nations Development Programme, 'Human Development Report: Globalisation with a Human Face', 1999, <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1999/en/>
United Nations Development Programme, 'Meeting the Millennium Poverty Reduction Targets in Latin America and the Caribbean', 2002, <http://www.undp.org/rblac/documents/poverty/mdg/MDGs-libro70.pdf>
United Nations-Habitat, The Challenge of the Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements 2003, (London: United Nations-Habitat, 2003).
United Nations Security Council, 'From Madness to Hope: the 12-year War in El Salvador: Report of the Commission on the Truth for El Salvador', 1993, <http://www.usip.org/library/tc/doc/reports/el_salvador/tc_es_03151993_V.html>
United Nations Security Council, 'Resolution 940 (1994)', 31 July 1994, <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N94/312/22/PDF/N9431222.pdf?OpenElement>
United Nations Security Council, 'Resolution 1483', 22 May 2003, <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/368/53/PDF/N0336853.pdf?OpenElement>
US Agency for International Development, 'Development Experience Clearing House: Haiti, Recent Reports on Democracy and Governance', <http://www.dec.org/country/more_display.cfm?country=Haiti&category=dg>
US Agency for International Development, 'Promoting Democracy and Good Governance', 2005, <http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/>
US Agency for International Development, 'USAID El Salvador Programme Overview', 2005, <http://www.usaid.gov/sv/progover/index.htm>
US Congress, 'Congressional Record: HR3546', 8 June 2006, <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?r109:2:./temp/~r109IdPyRA::>
US Congress, 'Financial Year 2005 Budget Requests. Request by Appropriation Account: Military Assistance', US Congress: International Affairs Function 150, 2004, <http://www.fas.org/asmp/profiles/aid/fy2005/CBJ05_milassist.pdf>
US Congress, 'Financial Year 2006 Budget Requests. Request by Appropriation Account: Military Assistance', US Congress: International Affairs Function 150, 2005, <http://www.fas.org/asmp/profiles/aid/fy2006/CBJMilAss.pdf>
US Congress, 'US Code, 2000 Edition: Title 18 - Crimes and Criminal Procedure, Part I, Crimes: Chapter 113C, Torture, Section 2340A', 6 January 2003, <http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=browse_usc&docid=Cite:+18USC2340A>

US Department of Defense, *Appendix C: Evolution of Inappropriate Materials*, (Columbus, Georgia: US Department of Defense, School of Americas, 1999).
US Department of Defense, *Catalogo de Cursos*, (Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: US Department of Defense, 1963).
US Department of Defense, 'Counterinsurgency Operations (Field Manual-Interim FMI 3-07.22)', Army, 2004, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-07-22/index.html>
US Department of Defense, *Counter Intelligence (LN 324-91), School of the Americas Training Manual*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1991).
US Department of Defense, *Course Catalogue*, (Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Department of Defense: US Army Caribbean School, HQ US Army Caribbean, 1960-1961).
US Department of Defense, 'Directive Number 5111.12. Subject: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation', 2002, <http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec/uploadedFiles/InstituteCharter.pdf>
US Department of Defense, 'Doctrine for Joint Special Operations', 1998, <http://222.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB63/doc3.pdf>
US Department of Defense, 'Doctrine for Joint Urban Operations (Joint Publication, 3-06)', 2002, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/doctrine/jp3_06.pdf>
US Department of Defense, *Escuela Latino Americana Terrestre. Catalogo de Cursos, 1948-1949*, (Fort Gulick, Panama: Department of Defense: Department of the Army in the Caribbean, 1948).
US Department of Defense, 'Fact Sheet Concerning Training Manuals Containing Materials Inconsistent With United States Policy', Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defence, 1992, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/archive/news/dodmans.htm>
US Department of Defense, *Field Manual 27-10: The Law of Land Warfare*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1956), <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/27-10/index.html>
US Department of Defense, *Field Manual 30-5: Combat Intelligence*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense: Army, 1973).
US Department of Defense, *Field Manual 31-15: Operations Against Irregular Forces*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense: Army, 1961).
US Department of Defense, *Field Manual 33-5: Psychological Operations*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense: Army, 1962).
US Department of Defense, *Field Manual FM 8-2: Counterinsurgency Operations*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense: Navy, 1967).
US Department of Defense, Floyd D. Spence National Defence Authorisation for Fiscal Year 2001. 10 USC 2166. Public Law 106-398. Section 911, Paragraph 2166: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 2000).
US Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Assistance 1990-2003', 2001, <http://www.fas.org/asmp/profiles/aid/aidindex.htm>
US Department of Defense, 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest: Joint Report to Congress', Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, 2001-2005, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/>
US Department of Defense, *Handling Sources, School of the Americas Training Manual*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1989).
US Department of Defense, *Information Brochure: The United States Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Department of the Army, 1965).
US Department of Defense, *Information Brochure: The United States Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, 1972).
US Department of Defense, 'Memo for Secretaries of the Military Departments: Department of Defense Policy on Intelligence, Counterintelligence Training of Non-US Persons', US Assistant Secretary of Defence, 27 August 1992, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/archive/news/920827_1.gif>

US Department of Defense, 'Memorandum for the Secretary of Defence: Improper Material in Spanish-Language Intelligence Training Manuals', Office of the Secretary of Defence, 10 March 1992, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/archive/news/920310_1.gif>
US Department of Defense, 'Operational Law Handbook, Chapter 5: Rules of Engagement', Judge Advocate General's Legal Centre and School, 2003, <http://www.juancole.com/2005/08/us-military-rules-of-engagement-and.html>
US Department of Defense, *Organisation, Mission, and Functions. US Army School of the Americas*, (Fort Gulick, Panama: US Department of Defense, US Army School of the Americas, 1983).
US Department of Defense, *Project X*, (Arizona: US Department of Defense, Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme, US Army Intelligence Centre and School, Fort Huachuca, 1967).
US Department of Defense, *Project X: Annual List of Instructional Material*, (Arizona: US Department of Defense, Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme, Army Intelligence Centre and School, Fort Huachuca, 1977).
US Department of Defense, *Project X: Instructor Folder - Employee Procurement and Utilizations*, (Maryland: US Department of Defense, Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme, Army Intelligence School, Fort Holabird, 1968).
US Department of Defense, *Project X: Instructor Folder - Initial Investigation and Contact*, (Maryland: US Department of Defense, Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme, Army Intelligence School, Holabird, 1968).
US Department of Defense, *Project X: Instructor Folder - Release of Employees*, (Maryland: US Department of Defense, Army Foreign Intelligence Assistance Programme, Army Intelligence School, Fort Holabird, 1968).
US Department of Defense, *Terrorismo y Guerrilla Urbana, School of Americas Training Manual*, (Washington DC: US Department of Defense, 1989).
US Department of Defense, 'United States Special Operations Command Mission', <http://www.socom.mil/Docs/Command_Mission-060214.pdf>
US Department of Defense, *US Army Counterguerrilla Operations Handbook*, (Guildford, CT: Lyons Press, 2004).
US Department of Defense, *US Army School of the Americas 1946-2000. Historical Edition, Adelante*, (Columbus, Georgia: US Department of Defense, School of Americas, 2000).
US Department of Defense, *US Army School of the Americas Fact Book*, (Fort Gulick, Panama: US Department of Defense, US Army School of the Americas, 1983).
US Department of Defense, 'US Special Forces Posture Statement', 2006, <http://www.socom.mil/Docs/2006%20USSOCOM%20Posture%20Statement%20final.pdf>
US Department of Defense, 'WHINSEC Board of Visitors Annual Report and Recommendations December 2004', 1-2 December 2004, <http://www.fido.gov/facadatabase/listdocuments.asp?Type=meetings (2005-12170-139785_Minutes_(2005-11-14-15-18-34).DOC)>
US Department of Defense, 'WHINSEC Report to Congress', 2005, <http://www.fido.gov/facadatabase/docs_reports%5C2005-12170-12168_Report%20to%20Congress_(2005-11-18-09-01-39).pdf>
US Department of Defense, 'Memorandum for Correspondents', Public Affairs Office, 20 September 1996, <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep1996/m092096_m217-96.html>
US Departments of Defence and State, 'American Service-Members' Protection Act', Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, 30 July 2003, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/othr/misc/23425.htm>
US Department of State, 'Airgram from US Embassy in Argentina to the US Department of State: Human Rights Case Reports', 19 June 1979, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 8 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 73, Part One), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB73/790619dos1.pdf>
US Department of State, 'Airgram from US Embassy in Mexico to US Department of State: Human Rights in Mexico', US Department of State, 24 March 1976, (Declassified

document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 6 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 89), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB89/mexhr06.pdf>
US Department of State, 'America's Overseas Presence in the 21st Century', November 1999, <http://www.state.gov/www/publications/9911_opap?rpt-9911_opap_instructions.html>
US Department of State, 'Background Note: Panama', January 2006, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2030.htm>
US Department of State, 'Cable from US Embassy in Lima to the Secretary of State: Systematic Human Rights Violations Under Fujimori', June 1994, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 27 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 96), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB96/940630.pdf>
US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)', 2002-2007, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/cbj/>
US Department of State, *Country Reports on Human Rights,* (Washington DC: US Department of State, 1980, 1981, 1982).
US Department of State, 'Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004', Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour, 28 February 2005, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/>
US Department of State, 'Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2004: Algeria', 2005, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41718.htm>
US Department of State, 'Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2004: Saudi Arabia', 28 February 2005, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41731.htm>
US State Department, 'El Salvador Profile', Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, April 2005, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2033.htm>
US Department of State, 'Excerpt: Clinton Report to Congress on National Security Strategy', US Embassy Press Section, 11 January 2000, <http://www.usembassy-israel.org.il/publish/peace/archives/2000/january/me0111a.html>
US Department of State, 'Financial Year 1971 Country Analysis and Strategy Paper for Mexico, to the US Department of State', American Embassy, Mexico City, 17 February 1969, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 5 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 92), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB92/mexelect_5.pdf>
US Department of State, 'Haiti: Background Profile', 2005, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/1982.htm>
US Department of State, 'Memorandum of Conversation: Secretary's Meeting with Argentine Foreign Minister Guzzetti', 7 October 1976, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 6 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 104), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB104/Doc6%20761007.pdf>
US Department of State, 'Patterns of Global Terrorism', Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, 30 April 2001, <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/pgtrpt/2000/2419.htm>
US Department of State, 'Secret Cable. Subject: Fascell Sub-Committee Hearings on Guatemala Public Safety Programme, from the US Embassy in Guatemala to the US Department of State', 2 September 1971 (Cable obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and document 7 of 32 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, in NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 11), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB11/docs/07-01.htm>
US Department of State, 'Telegram 6076 from US Embassy in Jakarta to US Secretary of State, "Summary of Vice President's Meeting with Suharto", 10 May 1978', (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 29 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 174), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB174/10may1978%20suharto%20mtg%20summary.pdf>
US Department of State, 'Transmission of a Preliminary Analysis and Strategy Paper - Uruguay, from the US Embassy in Montevideo to the US Department of State', 25 August 1971,

(Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 2 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 71), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB71/doc2.pdf>
US Department of State, 'US Department of State Mission Statement', 2004, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/dosstrat/2004/23503.htm>
US General Accounting Office, 'School of the Americas: US Military Training for Latin American Countries', 22 August 1996, <http://www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govern/gao96178.pdf>
US General Accounting Office, 'Security Assistance: Efforts to Secure Colombia's Caño Limón-Coveñas Oil Pipeline Have Reduced Attacks, but Challenges Remain', September 2005, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05971.pdf>
US Inspector General, *Report of the US Inspector General: Policy and Oversight*, (Washington DC: Office of the US Inspector General, 1997).
US National Security Council, 'National Security Strategy of the United States', 1991, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/918015-nss.htm>
Vaky, Viron, 'Memorandum to State Department: Evolution of US Human Rights Policy in Argentina', US Department of State, 11 September 1978, (Declassified document, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Document 13 of NSA Electronic Briefing Book 73, Part Two), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB73/780911.pdf>
Vaky, Viron, 'Memorandum. Subject: Guatemala and Counter-Terror, Sent to Covey Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs', US Department of State, 29 March 1968 (Memorandum obtained by National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, and document 5 of 32 compiled for the Guatemala Documentation Project, in NSA Electronic Briefing Book no. 11), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB11/docs/05-01.htm>
Veillette, Connie, 'Plan Colombia: A Progress Report', US Congressional Research Service, Foreign Affairs: Defence and Trade Division, 17 February 2005, <http://www.ndu.edu/library/docs/crs/crs_rl132774_17feb05.pdf>
Waters, Maxine, 'Letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell', 13 February 2004, <http://www.haitiaction.net/News/mw2_13_4.html>
Weidner, Glenn (former US Army School of Americas Commandant), 'The US Army School of the Americas', US Army School of the Americas, 1999, <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usamhi/usarsa/main.htm>
Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, 'WHINSEC Board of Visitors', WHINSEC, 2006, <https://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec/BOV.asp?id=27>
The White House, 'White House Audio Tape: President Lyndon Johnson discussing the impending coup in Brazil with Undersecretary of State George Ball', 31 March 1964, (Declassified audiotape, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, NSA Electronic Briefing Book 118), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB118/index.htm#2>
World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Assistance Evaluation', 6 February 2002, <http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/B27BD8596FD1289C85256B810052C1EC/$file/el_salvador.pdf>
World Bank, 'El Salvador Country Brief', 2003, <http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/LAC/LACInfoClient.nsf/5996dfbf9847f67d85256736005dc67c/79051920dc2134e985256c08006f0cb2/$FILE/El%20Salvador%20Brief.pdf>
World Bank, 'Haiti Country Overview', 2003, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/LACEXT/HAITIEXTN/0,,contentMDK:20226261~pagePK:141137~piPK:141127~theSitePK:338165,00.html>
World Trade Organisation, 'Ten Common Misunderstandings About the WTO', <http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/10mis_e/10m00_e.htm>

Official Speeches

Blair, Tony (Prime Minister), 'Statement From Gleneagles Following the 7 July Bombings', 7 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4659953.stm>

Bush, George W. (President), 'Address to the Nation', The Oval Office, 11 September 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>

Bush, George W. (President), 'Remarks by the President on Iraq and the War on Terror (Transcript)', The White House, 24 May 2004, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/05/20040524-10.html>

Bush, George W. (President), 'State of the Union Address', 29 January 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129%2D11.html>

Bush, George W. (President), 'Order signed by the President on the Treatment of Detainees', Associated Press, 7 February 2002, <http://www.kron.com/global/story.asp?s=1962000&ClientType=Printable>

Carter, Jimmy (President), 'Human Rights and Foreign Policy', Speech given at Notre Dame University, June 1977, (Washington DC: US National Archives, Public Papers of the Presidents of the US, Jimmy Carter, vol.1, 1977).

Johnson, Lyndon (President), 'Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union', National Archives and Records Administration, 4 January 1965, <http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/Johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/650104.asp>

Nixon, Richard (President), 'Second Inaugural Address', Watergate.info, 20 January 1973, <http://www.watergate.info/nixon/inaugural-speech-second.shtml>

Reagan, Ronald (President), 'Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress Reporting on the State of the Union', 26 January 1982, <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1982/12682c.htm>

Reagan, Ronald (President), 'Defence and National Security, Address to the Nation', 23 March 1983, <http://www.afa.org/magazine/Feb2004/dns.pdf>

Media Sources (including on-line media articles)

Agee, Phillip, 'Doing the US's Bidding', *Red Pepper*, 2 July 2006, <http://redpepper.blogs.com/venezuela/2006/07/doing_the_uss_b.html#more>

Agence France-Presse, 'White House Declines to Totally Rule Out Torture', 13 November 2005, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/usattackstorture>

Ambinder, Marc, 'Inside the Council for National Policy. Meet the Most Powerful Conservative Group You've Never Heard Of', *ABC News*, <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/story?id=121170&page=1>

Applebaum, Anne, 'The Torture Myth', *The Washington Post*, 12 January 2005, < http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A2302-2005Jan11.html>

Associated Press, 'Biographical Info on Supreme Court Candidate Ben Hand', 7 April2006, <http://www.al.com/newsflash/regional/index.ssf?/base/news-20/114444686545500.xml&storylist=alabamanews>

Associated Press, 'Clinton Urges Aristide to Resolve Haiti's Electoral Impasse', 7 December 2000, <http://archives.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/americas/12/07/haiti.clinton.ap/>

Bailey, Stewart, and Emery, Alex, 'Bolivia to Seize Oil and Gas Reserves, President-Elect Says', *Bloomberg News* (The Washington Post Company), 12 January 2006, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/01/11/AR2006011102212.html>

BBC Online, 'EU Scores Steel Victory Over US', 10 November 2003, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/3256197.stm>

BBC Online, 'Israel Defends Torture in Interrogation Methods', 15 May 1998, <http://users.westnet.gr/~cgian/israelto.htm>

BBC Online, 'MI5 'Torture' Evidence Revealed', 21 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4363254.stm>

BBC Online, 'The Ricin Case Timeline', 13 April 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4433459.stm>
Borger, Julian, 'US Troops Ordered to Undergo Ethical Training after Killing of Iraqi Civilians', *The Guardian*, 2 June 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,329495232-103550,00.html>
Bruce, Iain, 'Venezuela to Seize "Idle" Firms', *BBC Online*, 19 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4692165.stm>
Buncombe, Andrew, and Hughes, Solomon, 'The fog of war: white phosphorus, Fallujah and some burning questions', *The Independent*, 15 November 2005, <http://news.independent.co.uk/world/americas/article327094.ece>
Burns, Robert, 'Army Dropped Abuse Probe, Records Show', *Newsday.com*, 13 January 2006, <http://www.newsday.com/news/politics/wire/sns-ap-iraq-detainee-abuse,0,3182960.story>
Campbell, Duncan, 'Kissinger Approved Argentine "Dirty War"', *The Guardian*, 6 December 2003, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/printer_120803D.shtml>
Casteel, Joshua, 'An Interrogator's Testimony', *Sojourners*, 16 November 2005, <http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=news.display_article&mode=C&NewsID=5031>
Chomsky, Noam, 'Democarcy Restored', *Z Magazine*, 1994, <http://www.zmag.org/ZMag/articles/dem-restored.htm>
Chomsky, Noam, 'Domestic Constitutencies', *Z Magazine*, May 1998, <http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/z9805-domestic.html>
Chomsky, Noam, 'Market Democracy in a Neoliberal Order: Doctrines and Reality', University of Cape Town, 1997, <http://www.bigeye.com/chomsky.htm>
Chomsky, Noam, 'The New War Against Terror', M.I.T., 18 October 2001, <http://www.zmag.org/GlobalWatch/chomskymit.htm>
Cobain, Ian, 'The Postwar Photographs that British Authorities Tried to Keep Hidden', *The Guardian*, 3 April 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/germany/article/0,,1745662,00.html>
Cohn, Marjorie, 'US Pulls Strings in Haiti', *Truthout/Perspective*, 29 September 2005, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/printer_092905I.shtml>
Concannon, Brian, '"Electoral Cleansing"in Haiti Violates Human Rights and Democracy', *ZNet*, (Americas Programme, International Relations Centre), 17 October 2005, <http://www.zmag.org/content/print_article.cfm?itemID=8951&sectionID=55>
Danner, Mark, 'Abu Ghraib: The Hidden Story', *The New York Review of Books*, 7 October 2004, <http://www.markdanner.com/nyreview/100704_abu.htm>
Dershowitz, Alan, 'Is There a Torturous Road to Justice?' *Los Angeles Times*, 8 November 2001, p.19.
Dodds, Paisley, 'Convicted Assasin Gets Role in Haiti', *Associated Press*, 3 March 2004, <http://www.independent-media.tv/item.cfm?fmedia_id=6014&fcategory_desc=Haiti>
The Economist, 'Torture in History: The Sight of the Rack', 9 January 2003, <http://www.economist.com/PrinterFriendly.cfm?story_id=1522812>
The Economist, 'Torture: Ends, Means and Barbarity', 9 January 2003, <http://www.economist.com/PrinterFriendly.cfm?story_id=1522792>
Eimer, Charlotte, 'Spotlight on US Troops in Paraguay', *BBC Online*, 28 September 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4289224.stm>
Elsner, Alan, 'US Seen as Unaccountable in Iraqi Civilian Deaths', *Reuters*, 3 May 2005, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/050505E.shtml>
Fishback, Ian, 'A Matter of Honour (Letter to Senator John McCain from Captain Ian Fishback, dated 16 September 2005)', *The Washington Post*, 28 September 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/27/AR2005092701527.html>
Folsom, George, 'IRI President Folsom Praises Venezuelan Civil Society's Defense of Democracy', *PR Newswire*, 12 April 2002, <http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=PRNI2&STORY=/www/story/04-12-2002/0001705053&EDATE=>
Frontline, 'The Torture Question: Interview with Tony Lagouranis', *Frontline*, 25 September 2005, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/torture/interviews/lagouranis.html>

Francis Fukuyama, ‘After Neoconservatism’, *New York Times*, 19 February 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html?ex=1298005200&en=4126fa38fefd80de&ei=5090 >
Galeano, Eduardo, 'Confessions of the Torturer,' *New Internationalist*, November 2004, p.5,
Gillard, Michael; Gomez, Ignacio; and Jones, Melissa, 'BP Hands "Tarred in Pipeline Dirty War"', *The Guardian*, 17 October 1998, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,3504,740184,00.html>
Globes Online, ‘One Billion Dollars in Defence Exports to Latin America’, Tel Aviv, 2004, <http://www.globes.co.il/serveen/globes/nodeView.asp?fid=942>
Graham, Bradley, 'Venezuelan Embassy Official Expelled', *The Washington Post*, 4 February 2006, p.A13. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/03/AR2006020301858.html>
Grandin, Greg, 'The Wide War - How Donald Rumsfeld Discovered the Wild West in Latin America', *Tomdispatch.com*, 7 May 2006, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/printer_050806L.shtml>
Grey, Stephen, and Cobain, Ian, 'From Logistics to Turning a Blind Eye: Europe's Role in Terror Abductions', *The Guardian*, 7 June 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/usa/story/0,,1791991,00.html>
Grim-Feinberg, Joe, 'The Bolivarian Revolution', *ZNet*, 2 January 2006, <http://www.zmag.org/ZNETTOPnoanimation.html>
Hersh, Seymour, 'The Coming Wars: What the Pentagon Can Now Do in Secret', *The New Yorker*, 24-31 January 2005, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_05/printer_011805A.shtml>
Hersh, Seymour, 'Selective Intelligence: Donald Rumsfeld has his own special sources. Are they reliable?' *The New Yorker*, 5 May 2003, <http://www.newyorker.com/printable/?fact/030512fa_fact>
Hodge, James, and Cooper, Linda, 'SOA Watch Scores Victory in Venezuela: President Chavez to Withdraw Officers from US Army Training School', *National Catholic Reporter*, 9 April 2004,
Hoyos, Carola, and Morrison, Kevin, 'Iraq Returns to International Oil Market', *The Financial Times*, 5 June 2003, <http://www.thedossier.ukonline.co.uk/Web%20Pages/FINANCIAL%20TIMES_Iraq%20returns%20to%20international%20oil%20market.htm>
Islam, Faisal, 'Iraq Nets Handsome Profit by Dumping Dollar for Euro', *The Observer*, 16 February 2003, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/iraq/story/0,12239,896344,00.html>
James, Clara, 'Haiti: The Roof is Leaking', *Z Magazine*, 1997, <http://www.zmag.org/ZMag/articles/june97james.htm>
Johnson, Kevin, 'Ex-CIA Chief Revitalizes “Truth Serum” Debate', *USA Today*, 26 April 2002, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002/04/26/torture.htm>
Jones, Bart, and Tayler, Letta, 'US Aware of Venezuela Coup Plot in '02, CIA Documents Show', *The Seattle Times*, 24 November 2004, <http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2002099262_venezuela24.html>
Klein, Naomi, 'The Rise of Disaster Capitalism', *The Nation*, 2 May 2005, <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20050502/klein>
Krauthammer, Charles, 'The Truth About Torture', *The Weekly Standard*, 5 December 2005, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/006/400rhqav.asp>
LaFranchi, Howard, 'US Effort to Rehab Image Falls Short', *The Christian Science Monitor*, 21 June 2006, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/062106K.shtml>
Lelyveld, Joseph, 'Interrogating Ourselves', *The New York Times Sunday Magazine*, 12 June 2005, <http://www.refuseandresist.org/detentions/art.php?aid=2059>
Lester, Will, 'Poll Shows Divide on Question of Torture', *Associated Press*, 6 December 2005, <http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=1376448&page=1>
Mabrey, Vicki, 'Truth Serum: A Possible Weapon', *CBS News*, 2003, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/04/07/60II/main548221.shtml>
Matthews, Mark, 'US Manuals Taught Murder, Kennedy Says: Allies Trained in Use of Torture in 1980s', *The Baltimore Sun*, 7 March 1997, <http://www.fas.org/MHonArc/AT-doc_archive/msg00030.html>

Mayer, Jane, 'Outsourcing Torture. The Secret History of America's "Extraordinary Rendition" Programme', *The New Yorker*, 7 February 2005, <http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050214fa_fact6>
Mazzetti, Mark, and Daragahi, Borzou, 'US Military Stages Media Offensive in Iraq', *The Los Angeles Times*, 29 November 2005, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/printer_113005I.shtml>
McCain, John, 'Torture's Terrible Toll: Abusive Interrogation Tactics Produce Bad Intel, and Undermine the Values We Hold Dear. Why We Must, As A Nation, Do Better', *Newsweek*, November 2005, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10019179/site/newsweek/>
Monbiot, George, 'America's Terrorist Training Camp', *The Guardian*, 30 October 2001, <http://www.monbiot.com/dsp_article.cfm?article_id=465>
Monbiot, George, 'The Rich World's Veto', *The Guardian*, 15 October 2002, <http://www.monbiot.com/dsp_article.cfm?article_id=538>
Murray, Craig, 'Craig Murray: The Reality of Britain's Reliance on Torture', *The Independent*, 27 October 2005, <http://comment.independent.co.uk/commentators/article322520.ece>
Nairn, Alan, 'Haiti Under the Gun: How US Intelligence Has Been Exercising Crowd Control', *The Nation*, 8 January 1996, pp.11-15.
Nairn, Alan, 'Our Man in FRAPH: Behind Haiti's Paramilitaries', *The Nation* 1994, pp.458-461.
The New York Times, 'The CIA and Haiti', *The New York Times*, 8 December 1995, <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/43a/187.html>
The New York Times, 'CIA Formed Haitian Unit Later Tied to Narcotics Trade', *The New York Times*, 14 November 1993, p.1.
The New York Times, 'Haitian Ex-Paramilitary Leader Confirms CIA Relationship', *The New York Times*, 3 December 1995, pp.8-9.
Priest, Dana, 'Army Instructed Latins on Executions, Torture Manuals Used 1982-1991, Pentagon Reveals', *The Washington Post*, 21 September 1996, <http://cypherpunks.venona.com/date/1996/09/msg01849.html>
Priest, Dana, 'CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons', *The Washington Post*, 2 November 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644_pf.html>
Priest, Dana, 'Covert CIA Programme Withstands New Furore', *The Washington Post*, Friday 30 December 2005, p.A01.
Priest, Dana, 'Jet is an Open Secret in Terror War', *The Washington Post*, 27 December 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27826-2004Dec26.html>
Priest, Dana, and Smith, Jeffrey, 'Memo Offered Justification for Use of Torture', *The Washington Post*, 8 June 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23373-2004Jun7.html>
Roberts, Les; Lafta, Riyadh; Garfield, Richard; Khudhairi, Jamal; and Burnham, Gilbert, 'Mortality Before and After the 2003 Invasion of Iraq: Cluster Sample Survey', *The Lancet*, 2004, <http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140673604174412/abstract>
Robinson, William, and Gindin, Jonah, 'The Battle for Global Civil Society', *ZNet*, 2005, <http://www.zmag.org/content/print_article.cfm?itemID=8069&sectionID=11>
Roy, Arundhati, 'Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy. Buy One, Get One Free', *Znet*, <http://zmag.org/content/print_article.cfm?itemID=3637&sectionID=11>
Simons, Marlise, 'Peru Adopts Severe Tactics to Combat Guerrillas', *The New York Times*, 18 August 1984, p.1.
Stefanoni, Pablo, 'The US, Bolivia, and Venezuela: An Interview with Evo Morales', *ZNet*, 3 July 2006, <http://www.zmag.org/ZNETTOPnoanimation.html>
Stokes, Doug, 'Counterinsurgency, Coups and Coercion: History and the US Empire in Latin America', *ZNet*, 2 April 2003, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/history/2003/0402counterinsurgency.htm>
Sturcke, James, 'EU Report Condemns Secret CIA Flights', *The Guardian*, 26 April 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,329465958-110878,00.html>
Thomas, Evan, and Hirsh, Michael, 'The Debate Over Torture', *Newsweek*, 21 November 2005, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10020629/site/newsweek/>

Toomey, Christine, 'The Killing Fields', *The Times*, 7 July 2002, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2801-138281,00.html>
Valentine, Douglas, 'The Prison at Guantanomo. What the World Should Know', *Counter Punch*, September 2004, <http://www.counterpunch.org/valentine09042004.html>
Vulliamy, Ed, 'Venezuela Coup Linked to Bush Team', *The Observer*, 21 April 2002, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,6903,688071,00.html>
Waller, Douglas, 'Running a "School for Dictators": US Training Doesn't Turn Soldiers into Democrats,' *Newsweek*, 9 August 1993, pp.34-37,
Weisbrot, Mark, 'Can Haitian Democracy Survive', *Z Net*, 2001, <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2001-02/17weisbrot.htm>
Wilson, Jamie, 'Bush Seeks CIA Exemption from Ban on Cruelty to Terror Suspects', *The Guardian*, 26 October 2005, p.16.

Grey Literature

The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Resolution on Guidelines and Measures for the Prohibition and Prevention of Torture, Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in Africa, (Geneva: The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights in collaboration with The Association for the Prevention of Torture, 2003).
America's Development Foundation, 'America's Development Foundation Website', <http://www.adfusa.org/home.htm>
Amnesty International, 'AI Press Release. Haiti: Convicted Human Rights Violators Must Not be Allowed to Take Power', 3 March 2004, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR360142004?open&of=ENG-HTI>
Amnesty International, 'Amnesty Releases New Gitmo Torture Testimony', 10 January 2006, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/printer_011106Z.shtml>
Amnesty International, *Annual Report on Human Rights*, (London: Amnesty International, 1974-1975).
Amnesty International, 'Argentina Feature: Cleaning Up the Dirty War', 2003, <http://news.amnesty.org/index/ENGAMR1312122003>
Amnesty International, *Briefing, Guatemala*, (London: Amnesty International, 1976).
Amnesty International, 'Bush Administration Document Reveals Dangerous Loopholes in US Training of Foreign Militaries', 19 September 2002, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/news/2002/usa09192002.html>
Amnesty International, *Guatemala*, (London: Amnesty International Briefing Papers, No.8, 1976).
Amnesty International, 'Haiti - The Human Rights Tragedy: Human Rights Violations Since the Coup', 1992, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/countries/haiti/document.do?id=CF1E58816376C148802...>
Amnesty International, *Haiti. Amnesty International Briefing*, (London: Amnesty International, 1985).
Amnesty International, 'Haiti: Breaking the Cycle of Violence: A Last Chance for Haiti', 21 June 2004, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR360382004>
Amnesty International, 'Haiti: Perpetrators of Past Abuses Threaten Human Rights and the Reestablishment of the Rule of Law', 2004, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/countries/haiti/document.do?id=C558C3E324AE46C680256E4C0057E995>
Amnesty International, *Indonesia: An Amnesty International Report*, (London: Amnesty International, 1977).
Amnesty International, 'The Inescapable Obligation of the International Community to Bring to Justice Those Responsible for Crimes Against Humanity Committed During the Military Government in Chile', 29 October 1998, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/ENGAMR220161998>
Amnesty International, *Report on Torture*, (Washington DC: Amnesty International, 1975).

Amnesty International, 'Torture and Ill-Treatment: The Arguments', 2006, <http://web.amnesty.org/pages/stoptorture-arguments-eng>
Amnesty International, 'Unmatched Power, Unmet Principles: The Human Rights Dimensions of US Training of Foreign Military and Police Forces', March 2002, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/stoptorture/msp.pdf>
Amnesty International, 'USA. Amnesty International's Supplementary Briefing to the UN Committee Against Torture', Amnesty Report 51/061/2006, 3 May 2006, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR510612006>
Asociación Nacional de Empresa Privada, 'Asociación Nacional de Empresa Privada Website', <http://www.anep.org.sv/actaconstitucion.htm>
Barry, Deborah, 'Una Herencia de AID en el Salvador: Andamiaje Institucional Empresarial en la Sociedad Civil', Programa Salvadoreño de Investigación sobre Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente, 1993, <http://www.prisma.org.sv/pubs/prisma02.pdf>
Barry, Tom, and Flynn, Michael, 'Profile: Condoleeza Rice', Right Web, International Relations Centre, 2005, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1325>
Byrne, Hugh, 'We Will Be Known By The Company We Keep: Lessons from US-Latin America Policy for the Post-September 11th World', Latin American Working Group, 2002, <http://www.lawg.org/docs/lesson.pdf>
Central American Human Rights Commission, (CODEHUCA), 'Report of Joint CODEHUCA and CONADEHUPA Delegation, January - February 1990', CODEHUCA, February 1990, <http://www.skepticfiles.org/socialis/panama39.htm>
Centre for Constitutional Rights, 'Centre for Constitutional Rights Seeks Criminal Investigation in Germany into Culpability of US Officials in Abu Ghraib Torture', 2005, <http://www.ccr-ny.org/v2/legal/september_11th/sept11Article.asp?ObjID=1xiADJOOQx&Content=472>
Centre for International Policy, '"Article 98" Agreements and the International Criminal Court', Latin America Working Group and Centre for International Policy: Just the Facts: A Civilian's Guide to US Defence and Security Assistance to Latin America and the Caribbean, 4 April 2005, <http://ciponline.org/facts/art98.htm>
Centre for International Policy, 'Defence Department Programmes: School of the Americas (Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation)', 2003, <http://www.ciponline.org>
Centre for International Policy, 'E-IMET: Expanded International Military Education and Training', 1998, <http://www.ciponline.org/facts/eimet.htm>
Centre for International Policy, 'Funding Sources', 2005, <http://ciponline.org/aboutus.htm>
Centre for International Policy, 'Just the Facts: A Civilian's Guide to US defence and security assistance to Latin America and the Caribbean', 2002, <http://www.ciponline.org/facts>
Centre for International Policy, 'US Security Assistance to the Western Hemisphere: By Country', 13 September 2004, <http://www.ciponline.org/facts/country.htm>
Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, 'Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation', February 1991, <http://www.usip.org/library/tc/doc/reports/chile/chile_1993_toc.html>
Chossudovsky, Michel, 'US Sponsored Coup d'Etat. The Destabilisation of Haiti', Centre for Research on Globalisation, 2004, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO402D.html>
Cole, Juan, 'US Military Rules of Engagement and the Iraq War', *Informed Comment: Thoughts on the Middle East, History and Religion*, Weblog of Juan Cole, 10 August 2005, <http://www.juancole.com/2005/08/us-military-rules-of-engagement-and.html>
Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos, Mexico, 'Informe Especial Sobre las Quejas en Materia de Desapariciones Forzadas Ocurridas en la Decada de los 70 y Principios de los 80', see Anexo I, "Gráficas," no. 10, <http://www.cndh.org.mx/lacndh/informes/espec/espec.htm>
Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation, East Timor 'Chapter 8: Responsibility and Accountability', 2006, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB176/CAVR_responsibility.pdf>
Council for a Livable World, 'Foreign Military Training', 2001, <http://www.clw.org/atop/training.html>

DeRienzo, Paul, 'Haiti's Nightmare: The Cocaine Coup and the CIA Connection', Centre for Research on Globalisation, 1994, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/RIE402A.html>
Diamond, Larry, 'Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives', Carnegie Corporation, Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1995, <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/mb.htm>
Docherty, Bonnie, and Hiltermann, Joost, 'United States. Dangerous Dealings. Changes to US Military Assistance After September 11', Human Rights Watch, February 2002, <http://hrw.org/reports/2002/usmil/usass0202.pdf>
Donahue, Sean, 'General Clark, the School of the Americas and US Values', School of Americas Watch, 12 May 2004, <http://www.soaw.org/new/article.php?id=721>
Doyle, Kate, 'The Guatemalan Military, What the Files Reveal', The Guatemalan Documentation Project, National Security Archive, 2000, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB32/index.html>
Doyle, Kate, and Kornbluh, Peter, 'CIA and Assassinations: The Guatemala 1954 Documents', The Guatemala Documentation Project, National Security Archive, 14 August 1997, <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/47/156.html>
Doyle, Kate, and Kornbluh, Peter, 'CIA and Assassinations: The Guatemala 1954 Documents', The Guatemalan Documentation Project, National Security Archive, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB4/index.html>
Doyle, Kate, and Osorio, Carlos, 'US Policy in Guatemala, 1966-1996', The Guatemalan Documentation Project, National Security Archive, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB11/docs/>
Federation of American Scientists, 'Report on the School of the Americas', 6 March 1997, <http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1997_rpt/soaexec.htm>
Federation of American Scientists, 'US International Security Assistance Education and Training', 2002, <http://www.fas.org/asmp/campaigns/training.html>
Flynn, Michael, 'Profile: Donald Rumsfeld', Right Web, International Relations Centre, 2005, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1346>
Flynn, Michael, 'Profile: Richard "Dick" Bruce Cheney', Right Web, International Relations Centre, 2005, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1072>
Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional, (FMLN), 'FMLN Website', <http://fmln.org.sv/portal/index.php>
Gabelnick, Tamar, 'Security Assistance after September 11', Foreign Policy in Focus, Institute for Policy Studies, 31 May 2002, <http://www.foreignpolicy-infocus.org>
Gilbert, Lauren, 'El Salvador's Death Squads: New Evidence from US Documents', Centre for International Policy, 1994, <http://ciponline.org/dethsqud.htm>
Harding, Robert, 'Military Extrication and Democracy in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Argentina in the 1990s: A Comparative Study', Latin American Studies Association, September 2001, <http://136.142.158.105/Lasa2001/HardingIIRobert.pdf>
Haugaard, Lisa, 'Declassified Army and Central Intelligence Agency Manuals Used in Latin America: An Analysis of their Content', Latin American Working Group, 18 February 1997, <http://www.lawg.org/pages/new%20pages/Misc/Publications-manuals.htm>
Horazuk, Cherrene, 'Turning Point for the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador', Crossroads, 1995, <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/47/067.html>
Peter Huang, 'The Paradox of Taiwan's Human Rights Conditions', International Conference on National Human Rights Commissions and Protecting and Promoting Human Rights, 2 January 2000, <http://www.tahr.org.tw/site/committee/2001.01Commissions/peter.htm>
Human Rights Watch, 'Afghanistan: Civilian Life Must be Donor Priority', 30 January 2006, <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/01/30/afghan12554.htm>
Human Rights Watch, 'Argentina: Reluctant Partner. The Argentine Government's Failure to Back Trials of Human Rights Violators', Chapter XI, 'The Role of the US', December 2001, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/argentina/>
Human Rights Watch, 'Colombia Human Rights Developments', 1992, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1993/WR93/Amw-02.htm>
Human Rights Watch, 'Colombia's Killer Networks: The Military-Paramilitary Partnership and the United States', 1996, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1996/killertoc.htm>

Human Rights Watch, *El Salvador's Decade of Terror*, (New York: Human Rights Watch / Americas, 1991).
Human Rights Watch, 'Haiti's Tarnished Election Results', 2000, <http://www.haiti-info.com/article.php3?id_article=54>
Human Rights Watch, 'Human Rights Watch World Report, 1989: Panama', 1989, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1989/WR89/Panama.htm#TopOfPage>
Human Rights Watch, 'The New Iraq? Torture and Ill-Treatment of Detainees in Iraqi Custody', January 2005, <http://hrw.org/reports/2005/iraq0105/index.htm>
Human Rights Watch, *Terror Prevails in Haiti: Human Rights Violations and Failed Diplomacy*, (Washington DC: Human Rights Watch/Americas and the National Coalition for Haitian Refugees, 1994).
Human Rights Watch, Torture and Ill-Treatment: Israel's Interrogation of Palestinians from the Occupied Territories, (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1994).
Human Rights Watch, *Untold Terror. Violence Against Women in Peru's Armed Conflict*, (Washington DC: Human Rights Watch / Americas, 1992).
Human Rights Watch, 'US Government Must Return Seized Haitian Documents. Deportation of Haitian Death Squad Leader Urged', 1999, <http://www.hrw.org/english/docs/1999/09/16/haiti1641_txt.htm>
Human Rights Watch, 'World Report 2003: Colombia', 2003, <http://hrw.org/wr2k3/americas4.html>
The Human Security Centre and Oxford University Press, 'The Human Security Report 2005', 2005, <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=28&Itemid=63>
Hunter, Wendy, 'State and Soldier in Latin America: Redefining the Military's Role in Argentina, Brazil and Chile', United States Institute of Peace, 1996, <http://www.usip.org/pubs/peaceworks/state10/summ10.html>
International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 'Democracy and Deep Rooted Conflict', 1998, <http://www.idea.int/publications/democracy_and_deep_rooted_conflict/>
International Trade Data System, 'Sections 201-204 of the Trade Act of 1974', 23 April 2004, <http://www.itds.treas.gov/sec201.htm>
Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), 'Report of the Inter-Parliamentary Delegation to Observe the Electoral Process in El Salvador', 1994, <http://www.ipu.org/elcn-e/rptslvdr.htm>
Institute for Policy Studies, 'Extending the War on Terrorism to Colombia: A Bad Idea Whose Time Has Come', 4 February 2002, <http://www.foreignpolicy-infocus.org>
Isacson, Adam, and Olson, Joy, 'Just the Facts 2001-2002. A Quick Tour of US Defence and Security Relations with Latin America and the Caribbean', Centre for International Policy, 2002, <http://www.ciponline.org>
Isacson, Adam, and Vaicius, Ingrid, 'Plan Colombia's "Ground Zero". A Report from CIP's trip to Putumayo, Colombia, March 9-12 2001', Centre for International Policy, 2001, <http://www.ciponline.org>
Kennedy, Joseph, *Report on the School of the Americas*, (Washington DC: National Security Archives, 1996).
Lamperti, John, 'E-mail Communication to Pen-L Mailing List', 12 April 1994, <http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/1994m04/msg00157.htm>
Larson, Eric, 'Casualties and Consensus: the Historical Role of Casualties in Domestic Support for US military operations', Rand Publications, Rand Corporation, 1996, <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR726>
Lumpe, Laura, 'US Foreign Military Training: Global Reach, Global Power, and Oversight Issues', Foreign Policy in Focus, May 2002, <http://www.fpif.org/papers/SRmiltrain.pdf>
Mitchell, Derek, 'The 2004 Removal of Jean-Bertrand Aristide', Centre for Cooperative Research, 2005, <http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/timeline.jsp?timeline=the_2004_removal_of_jean-bertrand_aristide&startpos=100>
National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, 'National Democratic Institute for International Affairs Website', 2005, <http://www.ndi.org/>

National Endowment for Democracy, 'Democracy Projects Database', 2005, <http://www.ned.org/dbtw-wpd/textbase/projects-search.htm>
National Endowment for Democracy, 'Democracy Projects Database: El Salvador', 2005, <http://www.ned.org/dbtw-wpd/exec/dbtwpub.dll>
National Endowment for Democracy, 'Democracy Projects Database: Haiti', 2005, <http://www.ned.org/dbtw-wpd/exec/dbtwpub.dll>
National Endowment for Democracy, 'National Endowment for Democracy Grants Programme', 2004, <http://www.ned.org/grants/grants.html>
National Endowment for Democracy, 'National Endowment for Democracy Venezuela Programme Frequently Asked Questions', <http://www.ned.org/grants/venezuelaFacts.html>
National Endowment for Democracy, 'Strategy Document', January 2002, <http://www.ned.org/publications/documents/strategy2002.html>
National Security Archive, 'Guide for Researchers', <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/archive/resguide.htm>
National Security Archive, 'The Oliver North File: His Diaries, E-mail and Memos on the Kerry Report, Contras and Drugs', 26 February 2004, (Declassified documents, obtained by the National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, Electronic Briefing Book 113), <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB113/index.htm>
National Security Archive, 'Overview of 'The US Military Online. A Directory for Internet Access to the Department of Defense' by William Arkin', George Washington University, 1998, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/usmil/usmil.htm>
National Security Archive, 'Prisoner Abuse: Patterns from the Past', 12 May 2004, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB122/index.htm>
National Security Archive, 'CIA Activities in Chile (Collection of Declassified Documents)', 19 September 2000, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20000919/>
National Security Archive, 'East Timor Truth Commission finds U.S. "Political and Military Support were Fundamental to the Indonesian Invasion and Occupation"', 24 January 2006, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB176/index.htm>
North American Congress for Latin America, The US Military Apparatus: Defence Department Organisation; the Intelligence Establishment; US Bases and Forces Abroad; Military Police Aid; Arms Sales, (Berkeley, California: North American Congress for Latin America, 1972).
North American Congress for Latin America, *US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel: The Pentagon's Protégés*, (Washington DC: North American Congress for Latin America, 1976).
Organisation of American States, 'Crisis in Haiti: Seeking a Political Solution', United Nations and Organisation of American States, 1993, <http://www.un.org/rights/micivih/rapports/crisis.htm>
Organisation of American States, 'The OAS Electoral Observation Mission in Haiti: Chief of Mission Report to the OAS Permanent Council', 13 July 2000, <http://www.upd.oas.org/EOM/Haiti/haitichief%20of%20mission%20report.htm>
Organisation of American States, 'Political Database of the Americas: El Salvador 1982-1994 Voter Turnout', Georgetown University and Organisation of American States, 2001, <http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba/Elecdata/ElSal/82-94tout.html>
Organisation of American States, 'Political Database of the Americas: El Salvador Presidential Election Results 1994', Georgetown University and the Organisation of American States, 1999, <http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba/Elecdata/ElSal/pres94.html>
Organisation of American States, *Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Haiti*, (Washington DC: Organisation of American States, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, 1979).
Ortiz, Diana, Allegations of Torture - SOA / WHINSEC: A Statement before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, (Washington DC: School of Americas Watch, 1998).
Osorio, Carlos, Chronology of Events Related to Seven Army Spanish Language Manuals and CIA Manuals to Train Latin American Military in Intelligence and Interrogation

Techniques through the School of the Americas, Military Training Teams, and CIA Trainers, (Washington DC: National Security Archives, 1997).
Osorio, Carlos, 'Nixon: "Brazil Helped Rig the Uruguayan Elections," 1971', National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington DC, 20 June 2002, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB71/>
Pax Cristi, *El Terrorismo de Estado en Colombia*, (Brussels: Pax Cristi International, Committee of the Churches on International Affairs, Rechtvaardigheid en Vrede, Commission Justice et Paix, 1992).
Project for the New American Century, 'Rebuilding America's Defences: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century', September 2000, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>
RAND, 'Terrorism Database Project', RAND Corporation, <http://www.rand.org/ise/projects/terrorismdatabase/index.html>
Rubio, Roberto, and Hansen-Kuhn, Karen, 'Structural Adjustment in El Salvador. An Alternative Emerges', Hartford, 1995, <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/47/069.html>
Schmitt, Garry, and Donnelly, Tom, 'The Bush Doctrine', Project for the New American Century, 30 January 2002, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/defense-20020130.htm>
Seibert, Ethan, 'History of SOA/WHINSEC: The Congressional Battle that Changes a Name', SOA Watch, 2000, <http://www.soaw.org/new/print_article.php?id=557>
Shifter, Michael, 'Drugs, Democracy and Latin America', American Foreign Services Association, 2001, <http://www.afsa.org/fsj/feb01/shifter01.cfm>
Sims, Beth, 'Populism, Conservatism, and Civil Society in Haiti', Interhemispheric Resource Centre, 1992, reprinted March 2004, <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/analysis/2004/0403ned-haiti.php>
School of Americas Watch, 'Argentina and Uruguay Abandon SOA! Critical Victory for Human Rights Organisations Across the Americas', 28 March 2006, <http://www.soaw.org/new/article.php?id=1290>
School of Americas Watch, 'Critique of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation', 2004, <http://www.soaw.org>
School of Americas Watch, 'Known Human Rights Abusers Continue to be Trained at the School of the Americas (SOA.WHINSEC)', 25 March 2004, <http://www.soaw.org/new/pressrelease.php?id=68>
School of Americas Watch, 'New Research Findings Further Incriminate the Notorious SOA/WHINSEC', 23 March 2004, <http://www.soaw.org/new/print_article.php?id=762>
School of Americas Watch, 'Notorious Graduates (By Country)', 2004, <http://www.soaw.org>
School of Americas Watch, 'Venezuela Ceases All Training of Venezuelan Troops at the School of the Americas (SOA/WHINSEC)', (E-mail/Website news item), 2004, <http://www.soaw.org/news/docs/venezuela.doc>
Sollis, Peter, Reluctant Reforms: The Christiani Government and the International Community in the Process of Salvadoran Postwar Reconstruction, (Washington DC: Washington Office on Latin America, 1993).
Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), 'The Fifteen Major Spender Countries in 2005', 2006, <http://www.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_trends.html>
Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), 'SIPRI Year Book 2006: Armaments, Disarmament, and International Security, Chapter Summaries', 2006, <http://yearbook2006.sipri.org>
Tomuschat, Christian; Lux-de-Cotí, Otilia; and Balsells-Tojo, Alfredo, 'Guatemala: Memory of Silence, Report of the Commission for Historical Clarification', 26 February 1999, <http://shr.aaas.org/guatemala/ceh/report/english/>
Truesdell, Andy, 'Clinton's Defence Policy: A Re-examination of Requirements', Global Defence Review, 1997, <http://www.global-defence.com/1997/ClintonDefence.html>
UK Steel, 'UK Steel Welcomes WTO Ruling on Illegal Tariffs but Warns of New US Threat to Trade', 10 November 2003, <http://www.uksteel.org.uk/nw108.htm>

Audiovisual Material

Defence Security Cooperation Agency, *DSCA Overview 2000 Slide Show* (Washington DC: Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 2000), <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/old%5Fpages/dsca300/sld001.htm>

Defence Security Cooperation Agency, *DSCA Overview 2003 Slide Show* (Washington DC: Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 2002), <http://www.dsca.osd.mil/briefing_slides/dsca402/sld001.htm>

School of Americas Watch, *Shut Down the SOA Flash Movie*, (Washington DC: School of Americas Watch, 2006), <http://www.soaw.org/new/flash.php>

APPENDIX ONE: DATA TABLES

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF STUDENTS TRAINED UNDER MAP AND IMET PROGRAMMES, 1950-2007 (MAP: 1950-1975, IMET: FROM 1976)

	1950-1993			1994-2007														
			% of World Total	**1994**	**1995**	**1996**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total 1994-2007	% of World Total
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	**45,308**		**8**	340	444	486	575	571	812	735	634	974	1,217	1,312	1,393	1,363	1,515	12,371	**12**
	1950-1975	1975-1993																	
	20,681	24,627																	
EUROPE AND EURASIA	**114,145**		**19**	431	524	724	746	1,074	2,678	2,619	2,904	3,368	3,719	3,149	2,651	2,353	2,682	29,622	**30**
	1950-1975	1975-1993																	
	98,162	15,983																	
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	**298,147**		**49**	215	360	498	363	402	930	648	664	718	791	667	1,011	955	1,048	9,270	**9**
	1950-1975	1975-1993																	
	249,790	48,357																	
W. HEMIS-PHERE	**128,130**		**21**	1,382	1,048	1,389	1,385	1,522	2,771	2,684	2,578	3,065	3,214	5,021	2,343	2,204	2,527	33,133	**33**
	1950-1975	1975-1993																	
	76,479	51,651																	
AFRICA	**17,882**		**3**	229	281	384	385	409	1,809	1,530	1,606	2,292	1,710	1,683	1,224	1,025	1,122	15,689	**16**
	1950-1975	1975-1993																	
	9,047	8,835																	
WORLD WIDE	**603,676**			**2,597**	**2,659**	**3,482**	**3,454**	**3,978**	**9,000**	**8,216**	**8,386**	**10,417**	**10,661**	**11,823**	**8,622**	**7,900**	**8,894**	**100,089**	

Shaded Cell = Peak Year. NB. Figures for 2006 are State Department estimates and figures for 2007 are based on requests submitted to Congress. The regional totals do not add up to the worldwide totals in some cases due to minor discrepancies in the data sources for the regions and the total. These discrepancies are not material. Note that some of those trained in the regions will have been trained in inter-regional programmes. Sources: North American Congress for Latin America, (NACLA), 'US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel: The Pentagon's Protégés (Washington DC: NACLA, 1976). Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts.' As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, 2003, http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)', 2002-2007, http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/cbj/

TABLE 2: FUNDING FOR FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING UNDER MAP AND IMET PROGRAMMES, 1950-2007 (MAP: 1950-1975, IMET: FROM 1976) US $ million																		
1950-1993			**1994-2007**															
		% of World Total	**1994**	**1995**	**1996**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**Total 1994-2007**	**% of World Total**
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	270.0	**11**	3.6	4.9	5.8	6.5	6.7	7.1	7.2	7.8	10.6	13.8	17.8	22.1	22.3	24.4	160.5	**19**
EUROPE AND EURASIA	672.5	**26**	6.8	7.9	13.3	15.2	18.7	18.5	19.4	22.6	26.8	31.5	35.5	30.5	26.4	27.1	300.1	**36**
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	915.5	**36**	2.4	3.5	4.8	5.0	5.7	5.3	5.0	5.3	6.4	6.9	8.6	9.7	9.2	9.9	87.6	**10**
W. HEMIS-PHERE	311.0	**12**	4.6	4.5	8.2	8.5	9.7	9.9	9.9	10.8	12.8	14.2	13.4	13.2	13.4	12.6	145.7	**17**
AFRICA	144.7	**6**	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.1	8.0	8.5	7.5	8.6	10.3	9.9	11.2	9.2	10.8	10.8	116.8	**16**
OTHER	251.9	**10**	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.0	0.7	2.8	3.0	3.2	4.6	4.3	3.7	4.2	32.4	**2**
WORLD-WIDE	**2,565.6**		**22.2**	**26.4**	**39**	**43.4**	**50**	**50.2**	**49.8**	**57.7**	**70**	**79.5**	**91.2**	**89**	**85.9**	**88.9**	**843.2**	

Shaded Cell = Peak Year. NB. Figures for 2006 are State Department estimates, and figures for 2007 are based on requests submitted to Congress. "Other" refers to additional, unspecified training costs.
Sources: North American Congress for Latin America, (NACLA), 'US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel: The Pentagon's Protégés (Washington DC: NACLA, 1976).
Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts.' As of September 30, 2003', Deputy for Operations and Administration, Business Operations / Controller, 2003, http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/biz-ops/2003_facts/Facts_Book_2003_Oct04_FINAL.pdf

TABLE 3: US FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING 1950-1975: NUMBERS OF STUDENTS TRAINED		
REGION	**COUNTRY**	**NO'S OF STUDENTS TRAINED**
East Asia and Pacific	Burma	794
	Cambodia	67,485
	Indonesia	4,757
	Indochina (1950-54 only)	434
	Japan	15,279
	South Korea	32,479
	Laos	37,771
	Malaysia	476
	Philippines	15,245
	Taiwan	24,507
	Thailand	14,775
	South Vietnam	35,788
Regional Total		**249,790**
Near East and South Asia	Afghanistan	359
	India	572
	Iran	10,807
	Iraq	404
	Jordan	1,098
	Lebanon	1,500
	Nepal	45
	Pakistan	4,449
	Saudi Arabia	1,380
	Sri Lanka	39
Regional Total		**20,681**
Latin America	Argentina	3,676
	Bolivia	3,956
	Brazil	8,448
	Chile	6,328
	Colombia	6,200
	Costa Rica	529
	Cuba (1950-60)	521
	Dominican Republic	3,705

	Ecuador	4,556
	El Salvador	1,682
	Guatemala	3,030
	Haiti	567
	Honduras	2,641
	Mexico	738
	Nicaragua	4,897
	Panama	4,130
	Paraguay	1,435
	Peru	6,734
	Uruguay	2,537
	Venezuela	5,341
Regional Total		**71,651**
Africa	Ethiopia	3,552
	Ghana	205
	Liberia	575
	Libya	470
	Mali	74
	Morocco	2,209
	Nigeria	462
	Senegal	18
	Sudan	132
	Tunisia	636
	Upper Volta	28
	Zaire	670
	Regional	16
Regional Total		**9,047**
Europe and Canada	Austria	426
	Belgium and Luxembourg	5,374
	Denmark	4,647
	Finland	37
	France	14,342
	West Germany	1,624
	Greece	14,144
	Italy	9,363
	Netherlands	6,297
	Norway	5,428

	Portugal	2,997
	Spain	9,872
	Turkey	18,900
	UK	3,867
	Yugoslavia	844
Regional Total		**98,162**
Interregional, e.g. NATO		465
WORLD TOTAL		**449,796**

Source: North American Congress for Latin America, (NACLA), 'US Training Programmes for Foreign Military Personnel: The Pentagon's Protégés (Washington DC: NACLA, 1976).

TABLE 4: IMET STUDENTS TRAINED 1976-2007		
FINANCIAL YEAR	**NO. OF COUNTRIES**	**NO. OF STUDENTS**
1976	42	7,000
1977	46	4,800
1978	41	4,400
1979	40	3,800
1980	52	3,600
1981	62	5,000
1982	72	6,200
1983	80	6,600
1984	86	6,000
1985	91	6,600
1986	96	6,200
1987	96	6,300
1988	98	5,600
1989	95	5,300
1990	94	4,500
1991	97	4,900
1992	102	6,416
1993	108	6,500
1994	102	2,597
1995	113	2,659
1996	120	3,482
1997	116	3,454
1998	114	3,978
1999	115	9,000
2000	115	8,216
2001	111	8,386
2002	115	10,417
2003	129	10,661
2004	129	11,832
2005	102	8,622
2006 (estimate)	132	7,900
2007 (request)	135	8,894
TOTAL EXPECTED		**202,825**

Sources: For figures from 1976-1991 see Cope, John, 'International Military Education and Training: An Assessment', Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1995, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/macnair/mcnair44/m44cont.html, chapter 3. For figures from 1991-2003 see Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Summary of Students Trained Under IMET', 30 September 2001, http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20Students.xls
For figures from 2004-2007 see US Department of State, 'Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations (Military Assistance)', 2002-2007, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/cbj/>

TABLE 5: IMET FUNDS 1976-2007	
Financial Year	**Funds Appropriated ($US in millions)**
1976	28.75
1977	25.0
1978	30.0
1979	27.9
1980	25.0
1981	28.4
1982	42.0
1983	46.0
1984	51.532
1985	56.221
1986	54.490
1987	56.0
1988	47.4
1989	47.4
1990	47.196
1991	47.196
1992	42.209
1993	42.627
1994	22.25
1995	26.35
1996	38.997
1997	43.475
1998	50.034
1999	50.159
2000	49.81
2001	57.748
2002	70.0
2003	80.0
2004	91.2
2005	89
2006	(estimate) 85.9
2007	(requested) 88.9
TOTAL EXPECTED	**1589.144**

Sources: For figures from 1976-1991 see Cope, John, 'International Military Education and Training: An Assessment', Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1995, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/macnair/mcnair44/m44cont.html, chapter 3.
For figures from 1991-2001 see Defence Security Cooperation Agency, 'Summary of Students Trained Under IMET', 30 September 2001, http://www.dsca.osd.mil/programs/Comptroller/2001_FACTS/FACTS%202001%20Students.xls

APPENDIX TWO:
EXCERPTS FROM *HUMAN RESOURCE EXPLOITATION* TRAINING MANUAL

Central Intelligence Agency, *Human Resource Exploitation Manual*,
(Washington DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 1982),
Manual acquired by National Security Archives, under the Freedom of Information Act).

Please contact author for copies (r.j.blakeley@kent.ac.uk)

APPENDIX THREE: LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS TO CLOSE SOA/WHINSEC

1993 Representative Joseph Kennedy offered an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 1994 that would have reduced the Army operations and maintenance account by $2.9million, which was the amount used at the time to run SOA. He explained that the amendment was intended to close SOA. The vote was lost 174 to 256.

1994 Kennedy introduced an amendment to the National Defence Authorisation Act for fiscal year 1995, that again would cut the Army budget by the cost of running SOA. The vote was lost 175 to 217.

1995 Kennedy sponsored a bill that would have closed SOA and opened a US Academy for Democracy and Civil-Military Relations in its place. This was referred to the House Committee on National Security but no action was taken.

1996 Kennedy offered an amendment to the Foreign Operations Export Financing and Related Programmes Act for fiscal year 1997 which would have removed all SOA funding. He withdrew the amendment before it came to a vote.

1997 Representative Esteban Torres offered an amendment to the Foreign Operations Export Financing and Related Programmes Act for fiscal year 1998 that would have removed all SOA funding. The vote was lost 210 to 217.

Representative Kennedy also offered an amendment that would have suspended all SOA funding, but the vote was lost 201 to 212.

Representative Kennedy also introduced a bill to close SOA. This was referred to the House Committee on National Security but no action was taken.

Senator Dick Durbin introduced a bill in the Senate to close SOA. This was referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee but no action was taken and no vote was held.

1999 Representative Moakley introduced a bill to close SOA. This was referred to the House Committee on National Security but no action was taken.

Representative Moakley also sponsored an amendment to limit assistance to SOA but not to close the School. The vote was won 230 to 197, but the Senate did not approve a similar cut in SOA funding, losing by one vote.

Senator Durbin introduced a bill to close SOA in the Senate. The bill was referred to the Armed Services Committee but no action was taken.

2000 Under the Floyd Spence National Defence Authorisation Act for 2001, SOA was closed and WHINSEC opened.

2001 Representative McGovern introduced bill HR1810 to close WHINSEC but no vote was held.

2003 Representative McGovern introduced bill HR1258 to close WHINSEC but no vote was held.

2005 Representative McGovern introduced bill HR1217 to close WHINSEC. This is still in progress.

2006 Representative McGovern introduced an amendment to bill HR5522 under the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programmes Appropriations Act, 2007, to limit WHINSEC funding. The vote was lost 188 to 218.

Sources: Ethan Seibert, 'History of SOA/WHINSEC: The Congressional Battle that Changes a Name', SOA Watch, 2000, <http://www.soaw.org/new/print_article.php?id=557>
US House of Representatives, 'Congressional Record: HR3546', US House of Representatives, 8 June 2006, <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?r109:2:./temp/~r109IdPyRA::>

APPENDIX FOUR: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview 1:
Ken LaPlante. (HQDA DCS G-3)

Thursday 3 June 2004. The Pentagon.

WHINSEC liaison with the Army, 2004, and WHINSEC Board of Visitors.

Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, International Affairs.

Interview 2:
Lt Col Linda L. Gould (HQDA, G3)

Thursday 3 June 2004. The Pentagon.

Chief of the Latin America Branch,

Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, International Affairs

Interview 3:
Jacqueline Baker

Monday 7 June 2004. SOA Watch Office, Washington DC

Legislative Coordinator, SOA Watch

Interview 4:
Jose Alvarez

Tuesday 8 June 2004. The Pentagon.

Former SOA Commandant (Feb 1993 – March 1995)

Currently: Defence Contractor for DoD

Interview 5:
John Speedy III. (HQDA, G3, DAMO-SSZ)

Tuesday 8 June 2004. The Pentagon.

Deputy Director for International Affairs. Strategy, Plans and Policy Directorate.

Interview 6:
Eric Maltzer (HQDA, Army G-35-R)

Tuesday 8 June 2004. The Pentagon.

Country Desk Officer, Southern Cone, Latin America Branch.

Interview 7:

Ambassador George Bruno (Retired)

Thursday 10 June 2004. Telephone.

General Counsel and Managing Director, USA GROUP INTERNATIONAL

Interview 8:

Mr. Steven Schneebaum

Monday 14 June 2004, Patton Boggs LLP, Washington DC Office

Partner: Patten Boggs LLP, Human Rights Litigator

Chairman of WHINSEC's Board of Visitors, 2004 (formerly on SOA Board of Visitors)

Interview 9:

Mr. Eric LeCompte

Wednesday 16 June 2004, SOA Watch Office, Washington DC

SOA Watch

Interview 10:
David Mazzera

Friday 18 June 2004, Foggy Bottom Metro Station

SOA Watch

Interview 11:
Jose Sorzano

Monday 21 June 2004, Jose Sorzano's Office, Arlington

US Ambassador to the UN (retired); Director for Latin America Peace Corp; Chairman: Austin Group. (See CV)

Current member of WHINSEC Board of Visitors

Professor: George Town University (18 years)

Interview 12:
Eric Olson

Monday 21 June 2004, Amnesty International USA Office

Amnesty International USA, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Washington DC 20003

Interview 13:
Rachel Stohl

Tuesday 22 June 2004, Centre for Defence Information Office, Washington DC

Senior Analyst, Centre for Defence Information

Interview 14:
David Mazzera

Wednesday 23 June 2004, Foggy Bottom Metro Station

SOA Watch

Interview 15:
Ken LaPlante. (HQDA DCS G-3)

Thursday 24 June 2004. The Pentagon.

WHINSEC liaison with the Army, 2004, and WHINSEC Board of Visitors.

Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, International Affairs.

Interview 16:
Dr. Deborah Avant

Monday 28 June 2004

Associate Professor, Political Science and International Affairs

George Washington University

Member of WHINSEC Board of Visitors, 2004

Interview 17:
Adam Isacson

Tuesday 29 June 04

Director of Programmes, Centre for International Policy

Interview 18:
Lee Rials

Tuesday 6 July 04

WHINSEC Public Affairs Officer

WHINSEC

Interview 19:
Commandant Gilberto Pérez

Wednesday 7 July 2004

WHINSEC Commandant

WHINSEC

Interview 20:
Mr. Yamil Collazo

Thursday 8 July 2004

WHINSEC Information Specialist

WHINSEC

Interview 21:
Lee Rials

Thursday 8 July 04

WHINSEC Public Affairs Officer

WHINSEC

Interview 22:
Dr. Russell Ramsey

Monday 12 July 2004

WHINSEC Visiting Professor, Norwich University

CMS3 Course: Resource Management

WHINSEC

Interview 23:
Major Irma Baquedano (Honduras)

Tuesday 13 July 2004

Student: CMS3 Resource Management (7 June – 16 July 2004).

WHINSEC

Interview 24:
Antonio Raimondo

Wednesday 14 July 2004

Judge Advocate, Chief of Human Rights Training, Instructor

WHINSEC

Interview 25:
Father Roy Bourgeois

Roy Bourgeois' office, Columbus, Georgia

Tuesday 20 July 2004

Founder, SOA Watch

Interview 26:
Dr. Donald Harrington

Monday 26 July 2004

Academic Dean, WHINSEC

WHINSEC

Interview 27
Chaplain Luis Scott

Monday 2 August 2004

Command Chaplain

WHINSEC

Interview 28
Elisabeth Andrews

Wednesday 4 August 2004

Spanish Instructor

WHINSEC

Interview 29
Colonel Walter Pjetraj.

Thursday 4 August 2004

Chief of Department of Professional Military Studies

WHINSEC

Interview 30
Major Antonio Raimondo

Monday 9 August 2004

Judge Advocate, Chief of Human Rights Training, Instructor

WHINSEC

Interview 31
WHINSEC Instructor (interviewee wishes to remain anonymous)

Monday 9 August 2004

WHINSEC

Interview 32
Colonel Cardenas. (Colombia).

Wednesday 11 August 2004

CMS2 Democratic Sustainment Course.

WHINSEC

Interview 33
Lt Colonel Martinez (Guatemala).

Wednesday 11 August 2004

CMS2 Democratic Sustainment Course.

WHINSEC

Interview 34
Police Officer (Colombia)

Counternarcotics (interviewee wishes to remain anonymous)

Wednesday 11 August 2004

CMS2 Democratic Sustainment Course.

WHINSEC

Interview 35
Jorge Santiso (Guatemala)

Analyst, Department of Defence

Wednesday 11 August 2004

CMS2 Democratic Sustainment Course.

WHINSEC

Interview 36
Dr Jorge Figueron Salguero (Guatemala)

Ministry of Foreign Relations: Sub-director of North American Division (US, Canada, Mexico)

Wednesday 11 August 2004

CMS2 Democratic Sustainment Course.

WHINSEC

Interview 37
Captain Edwin Urbano (Colombia)

Colombian Police Force, Counternarcotics

Wednesday 11 August 2004

CMS2 Democratic Sustainment Course.

WHINSEC

Interview 38
Major Paradas (Honduras)

Logistics

WHINSEC Guest Instructor

Thursday 12 August 2004

WHINSEC

Interview 39
Lt Col Luis Garcia (Peru)

Professional Military Studies Division

WHINSEC Guest Instructor

Thursday 12 August 2004

WHINSEC

Interview 40
Mr Joseph Leuer

Monday 16 August 2004

Assistant Dean of Academics

WHINSEC

Interview 41
Mr. Walter Santamaria

Wednesday 18 August 2004

Chief, Translation Division

WHINSEC

Interview 42
Mr. Pedro Valle

Monday 23 August 2004

Chief, Training and Education Development Division

WHINSEC

Interview 43
Mr. Pedro Valle (Chief, Training and Education Development Division)

Captain Chris Murray (Instructor TAC6 – Counterdrug Operations Course)

Captain Cosme (Instructor TAC6 – Counterdrug Operations Course)

Monday 23 August 2004

WHINSEC

Interview 44
Commandant Gilberto Pérez

Wednesday 7 July 2004

WHINSEC Commandant