

## **Obama's Latin America Policy: Continuity Without Change**

by Mark Weisbrot, Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR)

When Latin America's left presidents watched the campaign of Barack Obama for President in 2008, they thought that they might finally see a U.S. president that would change Washington's foreign policy in the region. It seemed like another revolt at the ballot box was arriving in the Western Hemisphere, of the kind that elected Lula da Silva, Hugo Chavez, Evo Morales, Rafael Correa, Fernando Lugo, and Tabare Vasquez. Before Obama's election, President Lula da Silva of Brazil expressed this sentiment: "Just as Brazil elected a metal worker, Bolivia elected an Indian, Venezuela elected Chavez and Paraguay a bishop, I think that it would be an extraordinary thing if, in the largest economy in the world, a black man were elected president of the United States."

In a sense, the shift in the electorate had similar causes in the hemisphere. Latin America's swing to the left was largely driven by the failure of neo-liberalism: the worst long-term economic growth performance in more than a century, from 1980-2000. More than a generation of Latin Americans had lost out on any chance to improve their living standards. In the case of the United States it was not so much a growth failure (although the growth of per capita GDP did decline significantly in the neo-liberal era as a vast increase in inequality, and of course the worst recession since the Great Depression that finally brought voters to demand an end to nearly four decades of rightward drift.

A few months after taking office, in April 2009, Obama seemed to raise Latin America's expectations at the Summit of the Americas in Trinidad. Acting like the former community organizer he was, Obama walked over to shake hands with Chavez – an image that sped instantly around the world and infuriated the Right. He made some unprecedented statements for a U.S. president, admitting that the United States has "at times we sought to dictate our terms." Even Raul Castro was impressed, and responded to Obama's loosening of travel and remittance restrictions (for Cuban-Americans only) by saying that he was ready to discuss "human rights, freedom of the press, political prisoners, everything." He added: "We could be wrong. We admit it. We're human beings."

It didn't take long for all of these leaders' hopes to be crushed. On June 28, the Honduran military overthrew the government of President Manuel Zelaya of Honduras and flew him out of the country. Over the next six months, to the horror of the Brazilians and everyone else who expected differently, the Obama administration would do everything in its power to help the coup government succeed.

On the day of the coup, the White House did not condemn it, instead calling on "all political and social actors in Honduras" to respect democracy. Given that U.S. officials were talking to the Honduran military right up to the day of the coup – in their account, to try and discourage it – the event was not a surprise. And no one was fired for the White House statement. Therefore we must assume that this was a carefully worded statement; and since the administration could not openly support the coup, it was the most supportive statement that it could issue, as a political matter. Thus it was a clear signal to the international diplomatic community that Washington supported the coup government – and everything that followed for the next six months was therefore predictable, and predicted.

2011

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sent another signal on the day after the coup, when she was asked if “restoring the constitutional order” in Honduras meant returning Zelaya to the presidency. She would not say “yes.” When President Zelaya attempted to return to Honduras on July 24, Clinton denounced his action as “reckless,” adding that “We have consistently urged all parties to avoid any provocative action that could lead to violence.”

For at least five months the Obama administration refused to condemn the massive human rights violations committed by the coup regime, despite documentation and denunciations from Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), as well as Honduran, European, and other human rights organizations. There were thousands of illegal arrests, beatings and torture by police and military, the closing down of independent radio and TV stations, and even some killings of peaceful demonstrators and opposition activists.

In order to get around laws that required cutting U.S. aid to governments that come to power through a military coup, the Obama administration refused to officially determine that a “military coup” had taken place in Honduras. Most U.S. aid to Honduras, which came from the Millennium Challenge Corporation, a U.S. government agency, was never suspended. But Wikileaks cables published this year showed that by July the U.S. embassy in Honduras was quite clear about what had happened. In a cable from July 24, 2009 asserted that “there is no doubt” that the events of June 28 “constituted an illegal and unconstitutional coup.” As for the justifications given by coup supporters, the embassy said, “none... has any substantive validity under the Honduran constitution.”

Not surprisingly, the Obama administration ran into conflict with the rest of the hemisphere in its support for the coup government. On September 28, 2009 the United States blocked the OAS from adopting a resolution on Honduras that would have refused to recognize Honduran elections carried out under the dictatorship. Latin America turned to the Rio Group (23 nations, including all of Latin America and some of the Caribbean), where a resolution was passed in November saying that Zelaya’s restitution was an “indispensable prerequisite” for recognizing the elections. On October 30th, U.S. government representatives including Thomas Shannon, the top U.S. State Department official for Latin America, brokered an accord between President Zelaya and the coup regime. The agreement was seen throughout the region as providing for Zelaya’s restitution, and – according to diplomats close to the negotiations – both Shannon and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton gave assurances that this was true. Yet just four days later, Mr. Shannon stated in a TV interview that the United States would recognize the November 29 elections, regardless of whether or not Zelaya were restored to the presidency. These maneuvers created a rift between the United States and the rest of the hemisphere. To this day, Honduras remains outside of the OAS, because all of South America — except for Chile, Colombia, and Peru – has refused entreaties from Washington to let the government of Porfirio Lobo in to the organization, from which it was suspended after the coup. It is worth emphasizing that this episode shows not only the continuity between the Bush Administration and its successor on policy toward Latin America, but it also shows how easily the Obama administration was willing to alienate the government of Brazil, simply to get rid of one leftist government in a small, poor country. Brazil is regarded by the U.S. foreign policy establishment as an increasingly important player, not only in the region, but globally. But it was not important enough for the State Department to consider aligning itself with the pro-democracy stance of the rest of the region. The Obama team also sowed distrust in the region and took a step farther to the right than the Bush Administration in July 2009, when the U.S.-Colombia Defense Co-operation Agreement (DCA) was leaked to the press. This agreement between the governments of the United States and Colombia increased access for U.S. military personnel at seven Colombian military bases. It was met with concern

and opposition throughout South America. Then President of Chile Michelle Bachelet referred to the agreement as “disquieting,” and asked for assurances that the bases would not be used for forward operations in other countries. Brazilian president Lula da Silva was also concerned; “I’m not happy with the idea of another U.S. base in Colombia,” he said. He also urged President Obama to attend the meeting of UNASUR where the issue would be discussed. More worries came from the U.S. Air Force’s Air Mobility Command White Paper on Global En Route Strategy: “Recently,” according to the White Paper, “USSOUTHCOM has become interested in establishing a location on the South American continent that could be used both for counter-narcotics operations and as a location from which mobility operations could be executed. . . . Until such time that USSOUTHCOM establishes a more robust theater engagement plan, the strategy to place a CSL at Palanquero should be sufficient for air mobility reach on the South American continent.” On August 28, the UNASUR countries met in Bariloche, Argentina and discussed the problem of the U.S.-Colombia DCA. The final declaration described South America as a “Zone of Peace” and the UNASUR nations’ commitment to respect the “territorial integrity” of all UNASUR states. It also took note: “To reaffirm that the presence of foreign military forces cannot, with its means and resources linked to its own goals, threaten the sovereignty and integrity of any South American nation and as a consequence, the peace and security of the region.” In other words, the governments reached agreement, with Colombia signing on, that the U.S. military forces could not use these bases for forward operations out of Colombia, which had been the stated or implied purpose according to various U.S. government documents. In October, the Colombian magazine *Semana* reported on a U.S. Air Force document that outlined plans for the Palanquero base, one of the bases included in the U.S.-Colombia DCA. The document states: “[D]evelopment of this CSL (Cooperative Security Location) provides a unique opportunity for full spectrum operations in a critical sub-region of our hemisphere where security and stability is under constant threat from narcotics funded terrorist insurgencies, anti-U.S. governments, endemic poverty and recurring natural disasters.” The mention of “anti-U.S. governments” as part of a “constant threat” to “security and stability” raised alarm bells among the left-of-center governments in South America.

In August 2010, the Colombian constitutional court ruled that the Defense Co-operation Agreement was unconstitutional and would have to be passed by the Colombian Congress as an international treaty. But by this time there was a new president, Juan Manuel Santos, who has so far shown no interest in pursuing ratification of the agreement. Santos has taken a drastically different approach to regional relations than his predecessor, Alvaro Uribe, most importantly repairing and maintaining very good relations with Venezuela. Ironically, this U-turn in Colombia’s foreign policy was partly a result of the Obama administration’s aggressive moves, matched by those of Uribe. Venezuela had responded to the DCA but cutting off its imports from Colombia, which shrank in one year from 15.6 to just 3.6 percent of its total exports. With this huge loss of commerce and the fact that Venezuela was allied with most of the rest of South America, Santos was faced with a choice of whether he wanted Colombia to be an unquestioningly loyal partner of Washington or a part of South America. He chose to have Colombia become more a part of South America.

The Obama Administration has also downgraded diplomatic relations with Venezuela, reversing its earlier decision at Trinidad to restore relations at the ambassadorial level. In June 2010 the Administration announced the appointment of Larry Palmer, President and CEO of the Inter-American Foundation, to replace its ambassador in Caracas. The Venezuelans responded with the formal initial approval. Palmer then testified before the Senate on July 27, as part of the confirmation process, and there were not problems. But then Palmer was subsequently asked to respond to written questions from Senator Richard Lugar, then the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In his written responses, Palmer said some things that a candidate for ambassador would not say publicly about the host country. He referred to “morale” in the Venezuelan armed forces as “considerably low” and to “clear ties between the Venezuelan government and Colombian guerrillas.” There were a number of other remarks about Venezuela that would cause almost any government to reject him as ambassador. Although Palmer’s answers to these questions were presumed to be for the Senators and not for the public, a week later they were posted on Senator Lugar’s website. This caused an uproar in Venezuela, and – like any other government would do – the Venezuelan government rejected Palmer’s appointment. Washington then retaliated by expelling the Venezuelan ambassador from the United States, and the two countries remain without ambassadors at this time.

This episode highlights the role that congressional staff play in maintaining the continuity of right-wing foreign policy. It is clear that this maneuver was executed by Congressional staff, in co-operation with right-wing allies in the State Department. Of course, President Obama is ultimately in charge and could have simply appointed a new ambassador that would not be tricked into publicly insulting the host government before his appointment. But once the confrontation was engineered, the White House – which has mostly left Latin America policy to the State Department – did not want to take the political risk of being seen as “caving to Chavez.” The Obama administration has also continued the Bush Administration’s policy toward Bolivia, with the result that the United States and Bolivia also remain without ambassadorial relations. Bolivia expelled the U.S. ambassador in September of 2008, on the grounds that he (and Washington) were intervening in Bolivia’s internal affairs. The U.S. embassy was caught trying to use Peace Corps volunteers and a Fulbright scholar for spying; U.S. ambassador Phillip Goldberg had met privately with opposition leaders at a time when a significant part of the opposition was involved in violent efforts to destabilize the government; and Washington was seen as tacitly supporting the Bolivian opposition by not condemning this violence or even offering condolences when dozens of government supporters were massacred in Pando in September 2008. The Bush administration had also suspended Bolivia’s trade preferences under the ATPDEA (Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act). The official reason was that Bolivia had not been co-operating sufficiently in the war on drugs. But according to the UN’s 2008 report, Bolivia’s coca cultivation had increased by just 5% that year, compared to a 27% increase in Colombia, the biggest beneficiary of U.S aid in the region. Bolivia kicked the Drug Enforcement Agency out of the country, in 2008, accusing it of aiding the political opposition. The Obama administration has not restored Bolivia’s trade preferences, despite the fact that the suspension itself is probably illegal under the WTO. Under WTO rules, countries are allowed to establish rules for preferential access to their markets, but the rules must be applied equally to all countries receiving the preferences. There is also another holdover from the Bush administration: Bolivia’s new constitution declares that health care (along with water and other necessities) is a human right and cannot be privatized. In keeping with their constitutional law, Bolivia asked the WTO for permission to withdraw the previous government’s commitment to open up its hospitals and health care sector to foreign corporations. According to the WTO’s procedural rules, if there are no objections to such a request within 45 days, it is approved. The European Union, home to some of the big health care corporations that might have an interest in the issue, responded that it had no objections. On January 5, 2009 the last day of the waiting period, the Bush administration objected. As of this writing, the Obama administration has still not withdrawn the Bush administration’s objection. Perhaps the most important sticking point in the restoration of ambassadorial relations right now is Bolivia’s demand for transparency in the use of USAID money within the country. The United States currently spends over \$80 million per year in Bolivia through USAID. Relative to Bolivia’s economy, this is comparable to what the United States is spending in Iraq. Although some of this money is dedicated to specific projects that are

disclosed, much of it is not, and the State Department has acknowledged that some of it goes to groups or individuals that are part of the opposition. But the U.S. government refuses to disclose where this money is going. The Bolivian government has demanded full transparency with respect to these funds. Haiti is yet another example of a country where the Obama administration has continued its predecessor's policy with a vengeance. On November 28, Haiti held a presidential election in which a Duvalierist candidate, Mirlande Manigat, placed first and the government's candidate, Jude Celestin was second. In a close third, separated by only 0.7 percentage points, was popular musician Michel Martelly, who is backed by right-wing sources in Miami and in Spain. The election was of questionable legitimacy to begin with, since the country's most popular political party – Fanmi Lavalas, the party of Haiti's first democratically elected president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide – was arbitrarily excluded from the ballot, and about three-quarters of the electorate did not vote. This was the lowest turnout for a presidential election in the hemisphere for 60 years, including Haiti, where 59 percent voted in the last presidential election. Nonetheless, the Obama administration did not like the results, because Celestin was the candidate of President Rene Preval, who had fallen out of favor with Washington in the last couple of years. The United States, together with its allies such as Canada and France, then used the OAS to change the results of the election. An OAS “Expert Verification Mission,” examining only a sample of the ballots and without using any statistical inference to determine the overall result, recommended that Manigat and Martelly proceed to the runoff. There were over 150,000 missing or quarantined votes, and although the Mission looked at these areas and determined that they were significantly different from the overall population – and would likely have shifted the result back to Celestin — their report did not include this information. It was also unprecedented, as the Mission's chief statistician — Fritz Scheuren, the President of the American Statistical Association – verified, for an election result to be reversed without a recount. (Normally, in a disputed election, the results are either accepted, or a new election is held, or a recount can be used to determine the winner). The Obama administration then repeatedly threatened Haiti's current government until it reluctantly accepted the change of results, leaving only two right-wing candidates – who had received 6.5 and 4.6 of the electorate's votes, respectively – competing for president in a country that would never willingly vote for a right-wing president. Among the threats was a cut-off of desperately needed earthquake relief aid, and according to multiple sources, a threat to fly President Preval out of the country. The latter was no idle threat; the United States and its allies had overthrown President Aristide in that manner seven years ago, after first destroying the economy by cutting off international aid for nearly four years, while funneling money to opposition groups. At the time of this writing the State Department was still trying to block Aristide from returning to Haiti. The case of Haiti is important to this analysis because it shows to what great lengths the Obama administration is willing to go in order to control the government of a small, desperately poor country. Honduras, at least, has a U.S. military base; Haiti has almost nothing of value to U.S. military or corporate interests. Why, then, have they sought to get rid of the country's only national political leader over the last 20 years, overthrowing him twice and aiding an abetting the slaughter of thousands of his supporters each time, as well as the suppression of the country's largest political party? The answer is evident from recent Wikileaks cables, which show that Washington was worried about Haiti's foreign policy under Preval. As insignificant as it may seem to someone outside of Washington circles, the State Department sees Haiti as just one more pawn in its game of Cold War chess in the Western Hemisphere – and one that it believes it should be able to capture, given Haiti's poverty and defenselessness.

### **Conclusion**

There is little that is surprising about the continuity of the Obama administration's foreign policy in Latin America with that of the Bush administration. Most generally, President Obama appears to have made a decision early on that he would change U.S. foreign policy in the world as little as

possible. The appointment of Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State, who lost the primary election to him partly because of her stubborn defense of her support for the Iraq war, was an obvious indicator. From a politician's point of view, it was a simple calculation. Obama took the presidency while the United States was suffering its worst recession since the Great Depression. Foreign policy concerns normally do not play a major role in U.S. presidential elections, and – even in normal times – there is a compelling body of political science research showing that the state of the economy prior to the election is of primary importance. In this case, it seems very likely that President Obama's re-election chances will rest primarily on economic issues – including, more broadly, his attempt at health care reform. In these circumstances, it does not make sense from a political point of view to get in any avoidable fights over foreign policy. On issues of higher public salience and with greater grassroots activism, Obama may be influenced by public opinion – e.g. in Afghanistan, where he appears ready to defer to the military and continue the war indefinitely, but could be forced out earlier as the war becomes increasingly unpopular and the anti-war movement increasingly wins more Democratic Members of Congress to vote against it. But Latin America is off the radar screen for the vast majority of the electorate. Therefore there is no electoral gain, and only possible risk, in changing U.S. policy toward Latin America. The embargo on Cuba is an obvious example – although the risk of losing Florida due to lifting the embargo is increasingly small, there is simply no reason to take even a small risk. This is true even though the majority of the business elite would favor an end to the embargo.

President Obama also focuses more on media than most U.S. presidents, in that the media is the primary constituency that he seeks to keep satisfied. In this regard, he is easily intimidated by a media climate that has demonized Venezuela and often portrays Latin America in Cold War terms. It must be remembered that the editorials in the newspapers have much more influence than the news articles – even for Members of Congress and other policy-makers – and these are mostly an obstacle to improved relations with Latin America.

The foreign policy establishment mostly reinforces the current state of relations with Latin America. Looking through the articles in *Foreign Affairs* or other publications of the establishment, there is little to indicate that these analysts have grasped the historic significance of the transformation that has taken place over the last decade. Latin America is now more independent of the United States than Europe is, and its independence is growing. There are structural reasons for these changes – the failure of neo-liberalism noted above; the collapse of the IMF's creditors' cartel in the region – which was the major avenue of U.S. influence; the rising relative importance of Asia as a source of markets and investment funds; and the increasing multi-polarity of world politics generally. And perhaps most importantly, the majority of the region has voted for left governments because they can: in the past, as is sadly still the case in Honduras and Haiti today, the United States did not allow such choices to be made peacefully. Yet the foreign policy establishment here sees Latin America's leftward shift as primarily just a swing of the pendulum, something that will eventually swing back and allow the United States to regain its lost influence without changing its policies. Needless to say, this is unlikely. The capture of the House of Representatives by the Republicans will simply provide more pressure for the continuation of the Administration's conservative policies toward Latin America. Florida Cuban-American Ileana Ros-Lehtinen is now chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and hard-right Florida Representative Connie Mack is Chair of the Sub-Committee on the Western Hemisphere. Ros-Lehtinen was a strong and open advocate for the coup regime in Honduras, lobbied on behalf of Cuban terrorists Orlando Bosch and Luis Posada Cariles, and has called for the assassination of Fidel Castro. Mack and Ros-Lehtinen have introduced legislation “to add Venezuela to the list of states which sponsor terrorism...”.

For the foreseeable future at least, most positive changes in U.S.-Latin American relations will come from the South.

**Mark Weisbrot** is co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research, in Washington, D.C. ( [www.cepr.net](http://www.cepr.net) ). He is also President of Just Foreign Policy( [www.justforeignpolicy.org](http://www.justforeignpolicy.org) ). Scheuren also verified that no statistical inference was used to determine the overall result from the sample; and the Mission had looked at the missing votes and determined that they would have swung the second place finish to Celestin, but did not include this part of their work in the Mission's report.

Weisbrot, Mark, "Obama Should Make A Clean Break With the Past on Latin America", McClatchy Tribune Information Services, November 26, 2008.

Weisbrot, Mark, "Changes in Latin America: Consequences for Human Development", International Journal of Health Sciences 37-3 (2007): 477 – 500.

Baker, Dean, "The Productivity to Paycheck Gap: What the Data Show", Center for Economic and Policy Research, April 10, 2007. <http://www.cepr.net/index.php/press-releases/press-releases/slow-productivity-growth-not-just-income-redistribution-to-blame-for-lagging-wages/>

Weisbrot, Mark, "After Four Decades, Finally: The Beginning of the End", Commondreams, November 5, 2008. <http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/after-four-decades-finally-the-beginning-of-the-end/>

Remarks by the President at the Summit of the Americas Opening Ceremony, The White House, April 17, 2009. [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-the-Summit-of-the-Americas-Opening-Ceremony/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-the-Summit-of-the-Americas-Opening-Ceremony/)

Carroll, Rory, "Raúl Castro open to talk with Obama about 'everything'", The Guardian (UK), April 17, 2009. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/apr/17/raul-castro-barack-obama-cuba-america>>

Statement from President on the situation in Honduras, The White House, June 28, 2009.

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Statement-from-the-President-on-the-situation-in-Honduras/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Statement-from-the-President-on-the-situation-in-Honduras/)

Clinton, Hillary, "Remarks at the Top of the Daily Press Briefing", June 29, 2009.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/06/125487.htm>

"Zelaya 'reckless' to return to Honduras: Clinton", Agence France Presse, July 24, 2009.

<[http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5ip57hlmApbWY425sYPINw29GH\\_8A](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5ip57hlmApbWY425sYPINw29GH_8A)>

"Honduras: Investigate Abuses, Repeal Repressive Measures", Human Rights Watch, October 30, 2009. <<http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2009/10/30/honduras-investigate-abuses-repeal-repressive-measures>>

"Honduras: Abuses escalate in crackdown", Amnesty International, September 25, 2009.

<http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/AMR37/006/2009/en>

"IACHR CONDEMNS EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE IN REPRESSION OF PROTESTS IN HONDURAS", Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, September 22, 2009.

<http://www.cidh.org/comunicados/english/2009/65-09eng.htm>

Naiman, Robert, "WikiLeaks Honduras: State Dept. Busted on Support of Coup", Huffington Post, November 29, 2010. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-naiman/wikileaks-honduras-state\\_b\\_789282.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-naiman/wikileaks-honduras-state_b_789282.html)

Padgett, Tim, "Is U.S. Opposition to the Honduran Coup Lessening?" TIME, October 16, 2009.

<http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1930835-1,00.html>

"DECLARACION ESPECIAL SOBRE LA SITUACION EN HONDURAS", XXVIII Reunión de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores del Mecanismo Permanente de Consulta y Concertación Política, Grupo de Río, November 5, 2009.

[http://portal2.sre.gob.mx/gruporio/images/STORIES/09\\_XXVIIMRE/xviiimre\\_honduras\\_es.pdf](http://portal2.sre.gob.mx/gruporio/images/STORIES/09_XXVIIMRE/xviiimre_honduras_es.pdf)

“Acuerdo en Honduras”, CNN en Espanol, November 3, 2009. <http://www.cnn.com/video/data/2.0/video/spanish/2009/11/03/WEBhondureno.cnn.html>

Bronstein, Hugh, “Criticism grows over Colombia’s U.S. military plan”, Reuters, August 3, 2009. <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN03539055>

Washington Office on Latin America, “WOLA Expresses Concern on Palanquero Base”, August 7, 2009. [http://www.wola.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=viewp&id=970&Itemid=2](http://www.wola.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=viewp&id=970&Itemid=2)

“Declaración conjunta de Reunión Extraordinaria del Consejo de jefes y jefas de Estado de la Unión de Naciones Sudamericanas”, UNASUR, August 28, 2009. <http://www.comunidadandina.org/unasur/28-8-09bariloche.htm>

. “Military Construction Program: Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 Budget Estimates.” Department of the Air Force , May 2009. <http://www.justf.org/files/primarydocs/091104pal.pdf>.

Weisbrot, Mark and Jake Johnston, “The Gains From Trade: South American Economic Integration and the Resolution of Conflict”, Center for Economic and Policy Research, November 2010. < <http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/gains-from-trade-2010-11.pdf>>

“US revokes Venezuela ambassador’s visa amid Chavez row”, BBC, December 30, 2010. < <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-12091689>>

Friedman-Rudovsky, Jean and Brian Ross, “Exclusive: Peace Corps, Fulbright Scholar Asked to ‘Spy’ on Cubans, Venezuelans”, ABC News, February 8, 2008. < <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/Story?id=4262036&page=1>>

Chávez, Franz, “U.S. Ambassador Expelled for Allegedly Supporting Violent Opposition”, Inter-Press Service, September 11, 2008. <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=43846>

:Coca Cultivation in the Andean Region: A Survey of Bolivia, Colombia and Peru”, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, June 2008. [http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/Andean\\_report\\_2008.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/Andean_report_2008.pdf)

“Congressional Budget Justification: Foreign Operations FY 2011”, United States of America Department of State. [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PCAAC013.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PCAAC013.pdf)

Johnston, Jake and Mark Weisbrot, “Haiti’s Fatally Flawed Elections”, Center for Economic and Policy Research, January 2011. <http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/haiti-2011-01.pdf>

Weisbrot, Mark and Jake Johnston, “Analysis of the OAS Mission’s Draft Report on Haiti’s Election”, Center for Economic and Policy Research, January 2011. <http://www.cepr.net/index.php/publications/reports/analysis-of-the-oas-missions-draft-final-report-on-haitis-election>

Fritz Scheuren, Private Meetings and Event “The Elections: Flawed Beyond Repair?” sponsored by Haiti Democracy Project, February 2011. <http://www.cepr.net/index.php/events/events/the-elections-flawed-beyond-repair>

“Haiti: U.S. Asks South Africa to Delay Aristide’s Departure”, Reuters, March 14, 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/15/world/americas/15briefs-ART-Haiti.html>

Weisbrot, Mark, “WikiLeaks’ lesson on Haiti”, The Guardian (UK), December 17, 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/dec/17/haiti-wikileaks>

Main, Alex, “Certified Right-Wing Extremists Set to Take Over House Foreign Affairs Panels,” November 5, 2010, <http://www.cepr.net/index.php/blogs/cepr-blog/certified-right-wing-extremists-set-to-take-control-of-house-foreign-affairs-panels>