



Working Paper
Center for North American Studies

**The Current Debate Regarding the SPP:
Security and the Integration of North America**

Marcela Celorio*

I. Introduction

On March 23, 2005 in Waco, Texas, the leaders of North America – George W. Bush, Vicente Fox and Paul Martin – created the Security and Prosperity Partnership for North America (SPP). This declaration represents the second trilateral political instrument following the Declaration of Quebec in April 2001. The SPP's goal is to consolidate, increase and strengthen the cooperation between Canada, The United States and Mexico in order to build a more prosperous and secure region.

Interesting initiatives beyond the commercial arena followed the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which pertains to commercial and economic issues between the countries. The security issue is addressed for the first time in the trilateral agenda.

Since 9/11, security has been a priority in the American agenda and, consequently, in its relationships with Canada and Mexico. Since 9/11 there have been bilateral efforts to attain greater security in the region; however, it was not until the Waco meeting that the subject was included in the trilateral agenda. There is concern regarding the implications that security will have for regional integration.

The importance of a trilateral initiative at the highest level, such as SPP, has not been overlooked by governmental officials, experts, the media and society in general; however, it is worthwhile to mention that the initiative has not been fully addressed at these same levels. Thus, it is important to consider within the SPP the possible scope of implications of the inclusion of a security agenda for the integration of the region.

*Marcela Celorio was a Diplomat-in-Residence at the School of International Service at American University and a Senior Fellow at the Center for North American Studies. She was on leave as a Political Affairs Officer at the Embassy of Mexico in Washington D.C. Ms. Celorio is a lawyer and career member of the Mexican Foreign Service since 1999. The Center would like to thank Cementos de Mexico, S.A., CEMEX, and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico for supporting the position of Diplomat-in-Residence at American University. This paper does not necessarily represent the views of the Mexican government or any institution.

In order to give insight into the current status of the debate surrounding both North American integration and security, interviews with renowned experts in the field were conducted. The interviewees include politicians, diplomats, officials and academics from Canada, The United States and Mexico. In addition, important forums held in Ottawa, Washington, DC and Sonoma, California were attended. A compilation of the interviews that highlights and analyzes the most relevant aspects is provided.

II. Findings

1. Security and Prosperity Partnership –SPP-

In the trilateral arena, after NAFTA, the SPP constitutes the main effort to widen the agenda of the three North American countries beyond trade and economic issues. In this context the security element is introduced. It is important to underline that even though this partnership was adopted in March 2005, the development and explanation of its nature has taken some time.¹

Not all the interviewees had followed up on the initiative.² Nevertheless, experts from the three countries demonstrated great interest in the future of such an association. The majority viewed the partnership as a positive effort to encourage and deepen dialogue in the region, and most expressed their confidence in its transcendence of the current administrations.

Among the interviewees and in the different forums, SPP is viewed as a trilateral commitment which must be mutually reinforced. For many, SPP places Canada, The United States and Mexico on the road to greater integration.

The majority of the topics that comprise the partnership are related to economic, diplomatic, civil, and political concepts, in which both the public and private sectors participate. For some officials, mainly in the United States, SPP seems to offer an ideal forum to seek closer cooperation in the military, even though there are no substantial defense and mutual security topics stated in the agreement.

Limited Scope of the Waco Statement

On the other hand, SPP causes uneasiness and confusion in connection with its scope. Among the strongest criticisms to SPP is the argument that describes the partnership as an “air” initiative in which the whole is much smaller than each of the actions contained, a “laundry list”. These concrete measures are not enough, they “fall short” in the presence of a greater integration statement. The “whole” is diluted since there is no common strategic vision for the North American region. Taking into consideration these appraisals, some have proposed that the governments should focus on two or three relevant subjects instead of having multiple initiatives, which give rise to confusion.

In addition to the aforementioned concerns, *SPP* is mainly viewed as a Canada-United States bilateral initiative, because trilateral initiatives are very few, and for some experts, mainly from Mexico, it is understood as the confirmation of the partnership that these countries have had in connection with security for more than sixty years.

In this sense, Americans find it easier to deal with Canada. In turn, Canada's interests are to increase its cooperative actions to more adequately face emerging challenges and to continue in its role as instigator of multilateral amendments.

In regard to SPP's instrumentation, a lack of organization and inadequate direction seem to show its bureaucratic underpinnings. The multiplicity of actors and the diversified subjects give rise to the interaction of several authorities of different natures; which, instead of contributing to the communication and the dialogue with counterparts, generates mistrust and confusion. For example, in the event of a natural disaster in Mexico, the military would intervene, while natural disasters in the United States call for a response from a civil authority such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

Another concern among the Canadians and Mexicans is the United States' commitment both to encouraging specific development actions in the region as well as regarding the initiative as a whole. From experience, Canada and Mexico know that the United States is capable of giving preference to its national interests over any pre-established agreement or arrangement.

In return, United States is skeptical of Mexico's position, qualified as "ambivalent in everything", and towards Canada's divergent policies.

Notwithstanding these perceptions, it seems that the governments are willing to leave a legacy of a closer North America. In this regard, the presidents and prime minister are scheduled to meet again March 31st, 2007 in Cancun, Mexico, within the framework of the SPP.³

2. The Security Variable

According to John Bailey, security has been a driving force towards integration that was discussed as early as the eighties. To obtain popular support for NAFTA it was argued that the economy could be an element that would contribute to the edification of a more prosperous (and as a consequence, more stable) Mexico. Presently, in regional terms, it is relevant in regards to competitiveness. The construction of a security zone will guarantee the protection of the greatest commercial relationship worldwide.

Avenue for Cooperation

The 9/11 factor placed security in what can be called a "tri-national agenda." Security has become a major subject due to geographic, economic and demographic determinants that cannot be avoided. According to Leonardo Curzio, security leads Canada, The United States and Mexico to a convergent route. In the same way as commerce, security is configured as a pressure element towards a more integrated North America.

For Jorge Montaña and Andres Rozental, security may be an "exchange currency" or a "hook" for Mexico. Through such persuasion, security is guaranteed along the borders

and, as long as this work is effective, it may include the possibility of stimulating American pragmatism and may influence politics. Otherwise, security has the risk of becoming an obstacle.

Lack of Cohesion

On the other hand, as expressed by Bernardo Sepúlveda, security is another subject in which perspectives differ: the United States wants to control its borders and Mexico seeks a more open border. There is continuous tension between U.S. security policies that aim to restrict the entry of foreigners, and Mexico's need to assure a free flow of individuals.⁴

Notwithstanding the ineludible intersection of interests in this subject, the prioritization of threats to security is not the same.⁵ To be efficient in this heading it is necessary to harmonize the security concepts. For example, in the case of Canada and United States the main threats would be terrorism, matters in connection with rogue States, drug trafficking and organized crime; for Mexico the main danger is organized crime, followed by drug trafficking and terrorism.

Another security factor that is an issue in combating terrorism is the lack of control of the Mexico-United States border. Currently, there are high levels of violence provoked by organized crime, drug trafficking, trafficking in persons and smuggling.⁶ In view of the uncontrolled border, there is always a possibility that the United States will respond unilaterally.

Juan Rebolledo believes that there is the need to adopt special rules along the border. Both governments have to define and mutually agree on valid policies for the entire security corps on both sides of the border, in such a way that actions are based on previously established rules (place, time, and mode). In this regard, the cost of violating the rules is greater than having no rules at all.

The Road to the Construction of a Common Vision on Security

It is clear that one governmental task to be accomplished is the development of a common vision on security; mainly, when security is difficult to achieve in unilateral terms. The United States needs to administer its borders as well as those of its neighbors. Border security is only an element of total security, it is not the whole solution. The United States needs the cooperation of the other countries in the region.

The majority of those interviewed perceive the cooperation regarding security among the countries of the region to be fairly good. With respect to the relationship between Mexico and the United States, specifically in terms of the military, an attitude of greater cooperation is sensed, even though 9/11 events modified the American security structure.

The creation of the *Northcom* places Mexico, for the first time, in a position of responsibility for a unified command. Such a command has the assignment to administer American forces and defense initiatives in connection with Canada and Mexico. The Mexican army did not show interest in this new role since it is mainly perceived as a kind of

subordinate role to the United States. The *Secretaría de la Defensa* has made it clear that it will keep on working as it has done until now. They have direct contact with the Pentagon, the Secretary of the Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force.

On the other hand, since the end of the nineties, Americans have been increasing communication with the *Secretaría de Marina*, which already had a relationship with the Coast Guard, protecting oil structures and monitoring illegal activities that occur in the Yucatan peninsula.

Under the concept of *depth defense*, it is in America's interest to work with Mexico in order to exercise control over both its southern and northern borders. The problem of transnational crime is linked with what is happening along Mexico's border. United States security should cover the largest area possible.

With the purpose of constructing this defense system and seeking new forms of cooperation acceptable for the Mexican government, there have been some discussions within academia over the idea of creating a "Mexican Caribbean Surveillance System." According to Jay Cope, under this system *Northcom* would exchange information with the new Mexican command at a coordination level and not under the direction of a unique command. Likewise, this proposal takes into consideration the cultural and historical factors that Mexico shares with its southern neighbors. In this regard, Mexico must look both to the South and to the North; as must the United States.

This concept might have interesting results for Mexico. In terms of defense, Mexico should begin thinking more in regional terms and in the construction of partnerships. This proposal might even represent the basis for new forms of trilateral cooperation. The dynamic might lead during the upcoming years to a new cooperation level which might contribute to the formation of the so called "security perimeter."

The term "security perimeter," originated in the civil sphere. The concept began to attract interest among the different groups involved with security.⁷ The possibility of developing a common security perimeter for North America that enables the free movement of individuals and goods along the borders has already been discussed. At the same time it has taken into account that the resources at certain border points are concentrated, allowing a greater exchange of information. However, this will not be possible without first solving issues such as the commercial and migratory policies.

In general, it is recognized that, within the civil sphere – information exchange, intelligence works, police authorities – more has been achieved and at a faster speed than in the military sphere. It seems that *CISEN* (*Centro de Investigación y Seguridad Nacional*) plays a very important role as the connection between the Mexican and American security forces.

3. North America's Regional Integration

Although the concept of a North American community has not yet been achieved, certain levels of integration in the region have been acknowledged. Among the interviewees of the three countries there was a general consensus regarding the way in which the

integration is taking place in North America. It is worth mentioning that this integration is understood, mainly, in the bilateral scope. The integration process responds to a population dynamic more than to a governmental one. Economic, cultural, demographic and social factors contribute to an integration that evolves every day.

Jorge Montaña explains that there are integration processes operating at different levels:

- a) Informal, with two modalities: One with a daily impact, which is intrinsically linked to the border vicinity, where the advances are singular and asymmetrical. This gradual arrangement process takes decades and it has been intensified by *NAFTA*, due to the institutional cooperation mechanisms. However, more than anything else, the process has been intensified because of the existence of citizens with constant binational movements which have generated common roots of different order: familial, commercial, educational, cultural, tourist.

Within the same informal segment, these exchanges impact population groups in both countries, beyond the border areas. In Mexico goods and services are sold with prices estimated in dollars, American lifestyles and habits are imitated, formalized through royalties and self-service store chains. Many Mexicans travel back and forth across the border. In turn, this constant movement of migrants from their towns or villages, generates more migration due to the fact that they become aware of the comparative advantages given in a more advanced society, such as funds transfers.

- b) Formal: This is a process of more complexity due to resistance from both sides of the border. The *NAFTA* effect has been strong enough to break some enmities, but the formal integration process is advancing at a slower pace. Both congresses constantly show signs of their parochialism and inability to solve tensions with something other than replevying legislation.⁸

Governmental Leadership

In view of this scenario, the need for governments to assume leadership and direct the integration was also acknowledged. To date, the countries have been “playing catch-up.” It is the government’s responsibility to handle, channel and even accelerate the integration process.

The case mentioned by Agustin Carstens at the Sonoma forum is exemplifies this concept: even though it is acknowledged that regional integration should rely more on the market and less on the bureaucracy, we cannot disregard that a stable market cannot be conceived without governments. Pertinent to this observation, the Asiatic model is a good example of an integration based on the markets and, at the same time, contemplated as a high-priority issue by the governmental agenda.

Challenges and Opportunities

The challenges and opportunities raised by the integration of North America notoriously influence perceptions and positions adopted by the interviewees and participants of the different forums.

The “Great Idea of North America”

Even when it is acknowledged that the “Great Idea of North America” has not been articulated in the population nor in the governments, for some, such as Robert A. Pastor and Andrés Rozental, it is necessary for the countries to work together on three ideas: the creation of a customs union, a competitiveness commission for the region, and a North American investment fund. These are all steps that will help deepen regional integration.

One of the strongest arguments is that regional integration should be seen in terms of competitiveness. North America should become a regional group that is capable of competing *vis-a-vis* with the European Union, China and Southeast Asian country associations. Canada, the United States and Mexico should make use of the comparative advantage provided by their vicinity.

In this regard, even the asymmetries may be taken as an advantage to increase the competitiveness in the region. Mexico may offer cheap manual labor and its northern neighbors may provide it with technology to encourage its development.⁹

One of the advantages of having a North American community would be that having rules and institutions will provide balance and reciprocity within the relationships between these three countries. At the same time, problems will be solved in an easier way and relationships between countries and their governments will be improved by embracing the concept of belonging to a community.

The promoters of a vision of a common North American recognize integration as a fact. It is noteworthy that the forum *Where are we going? Canada and Mexico Looking Beyond 2006*; which took place in Ottawa on November 24, 2005; is probably the first formal debate, among PAN, PRD and PRI representatives, on the upcoming presidential election in Mexico. This discussion, and the fact that it was carried out in this setting and manner, was once unimaginable for many.

Trilateralization of the Dual-Bilateral Relationships

The majority of the officials interviewed are better identified with an intermediate position. They believe that we should no longer think in an isolationist manner. We should start thinking trilaterally; we should think about building economic spaces as well as increasing the cooperation in areas beyond the commercial scope. However, this does not imply integration or creation of common institutions.

The existence of three bilateralisms was acknowledged by many of the interviewees. Within this context, the United States’ influence serves as a political commitment to provide a greater integration. In regards to Canada, the interest in building a common vision of the North American region has increased. The Canadian *International Policy Review* contemplates the deepening of the relationship with Mexico. Apparently, results are beginning to be obtained from a relationship which has been intensified throughout the last ten years. This is not only due to *NAFTA*, but also because of increased understandings achieved in other areas such as foreign policy, development, human rights, education, culture, and energy.

Another explanation for this new interest is the acknowledgement of the demographic changes which are taking place in the United States. The presence of Mexicans in the U.S. is unquestionable. A large number of the members of the American government's branches are also from the southern part of the United States. Consequently, interests and priorities change and may focus on U.S.-Mexican issues, as is evidenced by the Bush Administration.

There is a perception among Canadians and Mexicans that their bilateral relationship within the trilateral context is a tool which facilitates the interaction with the United States. They can even urge the United States to adopt more multilateral initiatives. The same can be said of the relationship between the United States and Canada in terms of the security issue. On the other hand, Canada and Mexico both consider that they have a special relationship with the United States and trilateralization could imply the risk of losing it.

Some of the people in favor of trilateralizing the dynamics in the region argue that a mature sense of sovereignty should be pursued. In this regard, the States should exercise their sovereignty by cooperating with and making commitments to other countries.

Heterogeneity of Interests

For *Bernardo Sepúlveda* and other experts, more than common interests, there is a heterogeneity of interests that impede advancing towards a greater integration and consequently the construction of a North American community. North American regional integration and the formation of a community is not viable due to an insufficient confluence of economic and political interests: there is no possibility of creating a customs union; in the energy sector the divergences persist and there is a serious incompatibility in the Mexican and American views on immigration. Canada, even with a generous migratory policy, would be against the free transit of persons through its borders. From this perspective, these three elements which would integrate the community – customs, energy, and immigration – are not set on solid foundation.

Many decades will elapse before integration may take place. Political experts in the three countries think that there is an absence of a common direction and a realistic vision needed to advance integration. Some suggest that before working for greater integration in the region, problems in relationships between countries should be addressed and resolved. These problems include migration, sovereignty, foreign policy issues, and economic asymmetry, among others.

Taking into account that integration is a process that usually develops between peers, Jaime García Covarrubias states the following question: “How can a relationship be symmetric when countries are not symmetric?” In the case of North America, symmetry is hard to achieve because of the power of the United States. In answer to this question, Jose Luis Piñeyro states that for Mexico it is very important to consider economic and social inequality compared with the United States. He suggests exploring the possibility of creating cohesion funds as in Europe, in order to invest in physical and educational infrastructure, and human capital.¹⁰ Therefore, Mexico has to assume consider negotiations; what can be given in exchange for the funds needed to make these improvements? A greater integration

in which these considerations are not taken into account would generate a greater disparity of development for Mexico.

According to Carlos Heredia, we should take into consideration that Canadians and Americans are not willing to help Mexico's development process until the Mexican government approves the necessary structural reforms.

The commercial and economic subject is ineludible when talking about a greater integration in the North American region. As underlined by Jaime Zabudovsky in the *Sonoma* forum, United States is a global neighbor with a global agenda, not a regional one. On one hand, approximately 90% of Canada's and Mexico's trade depends on the United States. For the U.S., trade with its neighbors represents around 33% of its total. The "NAFTA attitude" only exists in the Canadian and Mexican business enterprise sector and not in America's. U.S. attention is focused on Asia. However, it is important that decision makers consider that, in general terms, the states in the U.S. do not compete among themselves, but individuals and companies do.

There is a perception in Mexico that there is inertia towards a greater economic and social polarization. *NAFTA* has not been able to improve the economics of the common citizen, as Carlos Heredia affirms. Instead, the agreement has contributed to the consolidation of a monopolistic structure of the market that benefits businessmen and the governmental elites. This is why the integration is perceived by many as the benefiting only a few.

The challenge for the governments is to lay a bridge between these sectors and the rest of the population. Agustin Carstens points out that the promotion of a North American common vision depends on the welfare of the individual economies.

For Mexico and United States, immigration has been an issue of major importance, and one that has not been resolved. In the last few years we have seen that it is not the Congress's or American public's intent to set the basis to administrate immigration. On the contrary, on December 16, 2005, the United States House of Representatives approved the *Sensenbrenner* initiative, which increases immigration and border control, including the construction of more than one thousand kilometers of wall along the border with Mexico.¹¹ There is a lack of compromise between what Mexico and the United States seek in the relationship. Presently, the importance of Mexico to the U.S. focuses on border security.

Finally, Canada and Mexico feel protected from the so-called "Imperial power" by always stating sovereignty issues. For example, contrary to the argument of some American academics that the United States has no interest in dominating Mexico, some Mexican officials argue that now that the security issue has risen, the U.S. may take advantage of an opportunity to dominate its southern neighbor. Therefore, there are reservations regarding the integration with the United States.¹²

IV. Final Thoughts

1. There are some hesitant approaches to consolidate the integration roadmap of North America; there is still a lot to do to reach a regional common vision. Canada, The

United States and Mexico face the reality of increasing economic and social interdependence. These countries are reconsidering the asset of geopolitics in a globalized world. The neighbor is no longer the enemy; on the contrary, closeness is seen as an advantage to build alliances. The association, the interdependence and the integration are no longer threats to State sovereignty, but tools to fortify the State.

North American leaders understand this new meaning and have agreed to increase cooperative actions within their legislative framework. This represents a small advance compared to the task that implies the adoption of a shared vision.

2. The agreement on the creation of a tri-national forum and the inclusion of the security issue is an important element on the road to the construction of new mechanisms that recognize interdependence. This precedent might lead us to increase integration within the North American region. The SPP is a trilateral forum that opens spaces to improve regional understanding.
3. This framework allows authorities and other players to establish a direct dialogue with their counterparts. It sets the bases to begin conversations on other issues, such as security: specifically, military cooperation. In this sense, security might be a trigger to activate a regional awareness and bring a sense of community in areas beyond trade. In this regard, is important to take into consideration that these talks, particularly over military cooperation, have a different pace in the case of Canada and Mexico.
4. The governments and their leaders must be capable of holding internal political processes during 2006 which will not interfere with the advances towards a greater trilateralization. The priority is to advance the political meaning of the Waco Declaration. As for the SPP initiatives, these will continue with or without this partnership. It is very difficult for political changes to affect the current cooperation dynamic.
5. One of the ways that a State can show its maturity and strength is through the willingness of cooperation. When States have decided to cooperate, it is due to the fact that they are capable of developing ideas and creating institutions that give them the stability and legitimacy to act within an international community.

As Barry Buzan points out, mature States are more likely to cooperate because they understand that their national security cannot be achieved and maintained under a unilateral scheme. It is necessary, therefore, that the North American countries transform their sovereignty concept from one of exercising such sovereignty.

Countries do not cooperate because they perceive that doing it represents a risk to their sovereignty, to their national security, to self-determination and to their national interests; especially when one of them perceives itself as asymmetric and its history has taught that the costs of asymmetry can be high. Nevertheless, it is essential to change this perception. We have to look to new ways of interaction; ones that will reposition roles and lead countries to a real partnership. Countries should deal with each other through the exercise of sovereignty rights, not due to pressures or weaknesses.

6. Security does not escape the transgovernmental phenomenon. Individuals and agencies are networking with their counterparts abroad, creating a dense web of relations. In these terms, integration is growing within individual sectors; at different levels and at different speeds.

This situation is reflected in the civil and military areas. In reference to civil areas, there have been significant advances; however, it is not the same case for the military. There are definitely some opportunities to cooperate, such as in the case of a natural disaster. In terms of security, the U.S. has a greater responsibility due to the fact that it is the principal motor that can impel, slow or stop cooperation.

7. One of the most important aspects that security faces is the costs that it represents. Canada is already considering a specific budget for security within the SPP. The United States is taking a look at that as well. This is good news that will contribute to the institutionalization of a partnership.

The case of Mexico is more complex. There is no such initiative, and even though a decision was made to pursue a budget, it is not clear who will manage it and how. Currently, *CISEN* is recognized as a reliable counterpart in security issues, yet it is important to consider whether that agency will control the security budget.

This is just one of the problems that stems from having multiple actors and undefined roles. When there is a problem, the official that is called to deal with it will try to solve it, but will likely not be the right official to handle the situation. It is very important to work on the definition of responsibilities and coordination.

8. The dual-bilateral inertia of North American relationships presents a difficulty. Even the SPP conceived in trilateral terms tends towards bilateralism. Most of the references are either to the relationship between Canada and The United States or the U.S. and Mexico; it is uncommon to hear a trilateral approach. Mexico and Canada have remained relatively distant from one another: when a Mexican or a Canadian talks about North America they think of the United States.¹³

Any attempt to promote greater integration of a North American community has to be linked or subordinated to how we perceive the bilateral relation with The United States. The weight and the dimension of that relationship are greater than the whole. In this regard, it is important to make the bilateral relationships work at aiming towards trilateralization.

In this sense, Mexico's next government has to:

- a) Balance the bilateral agenda. This means that in order to avoid being immigration-centered, Mexico should include in the dialogue other issues such as energy, health, education and even security. This does not imply that immigration will be excluded in any way, just balanced with other important issues.

- b) Restore the “special relationship.” This suggests that the U.S. and Mexico must recognize the fact that they are neighbors, trade partners and share common values, such as democracy, stability and prosperity, as has been recognized in the past.
9. Is not yet the time to know with certainty the advantages of a greater integration or trilateralization process in North America. Working on the bilateral level continues to be more attractive to the countries involved. In any negotiation towards integration, Mexico has to look for the best deal. We have to take in to consideration the asymmetry as well as the commercial and demographic links that tie Mexico with the United States.

Academia plays an essential role in determining the importance of trilateralization. First, it is important to define the gains for the countries from being part of a community; second, as a complementary task, academicians should find the way to publicize those benefits and improve their dialogue with the populations of the North American countries.

10. On the road towards a greater integration, these countries must administer spaces and areas, like the border, assuming conditions that allow them to satisfy their needs according to their objectives, in a way that is both convenient and preserves the sovereign rights of all. In this regard, Canada, Mexico and the United States must behave as good neighbors and avoid unilateral initiatives that will affect the relationship with a neighbor or the whole region.

The presidents and the prime minister will meet whenever it is necessary to evaluate the region’s status, and will review the common issues in which they will have to make joint decisions. To achieve this, one of the most important elements is that the leaders must show the political leadership that will allow them to accomplish it.

Along these lines, presidents George W. Bush and Vicente Fox will meet with the Canadian prime minister Stephen Harper, next March 31st, in Cancún Quintana, in order to further discuss trilateral issues.

Acknowledgments

Personal, telephone and e-mail interviews were conducted in Mexico City, Ottawa, Sonoma, California and Washington DC to the following politicians, diplomats, officials and academicians, who were so kind to share with me their time and their knowledge:

Canada

Nadine Busmann, Assistant Professor International Studies, University of Northern British Columbia

Graeme Clark, Director Mexico and North American Division *NAE*, Foreign Affairs Canada

Stephen Clarkson, Professor of Political Science and Researcher, University of Toronto

David Gollob, Vice President, Public Affairs, Canadian Newspaper Association

Athanasios Hristoulas, Professor, Department of International Studies, Instituto Tecnológico de México, *ITAM*

Barbara Martin, Director for Security and Defense Relations, Foreign Affairs Canada

Maria Teresa Segovia, Mexican Ambassador in Canada.

Coronel Francisco Terán, Military Attaché in the Mexican Embassy in Canada

United States

Walter Neal Anderson, Colonel, US Army, Director, Washington Office, Department of Defense

Cris Arcos, Director Office of International Affairs, Department of Homeland Security

John Bailey, Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Center for Latin American Studies, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University

Col John Cope, Senior Fellow Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University

Jaime Garcia Covarrubias, Professor of the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, National Defense University

Felix Hernandez, Political Military Officer Canadian Desk, Department of State

Thomas L. Holz, Senior Watch Officer, Information Assessment Infrastructure Protection, Department of Homeland Security

Roberta Jacobson, Director of the Mexican Desk, Department of State

William Kincade, Professor of US National Security Policy, American University

Mexico

Raúl Benítez Manaut, Research Senior Fellow, Centro de Investigaciones sobre América del Norte *CISAN*, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México *UNAM*

Jorge Castañeda, former Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores

Jorge Colín, Representative of Secretaría de Gobernación at the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC

Leonardo Curzio, Research Senior Fellow, Centro de Investigaciones sobre América del Norte *CISAN*, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México *UNAM*

Amalia Garcia, Governor of Zacatecas

Pedro Gurrola, General, Military Attaché at the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC

Carlos Heredia Zubieta, Foreign Affairs advisor to the Governor of Michoacán

Héctor Márquez, Representative of Secretaría de Economía at the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC

José Martín García, Representative of Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (SHCP) at the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC

Gustavo Mohar, Foreign Affairs Official from Centro de Investigación y Seguridad Nacional *CISEN*

Jorge Montaña, former Ambassador to the United States

Alberto Ortega, International Affairs Coordinator, Oficina para Políticas Públicas de la Presidencia de la República

José Luis Piñeyro, Research Professor, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana *UAM*

Carlos F. Quinto Guillén, Naval Attaché at the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC

Juan Rebolledo, former under Secretary for North American Affairs at the Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores

Enrique Rojo, Head of the Political Section at the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC

Andres Rozental, Ambassador and former under Secretary for North American Affairs at the Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores

Bernardo Sepúlveda, Judge of the International Court of Justice and former Ambassador to the United States

In addition to the personal interviews, I had the opportunity of participating in several forums, which took place in the last three months:

- ✓ ***Washington Diplomat Defense Seminar***, *Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, National Defense University*, Washington, DC. October 3 to 7, 2005;
- ✓ ***North American Forum, A Resilient North America: Security, Prosperity, and Quality of Life in a Global Perspective***, Sonoma, California. October 19 to 21 of the same year;
- ✓ ***Where are we going? Canada and Mexico Looking Beyond 2006***, organized by the *Canadian Foundation for the Americas FOCAL* in Ottawa, Canada on November 24, 2005, and
- ✓ ***The Mexico-US Partnership, Enhancing Our Common Security Workshop***, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Washington, DC, December 2, 2005.

Lastly, I would like to thank the support and advice received from the *Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores*; Gerónimo Gutiérrez, *Subsecretario para América del Norte*; the Mexican Embassy in Washington DC; Carlos de Icaza, Mexican Ambassador to the United States; CEMEX; Javier Treviño, Vice President of Image and Communication from CEMEX; American University; Louis Goodman, Dean of the School for International Services; Robert Pastor, Vice President of International Affairs and Head of the Center for North American Studies; Eduardo del Buey, Director of the Canadian Foundation for the Americas FOCAL; María de la Paz Celorio; Lucila Del Aguila; Mauricio Ibarra; Lorena Montes de Oca; Isidro Morales; Catalina Quintanilla; Laura Ramírez Rasgado; Juan Carlos Rodela; and David Stemper.

¹ SPP Seminar held by the *Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores* jointly with the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México* and the *Universidad de las Américas*, Puebla. Mexico City, November 17, 2005.

² It is enough to watch the results of the study carried out by Ekos' *Rethinking North America*, Summer 2005, to verify that the population of the three countries are not informed on *ASPAN*.

³ On November 28, 2005, the conservative, the new democrat and the Quebec parties voted in favor of carrying out elections next January 23, 2006. Canada has already begun its winter electoral campaign.

⁴ Last December 7 in Miami's international airport, for the first time an air marshal shot and killed a subject which said he had a bomb in his luggage. The subject was mentally ill. Accessed:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/08/national/08plane.html?ei=5070&en=6733e93b9799ba4e&ex=1134882000&adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1134743802-/eHAB6yjCofMRVBjBAW/cA>

⁵ In accordance with the survey “Two Voices: One issue” performed by the company *Ekos* in collaboration with the *American Enterprise Institute* on the public perception on threatens to security faced both by Canada and the United States. Among the main conclusions, security as a value occupies the same hierarchic level both for Canadians and Americans. In addition to the citizens of both countries approving the security strategies imposed by their governments, they preferred the strengthening thereof rather than a reduction of security. However, the Canadian concept of what represents a threat is larger, without being exclusively limited to terrorism. Source: Mexican Embassy in Canada, December 2, 2005.

⁶ Video sent to The Dallas Morning News showing the interrogation and execution of individuals involved in the drug cartels in Mexico, Consulted in http://www.dallasnews.com/s/dws/dn/opinion/editorials/stories/DN-video_06edi.ART.State.Edition1.e2f9226.html

⁷ *The Canada-US Partnership, Enhancing Our Common Security* Workshop, which took place in Washington, DC on March 14, 2005 by the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA) and the Canadian Embassy on the United States, sponsored by the Richard Lunsbery Foundation.

⁸ Recently, as evidence of its opening, the Mexican senate opened the possibility of discussing the draft of an American customs and migratory pre-recording in Mexican territory. A year ago it was unacceptable to contemplate such an issue in an agenda. At the same time in this session, the congress imposed special charges on fructose, imported beer and other goods in a protectionist spirit. On the other hand, the recent proposals of migratory legislation other than Mac Cain-Kennedy or Kyl- Cornyn as well as the Duncan Hunter, Tancredo and Sensenbrenner reflect a heartbreaking obstinacy both for a good relationship as well as for a more accelerated integration.

⁹ In this heading we should take into consideration that China is also taking the lead. Wal-Mart has pushed its suppliers to move from Mexico to China, for example in the case of Huffy bicycles in 2001. Consulted in

http://www.aflcio.org/corporatewatch/walmart/upload/report_ohio.pdf

¹⁰ Robert A. Pastor has worked in the subject *Narrowing the Development Gap: The Paramount Challenge for North America*, Council on Foreign Relations: November 30, 2005.

¹¹ Consulted in <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/16/AR2005121600250.html>

¹² *Eko's Rethinking North America Study*, summer 2005.

¹³ Poitras, Guy, *Inventing North America: Canada, Mexico and the United States*, (Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001) P. 41.