

**Attention Deficits: Why Politicians and Scholars Ignore
Defense Policy in Latin America**

David Pion-Berlin, University of California – Riverside

Harold Trinkunas, Naval Postgraduate School

Prepared for delivery at the 2006
Meeting of the Latin American Studies
Association, San Juan, Puerto Rico
March 15-18, 2006.

In an era of widespread democracy in Latin America, attention to civil-military relations and defense policy has become a low priority for both politicians and scholars of the region. Interest has faded with the retreat of militarism and the military in government. Unlike the public debate that national economic, education, or health care policies provoke in most Latin American countries, civil and political society are relatively silent on the issues of national defense. Why do civilian politicians show little interest in investing resources and expertise in defense institutions? Why has there been a parallel drop in scholarly attention as democracies consolidate in the region?

A survey of Latin America's past confirms that national defense policy has not been a high priority, even though the region has had a long history of troubled civil-military relations. Military coups have been a greater threat to democratic regimes in Latin America than foreign invasion, but coup prevention is not usually a sound basis for defense policy. It is also true that the expectation for interstate war among the countries of the region has reached an all time low even by the standards of a relatively conflict free continent. Given the unlikelihood of war, it seems odd that there has been little defense rationalization to free up resources or meet new roles and missions, even in countries with well established civilian control of the armed forces such as Argentina. While a number of countries have initiated defense white book projects, these have (with the exception of Chile) undergone a single iteration, and the glossy volumes produced by these projects have more value as coffee table books than defense planning guidance.

Latin American countries are dealing with emerging threats such as terrorism, organized crime, transnational gangs and drug trafficking that are in many cases overwhelming the capacity of the police to respond. The 2002 Pew Global Attitudes poll reports that Latin Americans consider terrorism and public safety 'a very big problem' in their countries, in significantly higher percentages than U.S. respondents even after the 9/11 attacks.¹ Given the negative experiences most of Latin America has with the use of the military in internal security roles, the reluctance of political leaders to involve the military is understandable, yet some threats are becoming so serious and so transnational that a role for the armed forces in supporting the police is inevitable. So why the lack of serious civilian attention to planning for such threats as part of a national security strategy?

We argue that there are historical, structural and rational reasons for why defense issues in Latin America are a low priority Latin American politicians and scholars of the region. The post-independence development paths of Latin American states deemphasized the role of the military in interstate conflict, and the results were small armies with low offensive capabilities. Very few countries experienced the existential threats from their neighbors that would have prompted civilian state leaders to pay attention to defense policy. Instead, the major threat to the power of civilian leaders was domestic insurrection and the coup d'état. Geography also blessed Latin America with a peripheral role in the major international conflicts of the past two centuries, which meant that conventional extra-continental threats were almost non-existent, again downgrading the importance of national defense to civilian political leaders. Even the United States in its role as a regional hegemon showed little interest in altering state boundaries or conquering new territories after the end of the 19th century. In fact, by the 1980s, it was rapidly becoming apparent that a zone of peace had emerged in South America that created an expectation that states would not use force to resolve their disputes. Instead,

international law and diplomacy have become the standard conflict-resolution mechanisms. Latin America spends the least on defense of any region of the world, purchases the fewest major weapons systems², and in many countries, the military burden (as a percentage of GDP) shrank in the wake of democratic transitions.³

Under these circumstances, the rational choice of politicians is to pay little attention to the national defense policy. There are almost no external threats, nor are they major economic or social constituencies in Latin American democracies that favor national defense issues. Defense contracting is not a big business as it is in the United States, and thus is not a major employer. Legislators and other politicians see no gain to be had in becoming defense savvy since they cannot deliver defense jobs to their districts in exchange for votes. Most scholars do not perceive Latin American militaries as worthy of serious study since they are peripheral to nearly all international conflicts in the last 100 years. Politicians and scholars then only consider the military important as a potential threat to regime stability. However, the importance of that problem has receded with democratic consolidation, and it can in any event be contained through coup avoidance mechanisms rather than by paying serious attention to defense policy-making and institution building.

HISTORICAL AND STRUCTURAL EXPLANATIONS FOR CIVILIAN INATTENTION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Latin America's civil-military relations have been profoundly affected by the continent's peripheral position in the international system. The paucity of existential threats to the Latin American state provided a development path that deemphasized the role of military power in state survival. Extracontinental powers never directly threatened state survival in the region. The regional hegemon, the United States, had little interest in acquiring additional territory in the region after the mid-19th century, and its relative power was rapidly becoming so overwhelming that no combination of self-help or alliances could form a realistic Latin American counterweight that would allow a balance of power. By the twentieth century, war among most Latin American states had been confined to border clashes, which might be instrumental for advancing foreign policy objectives and even have domestic implications, but did not lead to sustained civilian interest in national defense. In fact, international relations in South America have instead become characterized by legalism and diplomacy, leading some to theorize the region as a zone of peace. The absence of existential external security threats has meant that civilians and the armed forces focused on internal development and domestic politics. The result was that civilian politicians might have been occasionally interested in managing civil-military relations as a means to regime defense, but they were hardly ever interested in national defense policy or developing strategies for national security.

Path Dependency and the Historical Evolution of Latin America's Civil-Military Relations

Latin America's early post-independence history features considerable armed conflict, but the result was not the consolidation of professional military establishments or civilian interest in national defense. State boundaries were settled relatively early,

particularly once the ambitions of independence leaders to build large regional states, such as the Gran Colombia or the United Provinces of Central America, were dashed by separatist movements. There were a large number of militarized disputes, but these were fought by regional caudillos struggling to achieve national supremacy and in-fill the hollow administrative and legal shells left by Spanish colonial rule. Threats were internal and domestic and threatened the personal power of the caudillo, but they were rarely struggles for national survival. The state-building and army-building cycles hypothesized by Charles Tilly to explain European state formation never took hold in Latin America, or did so only incompletely.⁴

Nineteenth century South American did experience a small number of major interstate wars, but the outcomes of the wars did not produce a security dilemma or the militarization of regional states. The War of the Pacific (1879-1883), in which Chile was victorious over Peru and Bolivia, and the War of the Triple Alliance, in which Argentina and Brazil defeated Paraguay (1864-1870), instead produced more or less stable regional settlements that were not subsequently challenged by force of arms. In particular, Chile and Brazil emerged as territorially satisfied powers, and the most significant threat to regional stability, Paraguay, was nearly destroyed in the war of the Triple Alliance and never recovered. The combination of Chile and Brazil's power was sufficient to deter any serious challenges to altering the outcome of these conflicts. It is worth noting that even though Paraguay was thoroughly defeated, it survived as an independent state. As Dominguez observes, there are only six instances in which the territorial boundaries of states in Central and South America were significantly altered by force.⁵

European powers never succeeded in occupying the territory of Latin American states for very long, nor did they exhibit much interest in doing so, and Latin American states did not militarize to protect themselves from extra-continental threats as a result. The United Kingdom intervened relatively early in the post-independence period to secure the independence of Uruguay (1825) as a buffer state between Brazil and Argentina in the River Platte region. The French intervention in Mexico to set up the reign of Emperor Maximilian was encouraged by Mexico's conservatives who feared a liberal political victory under Benito Juarez, but it only lasted three years until 1867. In part, Latin American independence benefited from the relative quiescence of European imperialism between the end of the Napoleonic wars and the 1870s. During this period, the predominance of Great Britain in world affairs, which at the time preferred trade to conquest, tended to shield the region from intervention by other European powers. This does not mean that Latin American states were particularly sovereign, but the type of European intervention did not trigger a civilian interest in national defense, and with the exception of Mexico, a national mobilization to defend against such incursions.

Even the United States, which militarily intervened on numerous occasions in Latin America, did not pose an existential threat to the Latin American state, but rather to the power of its rulers. It is true that the Mexican-American war of 1848 let to major annexations of territory from Mexico. However, as Schoultz shows, there was considerable resistance in the United States to absorbing any territory that was culturally and demographically Hispanic. The territory annexed from the north of Mexico was seen by the U.S. elites as largely empty of people (and hence acceptable). Prior to the U.S. Civil War, private filibustering expeditions pursuing new acquisitions in Central America and Cuba were discouraged by the federal government, reflecting a consensus among

important segments of North and South that absorbing new territories that were culturally Hispanic would place an unacceptable burden on U.S. institutions. Similar sentiments led to the rejection of Dominican requests for annexation to the U.S. in 1869, and the non-annexation of Cuba and Puerto Rico after the Spanish American war. Even the intervention in Panama resulted in the lease of a 10 mile wide strip of territory and the creation of a new country, not the physical extinction of the Colombian state. This does not mean that the United States thought highly of Latin American capacity for self-governance, and it used political instability as an excuse to intervene repeatedly to replace regimes it disliked.⁶ However, much as was the case with 19th century European interventions, the result was not the development of Latin American military capabilities or alliances in an attempt to counterbalance the United States.

So what did Latin American militaries do if they did not participate in international wars? Latin American militaries of the nineteenth century were generally small, pre-professional and focused on internal disputes. In fact, it is difficult to characterize them as armies at all, since they were more likely to behave as armed political parties. The boundaries between the military and civilian politics were fluid, accession rules for the officer corps were almost non-existent, and professional education was largely absent. However, this did allow leading political figures to move back and forth between the civilian and military world, as Argentine presidents Sarmiento and Roca did during the war of the Triple Alliance and the Campaign of the Desert during the 1860s and 1870s. We can speculate that this might have provided the foundation for an elite tradition of interest and service in the armed forces. However, the subsequent professionalization of Latin America's militaries, largely conducted by foreign military missions, French and German in the main, broke this link. Officers were now a specialized body of educated professionals drawn from the aspiring lower and declining upper middle classes. The French and German military traditions shared a tradition of suspicion towards civilian authority and imbued militaries with a sense of national protagonism. Thus, the civilian and military worlds grew increasingly distant from one another as civilian politicians increasingly left defense affairs to the (military) specialists.⁷

By the early twentieth century, history, geography and the international system had placed Latin American states in a position where they did not face the existential threats that could have led to the forging of the type of civilian-military national defense complexes exhibited by even the smaller European powers of the times. Latin American armies were neither created nor called upon to serve in ways commensurate with West European armies. With few exceptions, Latin American rarely used offensive power to enlarge national territories at the expense of their neighbors. They were mainly involved in internal, internecine conflicts between caudillos, political party bosses and other power brokers--all within boundaries set by Spain and Portugal. Consequently, they did not have to grow to a size or achieve a readiness consonant with the tasks of state formation, and hence they do not inherit the critical legacies of the European armies. Strip away the myths armies have built about their indispensable roles in defense of "la Patria" and you are left with the fact that these institutions, with one or two exceptions, never succeeded at expanding the reach of states, or even consolidating the territories they had.⁸

Since their neighbors' armies posed such little threat to them compared to their own, it is no wonder that Latin America's civilian politicians abandoned an interest in

national defense and instead focused on regime defense. Civilian inattention to defense policy is a path-dependent phenomenon. Civilians do not believe their neighbors are a threat because history has shown that their neighbors rarely attack, so they pay little attention to defense policy and avoid funding strong militaries. The result is a relatively weak military establishment that poses little threat to their neighbors, reinforcing the civilian belief system. It would be very hard to reverse this path and start over to achieve militaries with strong offensive capabilities because the whole state infrastructure to support such an establishment (conscription, taxation, arms industries, logistics, mobilization plans) was underdeveloped due to the relatively benign threat environment. Even if Latin American civilian politicians had wanted a strong military by the 20th century, their states were, barring one or two exceptions, in no condition to support such an expensive adventure.

Structural Explanations for Civilian ADD

Latin America's peripheral position in the international system means that the states in the region are rarely subject to the security dilemmas, existential threats, or arms races more typical of other regions of the world. In the absence of actual or potential military threats, realists and neorealist theorists of international relations would concede that civilian inattention to defense policy is understandable. The fact that South America escaped essentially untouched by the fighting in both major world conflicts (1914-1918 and 1939-1945) of the period confirms just how peripheral the region is within the structure of the international system. This has also translated into a paucity of conventional external threats for Latin American states emanating from outside the continent. The geography of the continent and the limited offensive capabilities of the states in the region meant that most politicians did not conceive of their neighbors as threats, and balance of power behavior was limited, even among the more powerful states in the Southern Cone. U.S. hegemony also discouraged the pursuit of offensive military capabilities among states in the region. In addition to realist arguments, liberal and constructivist theorists of international relations would also point to democratization in the 1980s as reinforcing a trend towards regional peace. In fact, some liberal theorists have suggested that South America has become a de facto zone of peace and may be the locus of an emerging pluralistic security community. In essence, both liberal and realist theorists of international relations would probably agree that it would be logically difficult to mobilize public or political interest in national defense or justify large military establishments.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the gross characteristics of national boundaries were well established. The only major wars that occurred during the 20th century that resulted in territorial boundary changes were the Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay and the Peru-Ecuador conflict in 1941 which led to Ecuador's loss of its Amazonian territories. It is worth noting that both the Chaco and the Ecuadorian Amazon are peripheral, thinly populated and poor territories for the countries involved, so their loss had minimal effects on the material wealth of the elites or the voters, although they loom large in national histories. Even the Central American conflicts of the 1980s, which did lead to substantial militarization of society and drew the attention of civilian elites to defense affairs, were focused on the threat of internal subversion rather than cross-border

attack. For both El Salvador and Nicaraguan ruling elites, the FMLN and the Contras were a much greater threat to the state than each others armed forces.⁹

The United States policy has indirectly reinforced the trend away from interstate conflict by encouraging a focus on internal defense for Latin American militaries, rather than by directly intervening to resolve the conflicts that did occur. Contemporary international relations theory has occasionally referred to the U.S. role in Latin America as a classic example of hegemonic management, with the United States intervening to prevent war in the region. But we concur with Mares (2001) and Dominguez (2005) that U.S. hegemony has had little influence on interstate conflict per se. In fact, some would point to the Central American conflicts of the 1980s as an example of hegemonic 'mismanagement' that provoked greater conflict. Instead, we argue that the United States has influenced the nature of the militaries in the region in a way that deemphasizes conventional offensive capabilities. As early as World War II, the explicit policy of the United States was to assume the mantle of defending the Americas against extracontinental conventional military threats, and supporting and training Latin American armed forces to counter domestic subversion. The United States contributed to this trend as a major purveyor of military assistance and training to the region, through which it emphasized an internal orientation, provided counterinsurgency equipment and training and discouraged the purchase of advanced war fighting platforms by Latin American states. Latin American states began to diversify their acquisitions to European and Asian suppliers by the 1970s, but this still means that U.S. influence favoring a domestic orientation influenced two generations of military officers and discouraged the development of offensive military capabilities.¹⁰

The internal orientation of Latin American defense establishments was reflected in decisions about defense budgets, military training, and acquisitions. It meant that many Latin American militaries never developed the capabilities to engage in sustained offensive operations. The shortcomings of a relatively well-equipped Latin American military, such as Argentina's, in the face of combat against a capable European adversary is highlighted by the outcome of the Malvinas conflict.¹¹ This reinforced negative civilian perceptions about the usefulness of their military establishments, reduced the likelihood of armed conflict between neighboring states, and contributed to the lack of civilian political interest in defense policy. It also meant that Latin American militaries were often more dangerous to the regime in power in their own country than that of their neighbors, which produced civilian fear and suspicion of the military, and was most likely not conducive to developing civilian political interest in defense policy.¹²

Although disputed by scholars such as Mares (2001), democratization across the region during the 1980s and 1990s has contributed to a reduction in the resort to the use of force among Latin American states. In essence, the relative absence of war in Latin America would seem to support the often debated 'democratic peace' hypothesis set forth by liberal theorists of international relations. In the Southern Cone, democratizers in Argentina sought to demilitarize and eliminate conflicts with their neighbors to undermine the rationale for the existence of a large (and politically active) military. They had greater success initially convincing Brazil than Chile, but by the end of the 1990s, Argentina had successfully resolved all of its major border disputes. They also sought greater regional integration through the MERCOSUR treaty framework, and Pion-Berlin has documented how economic integration in the Southern Cone has reinforced an

expectation of peaceful interstate dispute resolution.¹³ The Contadora process in Central America, crafted by and pressed forward by civilian politicians in Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and the Southern Cone during the 1980s, also hinged on an expectation that democratization would produce a more peaceful subregion. Whether or not this logic was correct, it certainly appeared to be so for the civilian leaders of these major regional powers.¹⁴

This sustained peace has not meant that there has been no attention paid to regional security, but rather it has promoted diplomatic and legal (i.e. civilian) institutional innovations. Dominguez documents contributions to international law that originate in inter-American diplomacy, the most important of which is *uti possidetis juri*, which established that a modern states boundaries should match those of their colonial predecessor and favors the territorial integrity of states. He also points to the role of the OAS in managing interstate disputes and organizing peacekeeping mechanisms.¹⁵ Arie Kacowicz goes further and argues that South America has developed a 'zone of peace' in which states no longer expect to go to war with each other. Certainly, the Southern Cone has come the furthest towards developing a pluralistic security community whose members no longer have an expectation that force will be used in their interstate relations. The concept of zone of peace has even been enshrined in certain limited forms by regional treaties, such as the 1967 Treaty of Tlatelolco establishing Latin America as a nuclear-weapons free zone.¹⁶ Mares has disagreed with the concept of 'zones of peace' as a description of the international relations of Latin America, pointing out that states still make the choice to militarize interstate disputes.¹⁷ However, even the conflicts he identifies are small in scale and have not sparked significant civilian interest in defense policy beyond a brief 'rally around the flag' effect during the period of the conflict itself.

Civilian Defense Attention Deficits as a Result of Path Dependency

History and structure have reinforced civilian tendencies to ignore national defense policy. The peripheral status of Latin America as a continent and the policies of the hegemonic powers that dominated 19th and 20th century international relations greatly reduced the likelihood of existential threats to state survival in Latin America. The relative absence of even interstate threats within Latin America and the stability of territorial boundaries have afforded national elites the luxury of ignoring defense policy. The professionalization of Latin American militaries in the late nineteenth and twentieth century concentrated knowledge and expertise in an institution that is ipso facto not well connected to the civilian political and economic elites. The inward focus of civilian and military elites brought about a competition for national leadership and established (for both sides) that the main threats to retaining and exercising power lay in the domestic sphere (coups and revolutions) rather than the international. Both liberal and realist theories of international relations would predict that Latin America is an unlikely candidate for arms races, balance of power behavior or acute security dilemmas. Without such a stimulus for the development of offensive capabilities, it makes sense that civilian elites preferred diplomacy and international law as solutions to interstate disputes, reinforcing the prolonged peace in the region. The overall effect of history and structure is to produce a path by which civilian elites have consistently turned away from developing an interest in national defense as an important field of public policy.

RATIONAL CHOICE AS A SOURCE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE ATTENTION DEFICITS

In addition to history and international relations, the contemporary Latin American politicians' attention deficit on defense issues is a rational choice, driven by their constituents' interests and priorities. Of course, no one familiar with the region would suggest that the political class of Latin America earn high marks for attentiveness to citizen demands; far from it. Representation or lack thereof remains a serious problem. Nonetheless, if they are to survive, governments must demonstrate *some* ability to deliver essential goods (services) to the public and respond to its most pressing needs. Defense is an essential public good in most states, but is not perceived by the public in Latin America as a pressing national priority. Unlike other public goods, Latin American states rarely 'consume' national defense. Not a week goes by when the average Latin American citizen does not rely on the power, transportation, communication, sewage, health and school systems. But defense lies in waiting; it is almost never used, and seldom visible. If it is in a state of disrepair (as the roads, phones, electrical grids, and trains invariably are) citizens do not mind since it does not directly affect their daily lives.

Consider the following thought experiment. Let us say the Chilean military, unannounced suspend all their territorial defense functions for a week: no border, sea or air patrols, no training, all officers and enlisted personnel return to their homes. What would occur? In all likelihood, nothing would happen. The public would carry on as usual. None of Chile's neighbors would seize on its vulnerability and launch an invasion because relations between these states are generally stable and friendly, and even if they were not, neighboring states lack serious offensive capabilities. There are no insurrectionary forces that would suddenly emerge to threaten the state or society from within. Now compare this to the reaction if the electrical power and water supplies to be cut off to all major cities for a week. We could imagine the response of an alarmed, frantic and angry public: it would quickly identify the culpable government officials, and hold them accountable for the disaster. Defense in this part of the world at least, is a very different kind of public good from electricity, water or roads. Politicians can earn political capital by filling potholes or building new highways. They cannot earn capital by funding yet another year of defense for a country that has no enemies and faces no imminent threats.

Defense could become a pressing priority were military-related threats to national security more common, visible and imminent, and where the need to deploy military force more apparent. There are to be sure, various threats to security (narcotrafficking, terrorism, contraband, other criminal activity, and illegal migration) but these do not by and large compel wholesale military responses. In this not so "new" security environment, police, internal security forces, immigration authorities, and intelligence services are at the front line. Militaries occupy rearguard positions, waiting for the occasional call to assist the other forces. Even when they do engage, they do so in a limited way, whether it be logistical support, aerial surveillance, or conducting anti-crime sweeps through a favela controlled by drug traffickers. These are not the kind of

missions that fully test the capabilities of the military institution or provide a rationale for expanding defense spending. For that reason, politicians cannot persuasively sell anti-crime or counternarcotic efforts as defense-related missions.

Of course, even in the absence of threat, defense could still be relevant were it to provide important *private* goods to its citizens. In the U.S., that good is employment. Millions of North Americans-- in many cases whole communities--depend on defense expenditures for their livelihoods. Military bases and munitions plants that employ civilians are found in almost every state. They give legislators, governors and the president the motivation to care and know about national security, military procurement, the defense budget (and its enlargement), and they know that sustained attention to these issues will be rewarded by the votes of communities dependent on defense spending. Key legislators and their highly trained staff sit on the House Armed Services Committee and its Senate counterpart where they wield considerable clout. By contrast, in Latin America, military installations and defense contractors provide very few civilian jobs; defense is not a huge pork-barreling opportunity.¹⁸ Thus, few lawmakers stand to gain by diverting expenditures from other national priorities, such as health and education, or becoming more informed about defense.

To get a sense of the comparison between defense employment as a private good in the United States and Latin America, we provide some statistics in the tables below for a few countries from the region. Data is extremely hard to come by on civilian employment in the defense sector in Latin America. Fortunately, we have found some comparable figures for Argentina and the U.S. on governmental civilian employment in defense for 2005, as shown below. This first set of data covers civilian jobs in the army, navy and air force, on military bases, installations, and in schools, hospitals and defense-related government agencies. They exclude employment in private sector defense industries. The data are shown in absolute terms and as a percent of the economically active population. We should keep one caveat in mind: the Argentine data represents figures for the beginning of fiscal year budget defense jobs. Thus, there may have been some unaccounted for changes during the execution of the budget. Be that as it may, and as can be shown in Tables 1 and 2, U.S. employment in the public sphere is twenty four times that in Argentina in absolute terms. Once adjusted for the employable population of each country, the U.S. governmental defense employment is equal to two and a half times that of Argentina.

Tables 1 and 2 About Here

This is certainly a sizeable difference, but at the same time grossly understates the real magnitude of the difference between the two countries by omitting private sector employment in arms production. Table 3 makes that comparison. Since Argentina down-sized and privatized its sprawling defense conglomerate called Fabricaciones Militares during the 1980s and 90s, arms production has been largely in the hands of non-military owned enterprises. Of course in the United States, arms production is big business for the private sector. Munitions production generally occurs as a result of contracting between the Pentagon and private firms. Thus we can safely assume that the figures in Table 3 represent employment in the private, not public sphere. As shown,

the U.S. employs almost 58 times as many citizens in the defense industry as does Argentina. If we then combine government and private sector data for the two countries, as we do in Table 4, we see that overall civilian defense employment in the U.S., as a proportion of the EAP, is 1,100 percent greater than in Argentina. Certainly such a comparison does not allow us to make any easy generalizations about the Latin American region as a whole. However, since Argentina has historically had one of the larger military industrial complexes, rivaled only by Brazil, then the differences with the U.S. will presumably be even greater elsewhere.

Tables 3 and 4 About Here

In fact, there is also some arms production employment data on four other Latin American countries: Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Peru, as shown in Table 5. Brazil is of particular importance, since this nation has historically had the largest defense industry in Latin America. Yet the tables reveal that once adjusted for the size differentials of the work forces, arms production employment in Brazil, along with the other three countries is completely dwarfed by the United States. One final metric is worth noting. Of the one hundred largest arms producing companies in the world--measured by annual sales--forty four are headquartered in the United States. The rest are found mainly in France, Germany, UK, other European countries, Russia, South Korea, Japan and Israel. Not one of the top 100 firms is located in Latin America.¹⁹

Table 5 About Here

There are simply not enough civilians involved in defense related activities in Latin America to constitute an electoral payoff for politicians: not on bases, not in ministries, not in the military academies, nor in munitions factories. It is hard for political figures to prioritize defense in the face of relatively low security threats when they preside over defense budgets that do not translate into significant employment opportunities for the civilian population, and into a potential pool of grateful voters. And those few who have defense jobs constitute such a small fraction of the voting public that they are in no position to adequately reward political leaders for attention to defense issues. For example, civilians in the public and private defense sector in Argentina constitute just one tenth of a percent of all registered voters. That same constituency is *thirty times* greater in the U.S., equal to three percent of registered voters. If we turn back to Table 5 for a moment, and consider what fraction of registered voters are represented by those in the arms production industries for the four countries listed, then the figures are as follows: Brazil--one hundredth of a percent; Chile 6 hundredths of a percent; Mexico, nine thousandths of a percent; and Peru, two hundredths of a percent.

If politicians see no pork barreling or vote-attracting opportunities in defense, they could still theoretically be interested in defense spending for macroeconomic reasons. That is, they could associate greater defense spending with overall improvements in the national economy, and thus be stimulated to learn more about it as

matter of policy proficiency. However, the prevailing view --one confirmed by numerous studies--is that military spending is a drag on economic growth. In a statistical study of 18 Latin American countries, Kirk Bowman finds that increases in both military spending and military size result in significant declines in economic growth, even when controlling for democracy, school enrollments, government consumption, political instability, and investment.²⁰ The International Monetary Fund considers spending on the military to be unproductive, and has counseled LDC's to redirect funds away from defense and toward health and education in order to balance the budget while targeting spending along economically beneficial avenues.²¹ Conversely, the Fund has published a number of studies arguing that cuts in military spending will result in improved economic output, and in the long run, greater investment rates and overall economic welfare.²²

The IMF reports have given greater momentum to a military downsizing trend that was already well underway in Latin America. For economic and political reasons many Latin American states were, by the mid 1980's, making significant cuts in the size of military forces and budgets. It is important to note that defense expertise did not factor into politicians' decisions to downsize their militaries. Military programs, training and installations have been eliminated and personnel payrolls trimmed based on macroeconomic criteria, pressures from international lenders, and the political priorities of diverting resources to other areas. Such cuts were not made with defense-related needs in mind. Top policymakers demanded these cuts without asking what budget curtailments would mean for military strategy, force readiness, deployment, training, education, etc. They did not appointed civilian defense specialists to oversee the implementation of these cuts, but rather directed the military to operate within an ever shrinking budget cap. Rather than allocate resources based on a national security strategy, defense priorities were set (and scaled back) based on budgetary resources, which were in turn guided by overarching political priorities. Civilians set their own national priorities, assigned the military to the end of the queue, and then exerted the political will necessary to keep them there. This requires little defense expertise.

By the end of the twentieth century, the armed forces of most countries of the region had shrunk dramatically in size. This fact figures into the electoral calculations in certain Latin American countries that have granted active duty soldiers the right to vote. Politicians wishing to curry favor with voting soldiers would have, in theory, an interest in becoming more defense savvy. Unfortunately however, defense wisdom could produce, at best, a negligible electoral return because of the diminished size of nearly all Latin American militaries in comparison to the population of registered voters. As shown below in Table 6, there are ten countries in the region with voting soldiers. On average, these active duty soldiers constitute less than seven tenths of one percent of all registered voters.²³ Naturally for the other half of Latin America that prohibits balloting for military personnel, the electoral advantage disappears entirely.

Table 6 about Here

The bottom line is that civilian defense workers and soldiers comprise an insignificant fraction of the overall work force and voting public in Latin America.

Politicians have no incentive to “get up to speed” on defense issues or deliberate on defense policy, either in pursuit of narrow self interests or broader national policy goals. Political parties in Latin America rarely include defense issues in their platform statements, and do not make defense an issue either in the campaigns or thereafter.²⁴

Not surprisingly, the defense attention deficit is quite pronounced within the legislative branches in Latin America.²⁵ Legislative defense commissions--where they exist--are poorly equipped to wield authority and oversight. Congressional members of these commissions seldom stay long. They shuffle in and out and thus do not gain the necessary experience and expertise. Their inattentiveness is both a cause and a consequence of committee weakness. Certainly if legislators were to serve for longer periods of time, they would accumulate more defense knowledge which in turn might strengthen the committee's work. But the defense commissions have a restricted mandate which proves unattractive for legislators looking for institutionalized power. Based on data provided by Red de Seguridad y Defensa de América Latina (RESDAL 2004), a review of defense committee work for 13 countries in recent years shows that they most often deal with the following issues: granting permission for deployment of national troops abroad, and for the entrance of foreign troops into national territory, promotion and retirement rules, pensions and social security benefits for officers and families; judicial matters, including military court jurisdictions, and finally decorative/symbolic acts, including the conferring of medals and honors. These functions correspond very closely to what the national constitutions stipulate for the legislative branch in general. In other words, defense commissions have not carved out their own more detailed and unique defense agendas.

It is instructive to reflect on what these commissions are *not* doing on a regular basis. They are not reviewing the defense portion of the budgets, and for good reason; they have no access to them. Congressmen are not privy to the itemized details of the defense ledger. In most Latin American societies, national security trumps the right of Congress to review, analyze, let alone change defense allocations. Neither the defense commissions nor the budget and finance commissions are empowered to reopen, examine and rewrite the defense budget. There is no item by item review, no markup and thus no real capacity to assign or reassign resources. In essence, legislative committees have very little power compared to other committees within their very same legislatures, and certainly much less than that found in developed countries.

This then impairs the committees' ability to carry out another vital function: oversight. Defense commissions are not exerting informed oversight on defense operations, other than, as stated before, to decide on domestic and foreign troop exits and entrances, and occasionally weigh in on defense production and procurement as well as military judicial matters. Without the necessary expenditure information, the congress cannot take the military to task for misallocations, wasteful spending or fraud. The commissions have no auditors at their disposal to pore over military accounts. The commissions can at best, call the defense minister to testify. If there is any effort--however limited--to exert budgetary oversight, it appears to be exercised within the finance ministry, or more usually, the armed services themselves.

If the internal politics of Latin American states fail to provide a rationale for politicians to understand defense issues, then what of regional influences? Here too we find little in the way of rational incentives. There is no parallel to NATO in Latin

America.²⁶ The democratic governments of the new NATO members from Eastern and Central Europe had three strong incentives to overhaul their defense systems to bring them up to speed and make them interoperable with the more advanced NATO members. First, NATO entrance translated into automatic security guarantees. Second, the voting publics of these states were, for the most part, strongly supportive of NATO accession. And third, the NATO organization gave them favorable terms when it came to cost-sharing for common alliance expenses, in effect subsidizing their participation while allowing them to reap the rewards.

The United States has never shown interest in creating a hemispheric alliance similar to NATO that would integrate, *give parity to*, and help finance, Latin American forces to meet conventional defense threats. As mentioned earlier, the U.S. arrogated the mission of guarding the hemisphere from external threats during the Cold War while relegating its southern partners to more less tasking domestic security functions. In the post Cold War global war on terror, the U.S. once again sees itself as taking the lead, imploring the Latin American states to perform supporting roles. Even if Latin American states would tolerate being the lesser partners in such an arrangement, where are the material incentives to do so? Washington has focused most of its military assistance on Colombia, leaving very little for the rest of the continent. To the contrary, the U.S. has recently withheld military assistance (including IMET) from several Latin American states as punishment for failing to sign Article 98 agreements that would provide U.S. soldiers with immunity from potential human rights prosecutions by the International Criminal Court. Where else would funding originate from? It would not come from the Organization of American States, which has yet to agree on a formula to create its own regional security force that would bear some resemblance to NATO, even if it could find the resources to support such a project.

The fact is, there are no internal or external, material or rational incentives to motivate civilians to institutionalize their oversight of defense or to spearhead the reform and modernization of defense forces. For that reason, when and if reform and modernization are ever realized, they will not come at the behest of civilian leadership.

DEFENSE ATTENTION DEFICITS AMONG SCHOLARS

North American scholars pay scant attention to Latin American civil-military issues in general and defense policy in particular. If it is rational for Latin American politicians to ignore defense because they have no incentives to pay attention to it does this logically imply that academics would be equally uninspired to study the topic?

First, let us assess the magnitude of the civil-military and defense attention deficit among the scholarly community. Table 7 displays the results of a content analysis of article titles in the three leading Latin American area studies journals: Latin American Research Review, Latin American Politics and Society (formerly Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs), and Journal of Latin American Studies. All research articles, commentaries and debates were included for all volumes and issues between 1976-2005. We were charitable--perhaps too charitable-- in our definition of "military-related," and thus probably overstate the contribution of writings on the military to these journals. Included here were any articles that mentioned (besides the military or armed forces, defense or security) war, interstate conflict, armed conflict, and

authoritarianism, despotism and dictatorship. We were careful to include only those articles that referenced *military* authoritarian regimes. Nonetheless, even here, there were probably some articles about authoritarianism which had little to do with the military institution per se, let alone defense and security themes, and more to do with economic and social policies, technocrats, or culture. Secondly, articles on the drug war were ostensibly much more about U.S., Peruvian and Colombian government policies to stem the cultivation of coca, processing into cocaine, and its transshipment north, and less about the military components to that war.

Be that as it may, the results display a tremendous dearth of articles on the subject of the military and defense policy, and a general downward trend beginning in the middle to late 1980's. Whereas approximately 9 percent of all articles were on military themes from 1976-1985, only 5 percent of all articles have been devoted to this theme in the last decade. And if we were to have restricted the 30 year search to just those articles with defense in the title, there would be fewer than half a dozen in all, a small fraction of one percent.

Disinterest in the topic is widespread, though greater among North American than Latin American scholars.²⁷ Why the disinterest in the topic? In large measure, scholars have been greatly influenced by the U.S. role in the hemisphere which for many decades and especially during the Cold War, relegated our Southern neighbors to a peripheral, dependent role in hemispheric defense (see above). U.S. defense and security scholars have, in overwhelming proportions, focused their attention on major powers and few regional powers (Israel, South and North Korea) in regions of the world where threats loom large, where military force has been used more frequently in the past, or where geopolitical and economic interests vital to Washington may be at stake. Latin America just does not have that level of significance for the security community in the United States.

Ironically, we might expect more attention to the theme now in the post-Cold War era, because the decline in U.S. interest in and military aid to the region has opened up space for Latin American states to define their own defense roles. That is to say, states of this region are acting less as minor partners in hemispheric defense and more as autonomous actors free to carve out their own defense and security niches. This has already resulted in extensive efforts among the Southern Cone states to increase contacts, exchanges and confidence building measures between their militaries, and the creation of autonomous, regional security institutions in Central America, such as the civilian Central American Security Commission (CSC) and a military run Conference of Central American Armed Forces (CFAC).²⁸ Unfortunately, this reality has not caught up with scholars, who rarely address the topic.

Even the issue of democratic civilian control, which plausibly would provoke greater enthusiasm among U.S. scholars, has elicited far fewer contributions than one would imagine. As it has been commonly defined, civilian control exists when a coherent group of civilian politicians and experts are able to set the priorities and direction for national defense through well-developed institutional channels.²⁹ In fact nearly all definitions, including Huntington's, reference institutional strength, defense expertise, and defense agenda control by civilians. However, if defense is not a priority in Latin America, then neither is there a need to understand how to achieve or articulate civilian control. Scholars do not take seriously the notion that L.A. armies are important

providers of defense and security, and thus do not consider the achievement of civilian control to have quite the same “gravitas” it might have for advanced Western states.

In Latin America, civilian control understood mostly in negative terms--how to curtail military power, avoid coups and reduce military intervention. Scholarly interest in civil-military relations, which was never pronounced to begin with, has waned even further over the last two decades as the coup threat recedes in the face of democratic consolidation. Coups and coup attempts do occur but they are few and far between. Since the return to democratic rule, there have been only six military coups or coup attempts in four countries: Haiti, Venezuela, Paraguay, and Ecuador. Only in Ecuador and Haiti did the coups succeed, and only in Haiti did the coup plotters actually remain in power. As discussed before, regional changes have raised the costs to military intervention to unprecedented heights, and have generally dissuaded coup plotters from even trying. In those few cases where coups were actually carried out, the *de facto* governments that came to power lasted less than 48 hours, succumbing to enormous internal and external pressures.³⁰ This raises an important point: if coups are increasingly scarce, scholars conclude it is because civilian politicians have succeeded in avoiding their forcible expulsion from power—by what ever means necessary—and hence there is little need to probe further into the whys and wherefores of civil-military relations. Civilian control has not been conceived as a long term institution-building exercise designed to better manage defense forces, but rather as a series of short -term, stop-gap measures designed to forestall military takeovers.

Even in the absence of coups, there are always political dimensions to civil-military relation worth studying. The problem is that the civil-military story is often one about “the dog that didn’t bark.” Since democratic consolidation has occurred, it is a story about relatively peaceful, cloistered relations within bureaucratic state institutions--not conflict-ridden relations aired in public which threaten stability. Few active duty officers speak up against official government policy anymore, since those who do are reprimanded or cashiered. Democratic governments have hired ministers of defense who can politically manage military affairs- not defense policy. They know little about defense but quite a bit about how to keep the military out of the limelight. They smooth over the rough edges, put out small brush fires, calm jittery nerves, make pledges of support, reinterpret political messages in a positive light, all within the corridors of power rather than the public limelight. They have succeeded at channeling and routinizing military pressures. The military has a voice, but it is one heard inside defense and democratic institutions. Military officers can be seen in the defense ministries and in the congressional liaison offices. They are there to press their case for greater funding, salaries and pensions, what limited acquisitions can be accommodated within constrained national budgets. These appeals are part and parcel of normal democratic politics. This is good news for civilian control, but not front page news. It does not make for much political drama, and thus does not grab the attention of scholars.

The obsession with studying democracy persists in scholarly circles. Most concur that civilian control of the military is an essential component to any definition of a consolidated democracy, but rarely delve beyond this. After giving lip service to definitions, scholars plunge into other topics of greater interest to them: political parties, electoral systems, presidentialist vs. parliamentary systems, executive-legislative relations, judicial reform and the rule of law, decentralization, and so many more. It is

unlikely this blind spot for defense issues will change any time soon so long as Latin American militaries stay in the barracks, away from the presidential palace, and do not threaten their neighbors.

CONCLUSION

Defense policy has not been and is not a priority item, either among Latin American politicians or scholars of the region. These states and their leaders do not face existential threats from foreign invasion, and the militarized disputes they do enter into are not serious enough to trigger genuine civilian interest in defense. Over the course of a century or more, militaries have turned inward to engage in politicized, internecine conflicts and conspiratorial plots against elected governments. These moves prompt civilian attention to coup avoidance, not war avoidance. Moreover, politicians have no incentive to become defense savvy in a region where defense establishments and their supporting industries provide few employment opportunities for constituents. Scholars have no incentive to treat defense as a serious topic of inquiry in a region where there is a disconnect between civilian containment of politicized armies and civilian management of defense forces.

Should these conditions remain unaltered, it is unlikely civilian politicians will “discover” defense planning as a worthy policy goal any time soon. And if that is true, then they will also fail to invest resources and personnel into the development of stronger institutions of civilian control. As Thomas Bruneau has pointed out, getting the military to do what they are supposed to do within a democracy goes beyond mere subordination. Politicians must also concern themselves with military efficacy and efficiency. They must insure that militaries fulfill their internal and external roles and missions in a cost-effective manner.³¹ This demands oversight, management, organization, and strategic planning--in short civilian expertise. It is essential, argues Bruneau, that defense-related, civilian-led institutions be fortified to embed that expertise so that the tri-fold goals of civilian control, efficacy and efficiency are achieved routinely and in perpetuity.³² The quandary however is that Latin American politicians are not and will not become motivated to achieve these ends because they do not make the connection between the political control of the military on the one hand and the pursuit of effective and efficient defense policy on the other hand. Simply subordinating the military is important, but it is a low cost venture that can be pursued via strategies of containment, according to Trinkunas.³³ These measures weaken the military as a political actor, but can do so with minimal resources, staff, and bureaucracy. Long term defense and security planning, however, cannot be “bought on the cheap.”

What might cause this situation to change? New and troubling security threats would have to materialize. One scenario might revolve around the emerging ideological divide on the continent. This could conceivably leading neighboring states to perceive each other as threats and prepare accordingly. The rise of radical left presidents in Venezuela and Bolivia could exacerbate age-old border disputes with the more conservative governments of Colombia and Chile, prompting greater attention to defense preparedness. Another scenario that might unfold would have the United States fully recognize that Latin American states can perform subsidiary roles as international security providers and peacekeepers. This has already taken place to some extent with the introduction of Salvadoran troops into Iraq, and the use of Brazilian, Argentinean and

Chilean troops as peacekeepers in Haiti. To date however, these remain relatively small scale ventures which have not demanded large troop commitments from Latin America or resource commitments from the United States.

There is a third and final possibility. It is one where the militaries of the region move from the rearguard to center stage in combating drug traffickers, transnational gangs and terrorists. The justification for this kind of mission creep has been mounting in regional defense forums, where broader visions of the security threats and national security are gaining currency. Latin American defense ministers have begun to take up the view that if security is a multidimensional problem, it demands a multi-faceted response. That necessitates more fluid coordination between various security and non-security-related agencies of state, and in turn, a relaxing of restrictions on the use of the military to permit that coordination to take place. If it becomes easier to move the military to the front lines of these “wars” against new enemies of state, then the concept of defense may shift as well. If defense of the nation signifies a full scale military response to unconventional threats of the sort mentioned, then politicians and scholars alike may yet overcome their defense attention deficits.³⁴

Table 1. Argentine Civilian Employment in Government Defense Sector, 2005 (Budgeted)			
Defense Sector	Civilian Personnel. Permanent	Civilian Personnel Temporary	Total Civilian Personnel
Army	6160	525	6685
Navy	7022	64	7086
Air Force	11379	918	12297
Jt. Staff	120	11	131
Defense Ministry	999		999
Totals	25680	1518	27198
Economically Active Population (2001)	15,264,783		
Civilian Defense Employment as % of EAP	.178		
Source: Republica Argentina, Secretaria de Hacienda, Presupuesto para 2005, Jurisdicción 45, Ministerio de Defensa, www.mecon.gov.ar			

Table 2. U.S. Civilian Employment in Government Defense Sector, FY 2005			
Defense Sector	Civilian Personnel Permanent	Civilian Personnel Temp/Intermittent	Total Civilian Personnel
Army	217197	2676	219873
Navy	174944	1651	176595
Air Force	156508	2337	158845
Other Defense Orgs.	83518	13734	97252
Totals	632167	20398	652565
Economically Active Population (2003)	146,510,000		
Total Civilian Defense Employment as % of EAP	.445		
Source: U.S. Department of Defense, Civilian Personnel Reports, http://www.dior.whs.mil/mm/civilian/fy2006/december2005/december2005.htm			

Table 3. Private Sector Arms Production Employment: Argentina and U.S., 2003			
Country	Arms Production Employment	Economically Active Population	Arms Prod. Employment as % of EAP
Argentina	5,000	15,264,783	.032
U.S.	2,700,000	146,510,000	1.84
U.S. private sector civilian defense employment, as a % of EAP, is 57.5 times that of Argentina			
Source: SIPRI database, "Arms Forces, Weapons Holdings and Employment in Arms Production," http://first.sipri.org/ ; EAP data from the International Labor Organization, Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 2004.			

Table 4. Government and Private Employment in Defense, Argentina and the U.S., 2003, 2005			
	Defense Employment	EAP	Defense Employment as a % of EAP
Argentina	32,198	15,264,783	.21
U.S.	3,352,565	146,510,000	2.28
U.S. government and private sector defense employment, as a % of EAP, is eleven times that of Argentina			
Sources: See Tables above.			

Table 5. Arms Production Employment: A Five Nation Comparison, 2003.				
Country	Arms Production Employment (2003)	EAP	Employment as % of EAP	How many times larger is the U.S. as arms employer?
USA	2,700,000	146,510,000	1.84	
Brazil	15,000	83,243,239 (2001)	.018	102
Chile	5,000	6,357,620 (2004)	.078	24
Mexico	5,000	43,398,755 (2004)	.011	167
Peru	3,000	3,747,307 (2003)	.08	23
Source: SIPRI database, "Arms Forces, Weapons Holdings and Employment in Arms Production," http://first.sipri.org/ ; EAP data from the International Labor Organization, Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 2003, p. 11-12; and ILO online, LABORSTA, 2004.				

Table 6. Military Size as a Percent of Registered Voters, 10 Latin American Countries			
Country	Registered Voters (mill.)	Military Size	Mil Size as % of Registered voters
Argentina (2001)	24,735	70,100	.3
Bolivia (2002)	4,155	31,500	.8
Brazil (2002)	115,254	287,600	.2
Chile (2001)	8,075	87,500	1.0
Mexico (2000)	52,789	192,770	.4
Nicaragua (1996)	2,421	17,000	.7
Paraguay (1998)	2,049	20,200	.8
Peru (2001)	14,906	100,000	.7
Uruguay (1999)	2,402	25,600	1.1
Venezuela (2000)	11,623	79,000	.7
Total	238,409	911,270	.67
Source: Voting data from International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, http://www.idea.int/vt/ ; Military data from Institute for Strategic Studies, <i>Military Balance</i> , 2005/06			

Table 7. Military-Related Articles in Latin American Area Studies Journals,
as a Percent of Total Articles, 1976-2005

	LARR	LAPS/JISWA	JLAS	Averages
1976-85	6.0	8.4	13.5	9.3
1986-95	2.7	13.2	7.3	7.7
1996-05	2.3	8.8	4.9	5.3

Data source: analysis of article titles of all research articles, research notes, commentary and debates published for each volume of each journal during stated time periods. Omits book review essays. N = 1,856 total articles, and 137 military-related articles.

Notes

¹ Pew Global Attitudes Project, "What the World Thinks 2002." The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. Washington DC (December 2002).

² Michael Klare and David Anderson, A Scourge of Guns: The Proliferation of Small Arms and Light Weapons in Latin America, Arms Sales Monitoring Project, Federation of American Scientists, Washington D.C. 1996: 1.

³ Thomas Scheetz, "Military Expenditure and Development in Latin America," in Arming the South: The Economics of Military Expenditures, Arms Production and Arms Trade in Developing Countries, Jurgen Brauer and J. Paul Dunne, eds. New York: Palgrave, 2002: 55.

⁴ Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital and European States: 990-1992 AD. Basil Blackwell 1992. Miguel Angel Centeno, Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin America, Penn State University Press 2003.

⁵ Dominguez 2005, 21-22.

⁶ Lars Schoultz, Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy towards Latin America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1998.

⁷ Alain Rouquié, The Military and the State in Latin America. Trans. Paul Sigmund. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987.

⁸ For this reason, Brian Loveman emphasizes more the subjective appraisal of military strength and less the objective. It was, he says, "The military self perception and evolving military lore" [that] "identified the armed forces as their nation's guardians and saviors" (59). And he adds, Nineteenth Century Latin America was dominated by caudillos, violence and the military, but not by professional armed forces" (39). See his For la Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America. (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources Books, 1999).

⁹ Dominguez 2005, 21-24.

¹⁰ Loveman 1999; Mott 2002: 89-92, 142-145.

¹¹ Prudencio Garcia, El Drama de la Autonomía Militar. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1995: 225-256.

¹² Michael Barletta and Harold Trinkunas, "Regime Type and Regional Security in Latin America: Toward a "Balance of Identity" Theory," in T.V. Paul, James J. Wirtz, and Michel Fortmann, eds., *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century* (Stanford: Stanford University Press 2004): 334-359.

¹³ David Pion-Berlin. "Will Soldiers Follow? Economic Integration and Regional Security in the Southern Cone." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 42.1 (Spring 2000): 43-69.

¹⁴ Barletta and Trinkunas 2004

¹⁵ Dominguez 2005.

¹⁶ Barletta and Trinkunas 2004.

¹⁷ David Mares, Violent Peace: Militarized Interstate Bargaining in Latin America. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

¹⁸ Hunter 1997.

¹⁹ See SIPRI Yearbook, 2005 online at www.SIPRI.ORG/contents/milap/aprod/sipridata.html.

²⁰ Military size is measured as the proportion of the population serving in the military (soldiers per 1,000 in habitants) or MPR. Military spending is a percent of GDP. See Bowman (2002:205).

²¹ IMF, "Reducing Unproductive Expenditures is Important for Fiscal Adjustment," IMF Survey, February 24, 1997: 49-51; Fact sheet: Social Dimensions of the IMF's Policy Dialogue, March 2001, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/social.htm>

²² For example, see Malcolm Knight et al. "The Peace Dividend: Military Spending Cuts and Economic Growth," IMF Working Papers, May 1, 1995.

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/doctext.cfm?docno=WPIEA0531995>; Tamim Bayoumi, et al. "The Impact of Worldwide Military Spending Cuts on Developing Countries," IMF Working Papers, November 1, 1993. <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/doctext.cfm?docno=WPIEA0861993>.

²³ The countries which permit soldiers to vote are Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Data is found in Rial, Juan, 2005. "Las normas jurídicas y las organizaciones de la defensa," en RESDAL, Atlas Comparativo de la Defensa en América Latina. Ser 2000, Argentina. 28-29.

²⁴ Rut Diamint Democracia y Seguridad en America Latina. (Buenos Aires: Nuevohacer, 2002).

²⁵ This section borrows from Pion-Berlin, "Political Management of the Military in Latin America," Military Review, 85 (January-February, 2005):25-26.

²⁶ This section borrows from Pion-Berlin, "The Defense Wisdom Deficit in Latin America: A Reply to Thomas C. Bruneau," *Fuerzas Armadas y Sociedad*, 2006 (forthcoming).

²⁷ A small network of primarily Latin American scholars have cropped up in recent years to exchange views and information about defense and security themes. And nascent defense establishments exist in countries like Argentina, Chile, and Peru. Still, by comparison with other topics of inquiry, defense suffers a serious attention deficit south of the border as well.

²⁸ See Francisco Rojas Aravena and Joseph Tulchin, eds. *Strategic Balance and Confidence Building Measures in the Americas*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998); Craig Arceneaux and David Pion-Berlin, *Transforming Latin America: the International and Domestic Origins of Change*. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005), 156-186.

²⁹ For example, see Agüero who says that to achieve supremacy, civilians must have an active presence in defense spheres, including their own defense project, a set of well thought out views on military organization, professional norms and education, and allocation of resources. Felipe Agüero, *Soldiers, Civilians and Democracy: Post-Franco Spain in Comparative Perspective*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), p. 215.

³⁰ The ephemeral coup seems to be some product of swift and decisive regional action combined with a strong reaction from civil society within these states. Officers and their civilian allies are undoubtedly aware of the costs to democratic disruption since these have been made known repeatedly.

³¹ Thomas C. Bruneau, 2005. "Civil-Military Relations in Latin America: The Hedgehog and the Fox Revisited" *Fuerzas Armadas y Sociedad*, Año 19 (1): 113.

³² Ibid., p. 126

³³ Harold Trinkunas, Crafting Civilian Control of the Military in Venezuela: A Comparative Perspective. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

³⁴ We are not advocating either a broader definition of security, nor a wider role of the armed forces. Indeed there are good reasons to be skeptical about the wisdom of dragging the military into these unconventional “wars.” We are simply attempting to explain some hypothetical conditions that might prompt a renewed interest in defense policy.