
**1ST THEMATIC MEETING
THE 9TH CONFERENCE OF DEFENSE MINISTERS OF THE AMERICAS:
BUILDING A THEMATIC AGENDA**

*La Paz, Bolivia
May 10–11, 2010*

Organized by: Pro Tempore Secretariat of the IX CMDA and RESDAL

Report

Introduction

The Conferences of Defense Ministers of the Americas (CMDA) were established as a forum for dialogue that brings together high-level representatives to discuss defense policies and criteria within a democratic framework. From 1995, when the First Conference was held in Williamsburg, United States, through the Eighth Conference held in 2008 in Banff, Canada, the Conferences have been distinguished by their role as a forum for exchanging perspectives and identifying areas of potential cooperation. In this sense, they have served as a mechanism for building mutual trust in and of themselves.

To make this mechanism possible, each edition is backed by extensive preparatory work involving primarily the host country, which establishes a Pro Tempore Secretariat to begin coordinating and organizing the meetings and structuring the agenda.

To determine the topics to be discussed at the Conference, the host country proposes a tentative list of key themes or points. Based on this list, delegations from the Ministries of Defense of member countries are invited to participate in a preparatory session regarding the proposed agenda. By consensus, the structure of the thematic agenda is decided, and other topics of interest for the Conference are identified.

Civil society participation in these ministerial meetings was permitted for the first time at the Sixth Conference held in Quito in 2004. Since then, RESDAL's role in this hemispheric process has been growing. In this context, the Bolivian Minister of Defense, as the official responsible for the Ninth Conference to be held in November 2010, requested the Network's support in the process of developing the thematic agenda.

The premise for developing the agenda is that its content must be grounded in the principles of *preserving democracy as the foundation of mutual security* and *the subordination of the armed forces to an authority subject to democratic control*. In accordance with this basic premise, renowned defense experts gathered in La Paz, Bolivia, on May 10 and 11, 2010, for a meeting convened by the Pro Tempore Secretariat of the 9th CMDA and RESDAL, under the auspices of the British Embassy in Bolivia,



contribute to shaping the agenda through the perspectives and discussions of civil society and academia on defense issues and current trends in the hemisphere. This report summarizes the main points and discussions that took place during the meeting. A second meeting will be held on May 17 and 18, bringing together ministerial representatives for presentations by academic experts.

Participants and Event Format

The event consisted of two days of sessions held at the Radisson Hotel in Bolivia. It included the participation of 20 renowned analysts from countries across the hemisphere, who were invited to integrate civil society's contributions into the conference's thematic agenda and to reflect on the current regional landscape alongside the organizers and other Bolivian officials. Prior to the meeting, participants drafted a brief document containing their proposals for the thematic agenda, which served as a starting point for the discussions that took place during the event.

For its part, the Pro Tempore Secretariat established three main themes around which the agenda items would be structured:

- Peace and Conflict in the Americas
- Democracy, the Armed Forces, and Society
- National Defense and Natural Disasters

The meeting consisted of one and a half days of sessions conducted in a flexible, roundtable-style format, which allowed participants to exchange views based on presentations given by invited experts. These brief presentations served as discussion starters.

Program and Debates

The event began on Monday, the 10th, at 3:00 p.m., with opening remarks by Bolivia's Minister of Defense, Rubén Saavedra Soto, and in the presence of the British Ambassador to Bolivia, Nigel Baker.

During his remarks, he informed all participants that the Ministry had organized the first national discussion process, coordinated by the Pro Tempore Secretariat. This "Roundtable" included representatives from the armed forces, officials from the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as representatives from Parliament, civil society organizations, and social movements in Bolivia. During this meeting, three broad themes were identified to frame the agenda items: Peace and Conflict in the Americas; Democracy, the Armed Forces, and Society; and National Defense and Natural Disasters.



As another issue he addressed, he raised the need to discuss the transparency of military equipment in the hemisphere as a factor that will contribute to effectively maintaining the region as a zone of peace. In this regard, he highlighted the Bolivian government's pacifist stance and its deterrence policy in terms of defense. He also mentioned the concept of the Bolivian armed forces as an active agent in the country's development policy.

Next, Ms. Loreta Tellería, Pro Tempore Secretary of the 11th CMDA, took the floor and thanked RESDAL for its support in organizing this event, emphasizing that the event could not have taken place without the Network's unconditional support. She also thanked the British Embassy for joining this effort by sponsoring the event.

Finally, Ms. Tellería thanked the various participants, who had been invited to contribute based on their extensive knowledge of the subject, and emphasized the importance of their contributions in enabling the 11th CDMA to address a thematic agenda featuring innovative, priority, and relevant content that incorporates the defense interests and concerns of the participating countries. While it may be difficult to address issues critical to the region, it is important to confront them as promptly as possible while maintaining dialogue.

Reaffirming the words of the Minister of Defense, he highlighted the progress made so far by the Pro Tempore Secretariat through the organization of the First National Roundtable, which included the participation of representatives from all relevant sectors in Bolivia. The final document, containing the main resolutions, included: recognition of the opportunity for Bolivia to serve as the Pro Tempore Secretariat for the 11th CDMA and to present a proactive thematic agenda, recognition of shifts in traditional thinking regarding security and defense, as well as traditional concepts such as cooperative security, collective security, and even multidimensional security—which no longer reflect the region's interests—and the conceptual crisis surrounding security in light of the concepts of multiculturalism and plurinationalism.

The three main themes that emerged from this national debate to be included in the defense agenda were defined as follows:

- Peace and Conflict in the Americas: Military Spending in Latin America. How much is spent on military equipment in the region? How is this spending distributed by country?
What are the economic and political costs of this spending?
- Armed forces and society: gender, multiculturalism, education and the armed forces, and military service.
- Defense and natural disasters: experiences and lessons learned following the earthquakes in Haiti and Chile, and the events that occurred in the aftermath of these disasters.



A Critical Look at the Process of the Conferences of Defense Ministers (1995–2008)

The purpose of this first presentation was to offer a critical analysis of the CDMA from a historical and political perspective on these forums, provided by Hal Klepak and Juan Ramón Quintana.

Drawing on his expertise as a historian and his participation in all previous conferences, Mr. Klepak highlighted the enthusiasm that characterized the First CDMA in Williamsburg in 1995 and the developments that followed. The agenda at that time reflected the political climate of the moment: the effort to link the defense and security debate with discussions on political cooperation in the hemisphere. The U.S. perspective dominated this forum, but it was reinforced by Latin American countries, which sought to protect the existing security system, with a clear interest in maintaining a beneficial relationship in which bilateral ties took precedence over multilateral ones. Thus, although the difficulties and issues specific to the bilateral level were often brought up for discussion at these forums, the defense ministers consistently chose not to do so, as this would have disrupted the dialogue.

Despite these contradictions, the CDMA became the only forum where senior representatives from the ministries across the region can periodically meet in a spirit of camaraderie to exchange ideas and address the concerns of their counterparts in a relatively favorable setting—one from which no country has sought to exclude itself or been excluded. The CDMA meetings have succeeded in establishing a permanent venue and a tradition for discussing cooperation and the issues that unite us. Although there have always been attempts to raise issues that do not contribute to this goal, the ministers have consistently opted to address those matters in a separate forum.

Thus, countries have come to understand more and more that the problems we face are, in reality, primarily bilateral or subregional. The ideals of broad agreements involving all countries in the hemisphere have been progressively set aside in favor of creating favorable environments for initiatives that are not hemispheric in scope—such as peace processes, conflict resolution, and confidence-building measures. This marks a shift from the Williamsburg era, when efforts to build trust between two countries were still in their infancy. Over time, this approach has become more common, and from then until now, the frequency of bilateral meetings has increased significantly, and their chances of success have grown—especially under favorable circumstances.

In recent years, a review of the CDMA documents shows that the thematic agendas have not been dynamic. While the ongoing discussion surrounding democratic issues can be highlighted, in many contexts, what is referred to as a “new security agenda” has consisted of repetitive topics that do not fall within the scope of action of the defense ministers: drug trafficking and public safety, among others. What has taken on different forms within the CDMA is its organizational structure. The various organizational approaches have led to discussions of subregional issues that fall on the margins of the conferences—either because they are more complex to address at the central level and/or because they concern topics that do not interest all members equally.



On the other hand, the political landscape has changed in recent years. The United States has become involved in conflicts in other regions of the world; it has not been possible to maintain a consistent approach to defense; reformist governments have emerged with an interest in promoting ambitious and immediate reform processes; and the focus of activity has shifted from the hemispheric level to smaller regional spheres, among other developments.

Faced with this not entirely favorable outlook, it remains to be acknowledged that the CDMA is the only forum of its kind left: a high-level, hemispheric forum that allows for flexible diplomacy and, by definition, constitutes a positive environment that facilitates dialogue, even with its limitations.

Juan Ramón Quintana then took the floor, stating that his presentation would address the Bolivian government's national perspective ahead of the upcoming CDMA.

Bolivia's case is unique because it is currently undergoing a complex process of state reconstruction based on the recognition of three major historical debts in its Constitution:

- The debt to its citizens, stemming from a historical tension between society and the state, characterized by a duality between upholding and disregarding rights.
- The regional debt, which stems from a complex relationship between the central government and the regions—a relationship that was historically marked by neglect and indifference.
- The economic debt, which stems from the liberal framework upon which the country's economic system was built and which left the state with a minimal role.

In this new phase Bolivia is undergoing, efforts have been made to address these acknowledged debts through mechanisms such as:

- The recognition of Bolivia's multiculturalism.
- The establishment of regional autonomies and the redistribution of surpluses.
- The transformation of the political system itself, making room for the participation of a greater number of political groups, social movements, and civil society organizations.

With regard to defense and security, this new political, social, and economic landscape of the Bolivian state has led to a coexistence of old and new frameworks. The major transformations the state has undergone have not fully extended to the defense sector. However, among the priorities of this process of state reform, the transformations involving the defense sector—which will become evident in the near future—include the following:

- The renunciation of war as part of its new foreign and security policy, which entails a transformation of Bolivia's defense doctrine.
- Reforming the role of the armed forces in territorial control—a role that had previously been assigned to internal repression—to now assign them a primary role in border security.
- An active role for the armed forces in the conservation of natural resources.
- The restoration of sovereignty in matters of international security and defense, in contrast to a past in which doctrine and courses of action were dictated by external actors.



The floor was then opened for debate. Participants' remarks centered on the need to define a model or establish expectations regarding what is expected of the Conference: whether it will address more controversial issues that may generate conflicting positions, or, conversely, whether it will build a basic agenda grounded in common ground, containing topics that facilitate dialogue and consensus without generating tensions.

It is necessary to acknowledge the situation across the continent in terms of security, defense, strategic issues, and peacebuilding over the past four years. Maintaining regions where peace prevails constitutes an asset for the countries that make up those regions, particularly in terms of financial flows, political dynamics, and within the context of globalization. Based on this premise, this Conference should prioritize issues of peace and confidence-building.

The CDMA has played an important role as a venue for dialogue and mutual understanding on a wide range of issues. Emphasis was thus placed on the need to revitalize this unique hemispheric forum—the region's sole platform for defense matters. However, it is impossible to overlook the fact that the CDMA lacks autonomy as a multilateral institutional forum, making it impossible to escape the conditions that arise and complicate the regional landscape. The 11th CDMA faces a current scenario marked by disagreements on two fronts: a weakened multilateral context and national contexts in which positions regarding the armed forces are diverging, reigniting conflicts stemming from differing views on the strengthening of capabilities, territorial disputes, and other issues. It is therefore crucial to prevent these disagreements from escalating into confrontations. It is a mistake for a forum of this nature to attempt to sustain itself by addressing only issues that do not involve confrontation. On the contrary, it must establish itself as a political forum focused on the structural problems of defense: political definitions, institutional issues, and how these affect international cooperation.

From its inception, the CDMA system has imposed limitations on itself regarding the issues it must refrain from addressing. There is a contradiction between the aspirations articulated in hemispheric terms and the positions that ministers will actually take at the Conference, without overlooking the non-binding nature of the CDMA and the strictly rhetorical character of its declarations.

In this regard, the difficulty was highlighted for some countries that are just beginning the long process of distinguishing between the spheres and tasks of national defense and internal security; it is therefore ambitious to imagine that these countries might have an interest in multilateral cooperation with Latin America on defense issues.

Some participants identified the determination of the use of military forces in each country as one of the pending issues to be addressed, emphasizing that this freedom of determination is constrained by limits established by the Inter-American Court and Commission on Human Rights regarding the extraordinary intervention of military forces in the resolution of social conflicts. Some doubts were also raised regarding the vision that assigns an active role to the armed forces in development, since in some



national contexts, this very role has contributed to weakening the role of civilians and granting the armed forces a guardian role in the past.

Some participants firmly argued that it is impossible to include in the Conference a country that, during a democratic period, fosters a coup d'état.

Another issue raised was how this hemispheric forum should be reconciled with new subregional frameworks. Each country assigns these forums specific levels of priority, and it is within this framework that the 11th CDMA must be understood.

1) Peace and Conflict in the Americas

The session was moderated by Carmen Rosa de León Escribano, who reflected on how to begin shaping the agenda for a meeting where the agenda itself could become an obstacle to the meeting's success.

The first presentation was delivered by Luis Tibiletti. After presenting a conceptual framework and surveying two hundred years of Latin American history in the areas of peacebuilding and conflict resolution, he specifically addressed the role of defense ministries in this peacebuilding process: ensuring coherence between defense policy and foreign policy, with diplomacy serving as the instrument of peace. Returning to the Williamsburg Principles of institutionalization and civilian control, he emphasized the prior need for political leadership as a prerequisite for subsequent civilian control. However, he emphasized the importance of defense ministries managing their respective areas in a manner that supports the foreign policy of democratic governments and integration processes (while respecting subregional differences). It is the responsibility of defense ministers to work to prevent the adoption of doctrines foreign to the Latin American tradition (for example, "preemptive war" or "national security doctrine").

Within the framework of the CMDA, previous declarations have addressed this issue of contributing to peace through various points. This is one of the central themes of these Conferences. Likewise, the reference to transparency in military spending alludes to the pursuit of trust for peace. The history of peace and conflict in the Americas highlights the tension between Latin America and the hegemonic power. In this context, the challenges ahead are to acknowledge this issue and reinvigorate this space for multilateral dialogue. The Conferences must address these problems in order to begin solving them.

Main points of discussion:

- The importance of preserving the CMDA forum. The agenda of a political meeting such as the CMDA must address political issues, not merely technical ones.
- Making peace efforts one of the main priorities to be addressed by the CMDA, given the sensitive issues the region faces today regarding peace and conflict.



- The deployment of military forces in South America—linked to the fight against drug trafficking but with dual-use capabilities—is causing some concern among countries.
- A lack of willingness on the part of various regional actors to acknowledge their role in these problems. The use of defense as a tool of domestic policy, for example through rhetoric about the arms race. The politicization of the issue of re-equipment. A culture of secrecy among those who hold public office and positions.
- The instrumental use of a conflict-based perspective. Inertia toward practices that shape identities through difference and confrontation. This undermines the transparency and strategic predictability necessary for multilateral dialogue. Inability to create reliable institutions.
- Defense policy must be guided by foreign policy. The disconnect between the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is a cause for concern. Those responsible for these policies must understand how the other functions.
- Advance political governance and civilian leadership. Strengthen the ministries. Management of the military budget.
- White papers as a tool for transparency—internally, to legitimize the defense function in the eyes of the rest of society, and externally, as a unilateral confidence-building measure by one state toward other countries.
- Progress by the South American Defense Council (CDS) on confidence-building measures. CDS proposal to present a joint position at the IX CMDA on mechanisms for mutual trust and transparency in military spending.

2) Democracy, the Armed Forces, and Society

The presentation for this second working session was delivered by Marcela Donadio, who spoke in a personal capacity, emphasizing that her remarks did not necessarily represent the views of RESDAL. First, she noted that this topic has always been present at the CDMA meetings, dating back to the first meeting in Williamsburg, where the following principles were established: that mutual security rests on the preservation of democracy; the vital role of the military in defending democratic states; the subordination of the armed forces to constitutional authorities; and transparency in defense matters.

From the 1980s and 1990s onward in Latin American countries, reforms tended more toward the reorientation of the political order than toward the redefinition of the role of the armed forces within the overall framework of the state. Significant progress has been made in terms of institutional development and the strengthening of ministries. “Defense in the 21st century” has been a favorite phrase in official documents and speeches; however, the role of the armed forces remains unchanged from the models of the late 19th and early 20th centuries: territorial defense, a global presence, and, in many cases, the armed forces as an instrument for guaranteeing constitutional and political order. Defense institutional structures have not been adapted to the needs of recent times. With these reflections, Ms. Donadio sought to highlight the tension between historical trends and future perspectives; the gap between political declarations,



as expressed, for example, in white papers, and the current reality of military institutions, as reflected, for example, in budgets that do not align with those statements.

It is important to reinforce and build upon what has been achieved in terms of institutions and civilian control. But to advance democratic consolidation in our region, it is necessary to address a major pending debate that involves taking a closer look at military institutions from within.

There are certain issues in this regard that are included on the regional political agenda merely to be politically correct, such as gender, multiculturalism, and human rights. But for this very reason, there are limits to their genuine adoption. Other issues to be addressed when considering military reform include education, the justice system, and military service. All these issues have a strong impact on the democratization of the armed forces, as they change models, open up discussions, and confront the very essence of democracy. It is time to engage in the debate about what kind of armed forces we want, what missions these forces have, in what societies they operate, and, consequently, how they should be structured.

Today, the same conceptions of traditional liberal democracies do not prevail in all our countries. Accepting that we do not all have the same model would demonstrate that we are part of the same democratic hemispheric environment.

Key points for discussion:

- Democratization of defense. Defense as public policy. Transparency, accountability, and access to information. Progress made and building a relationship with civil society.
- The armed forces are a reflection of the society in which they are formed.
- Sharing experiences of processes of change. For example, the integration of African Americans into the U.S. Army, or on the issue of multiculturalism—such as the large number of Brazilian battalions composed of Indigenous military personnel protecting the Amazon.
- Democratic leadership of defense institutions to guarantee the rights of all military personnel, particularly those in vulnerable situations due to gender or age, for example. Strengthening human rights within the military institution can help the military itself expand the defense of human rights to the rest of society.
- Training of the armed forces in human rights and international humanitarian law.
- Involvement of the armed forces in national development.
- Involvement of the Legislative Branch. On many occasions, members of Congress serve longer on specific committees than ministers do in their posts; this “repository of knowledge” on defense matters should be leveraged.
- The situation in Honduras. Military intervention and/or the use of military force in the political arena. The role of the military in a democratic environment. The need to strengthen civilian leadership and control.



3) National Defense and Natural Disasters

The final keynote presentation was delivered by Miguel Navarro, who began by highlighting the complexity of the issue due to its political nature and relevance, given that no country is immune to disasters.

Inevitably, involving the armed forces in disaster response has an impact on civil-military relations, given that not all countries are prepared for this—specifically, in terms of preparation for interagency coordination and the designation of the institution that will lead the armed forces in these operations. In the case of the recent earthquake in Chile, the debate centered on when the armed forces can be called upon to act. Institutions do not act on their own initiative, and this entails political responsibilities and costs that the authorities must assume.

Other complex issues arise on the legal front. The constitutional “*State of Catastrophe*” has many political dimensions, because when it is declared, civil liberties are restricted and human rights violations may occur. In general, the state effectively abdicates its responsibilities, which are then assumed by the armed forces. Civilian authorities are, to a certain extent, sidelined from the entire decision-making process in a disaster zone, and it is the military authorities who take charge of day-to-day operations in that area. This raises questions about the roles and missions of civilian and military authorities. Generally speaking, the President of the Republic is the one who makes the decision regarding this division of roles and coordination between civilian and military institutions. Finally, there is an issue surrounding the role of military justice and its jurisdiction. In some cases, disaster zones are reclassified to fall under military jurisdiction, and different rules and procedures—as opposed to those of the civilian justice system—are applied in situations such as looting.

Nevertheless, the use of the military has clear advantages. In the face of large-scale disasters, the armed forces are the only institutions with the capabilities, means, and resources for an immediate response. The decision-making process within the military is very different from that of civilian institutions. Making and implementing decisions is easier in the military due to its hierarchical structure. Among other advantages is the ability to concentrate resources and mass transportation. It also has the capacity to be self-sustaining in areas where services have collapsed due to a natural disaster.

On the other hand, he highlighted the lessons learned from the terrible experience in Chile: the need for preparedness in terms of training, capacity building, and equipment; greater interagency coordination; the creation of rapid-response capabilities; and preparedness for receiving aid, including procedures and bilateral and multilateral mechanisms.

Looking ahead to the future of the armed forces’ participation in disaster situations, the importance of this approach becoming a unifying factor was noted, as well as the fact that it serves as an excellent first step toward establishing mechanisms for mutual trust, coordination, and international security frameworks.



Main points of discussion:

- Institutional framework for defense and disaster response: how joint efforts are implemented.
- Decision-making and implementation timelines by political authorities.
- The issue of who commands the armed forces during operations.
- Conflict over the exercise of authority between civilian and military authorities in the disaster zone.
- Inter-agency action protocols within and between countries for future responses. Creation and implementation of a subregional system for managing risks and vulnerabilities, resources, assets, and techniques.
- Challenges in the support provided by countries and MINUSTAH to the Haitian people: political leadership, oversight, cooperation, communication, coordination, transportation, and language.
- Sovereignty, international cooperation, and support from the armed forces in the event of disasters.

Conclusions and Proposals

The objective of this final session was to discuss how to conduct a hemispheric conference under challenging circumstances, an issue that had been addressed since the beginning of the event. The occasion was used as an opportunity for Mike Snell, organizer of the previous Ministerial Conference held in Banff, Canada, in 2008, to share his experience.

One of the highlights was the momentum the conference process has gained, the shift in thematic discussions and parallel sessions, though the need for a final declaration remains. He recommended the need to reaffirm the spirit of the Conference. He proposed a central theme for the meeting, seeking opportunities and ways for the ministers to focus on that single theme. A look at the region reveals complex and diverse problems. However, the region remains stable, and therefore the opportunity to build a unique form of cooperation must not be missed.

Next, each participant concisely outlined the themes and subthemes that the Thematic Agenda for the upcoming ministerial meeting should include. The themes proposed by Bolivia were generally well received. A consensus was thus reached to establish a thematic agenda that acknowledges the current regional reality. The proposals are summarized in the following outline:

1) Peace and Conflict in the Americas

- Reaffirmation of principles: the inalienable value of peace; non-aggression; non-interference; sovereignty.
- Transparency in military budgets and procurement. Arms race, yes or no? Compliance in the submission before inter-American . Communication and dialogue.
- Deployment of forces and confidence-building measures. Early-warning mechanisms in the event of use against terrorism or drug trafficking.



- Exchange and cooperation in the military sphere.

Some special considerations:

- Promotion, recognition, and support for confidence-building and peacebuilding efforts arising from other initiatives (such as the CDS or the Truth Commission in Honduras).
- Recognition of the work of MINUSTAH.

2) Democracy, the Armed Forces, and Society

- Institutionalization of defense and civilian control. Strengthening of defense ministries. Executive capacity and resource management. Defense as public policy: transparency and relations with society. Accountability.
- Transformation of the armed forces: military justice, military education, and recruitment systems. Professionalization of the military.
- Gender, Multiculturalism, and Human Rights.

3) National Defense and Natural Disasters

- Sovereignty, international cooperation, and support from the armed forces in the event of disasters
- Regional capacity to respond to disasters. List of vulnerabilities and potential responses.
- Coordination with other government agencies and the management of operations in the event of natural disasters.

Another question that guided these conclusions was how to ensure the continuity and strengthening of this forum. Here is a summary of some specific considerations in this regard:

- Recapture the spirit of Williamsburg—a spirit of dialogue and the pursuit of cooperation in the hemisphere.
- View this forum as a process for institutionalizing defense within a democratic framework.
- Identify issues of interest for the countries' defense policies.
- Establish a follow-up mechanism for each meeting that allows for building upon (rather than repeating) previous statements and monitoring progress on agreements. Promote an agenda of actions and collaborations that some countries—perhaps not all—will undertake in the intervening years, with the intention of reporting the results at the next ministerial meeting.
- Share lessons learned and best practices.
- Work toward the institutionalization of confidence-building measures through a permanent mechanism.
- Include broader and stronger participation by civil society organizations and academics, recognizing that they bring social legitimacy and transparency to the Conference process, in addition to important technical and conceptual contributions.



- Provide the ministries with a document prepared by civil society on the progress and setbacks over the past two years between the 8th and 9th CMDA.
- Once again invite members of Congress to participate as observers in the Conferences.

In closing, the importance of continued civil society participation within the framework of the hemispheric process was emphasized. This participation gained momentum under the Canadian organizers at the 8th CMDA, when they invited representatives from civil society organizations and academia to discuss the development of the thematic agenda—an initiative that has been taken up by Bolivia’s Pro Tempore Secretariat for the 9th CMDA.

Next, Loreta Tellería, as Pro Tempore Secretary of the 11th CMDA, highlighted several points regarding the main themes of discussion, particularly the value of peace and the importance of upholding the principles of non-interference and non-intervention in internal affairs. She reaffirmed her belief that when issues are addressed with honesty, respect, and tolerance, it is possible to tackle them and reach consensus on a thematic agenda that transcends the sensitivities that certain issues may raise for some countries. Discussing transparency and military procurement, for example, can help ease the tensions that this issue is currently generating. On the other hand, the recurring focus on issues such as multiculturalism or gender stems from the need to move beyond mere openness or new legal provisions; it requires a shift in doctrine and culture that involves many actors beyond the military.

Finally, he referred to two other challenges ahead: ensuring that ministers participate and engage in dialogue on these issues, leveraging the value of sharing lessons learned; and establishing mechanisms to monitor this hemispheric process.

The organizers expressed their gratitude for the support, preparation, openness, and sincerity with which each participant contributed throughout the meeting.

With the support of:



Embajada Británica
La Paz



List of Participants

- Col. LUIS ARIÑEZ, Pro Tempore Secretariat of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- NIGEL BAKER, British Ambassador to Bolivia
- C.C. JAVIER BALDIVIEZO, Pro Tempore Secretary of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- Lt. Col. JORGE CADIMA PAZ, Pro Tempore Secretary of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- ROBERTO CAJINA, RESDAL, Nicaragua
- PABLO CELI, Central University, Ecuador
- ELIZABETH COLOMA, British Embassy in Bolivia
- MARGARET DALY HAYES, Evidence Based Research Associates (EBR), United States
- C.F. CARLOS DEBRECZENI, Pro Tempore Secretary of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- ANTONIO DE LA CUESTA COLUNGA, Advisor to the Senate of the Republic, Mexico
- CARMEN ROSA DE LÉON, Institute for Education for Sustainable Development (IEPADES), Guatemala
- REINA GONZÁLES, Pro Tempore Secretariat of the 9th CDMA, Bolivia
- GUIDO GONZÁLEZ, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Bolivia
- JULIÁN GONZÁLEZ GUYER, University of the Republic, Uruguay
- IVELAW GRIFFITH, York College of the City University of New York
- CLAUDIA HERNÁNDEZ, Pro Tempore Secretary of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- HAL KLEPAK, Professor Emeritus, Royal Military College, Canada
- ERNESTO LÓPEZ, Argentine Ambassador to Guatemala
- FAUSTO LOVERA, Pro Tempore Secretary of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- MIGUEL NAVARRO, National Academy of Political and Strategic Studies (ANEPE), Chile
- KEVIN NEWMAYER, Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (CHDS), United States
- FREDERICK NUNN, Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (CHDS), United States
- Capt. IVÁN ORELLANA, Pro Tempore Secretariat of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- ROSARIO PÉREZ PONCE, Pro Tempore Secretariat of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
- JUAN RÁMON QUINTANA, Observatory on Democracy and Security, Bolivia
- JOSEFINA REYNOSO, Global Democracy and Development Foundation (FUNGLODE), Dominican Republic
- ELIÉZER RIZZO DE OLIVEIRA, Mackenzie Presbyterian University, Brazil



-
- JOSÉ ROCABADO MENDEZ, Pro Tempore Secretariat of the IX CDMA, Bolivia
 - LUCILA SANTOS, Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), United States
 - GONZALO SERRA, Executive Secretariat, RESDAL
 - MIKE SNELL, Pearson Peacekeeping Center, Canada
 - ANA MARÍA TAMAYO, Instituto de Defensa Legal (IDL), Peru
 - LUIS TIBILETTI, SER in 2000, Argentina
 - Sgt. GROVER TORREZ, Pro Tempore Secretariat of the IX CDMA, Bolivia

Organizers:

- LORETA TELLERIA, Executive Secretary, IX CMDA
- MARCELA DONADIO, Executive Secretary, RESDAL



Program

10 May

3:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Opening

Loreta Telleria (Pro Tempore Secretary, IX CMDA)

Marcela Donadio (RESDAL)

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

A Critical Look at the Process of the Conferences of Defense Ministers (1995–2008)

Presentation: *Hal Klepak*

Juan Ramón Quintana

Discussion

5:00 PM – 5:30 PM

Coffee Break

5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Proposals for a Thematic Agenda

Participants' remarks on agenda items

11 in May

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Peace and Conflict in the Americas

Presentation: *Luis Tibiletti*

Discussion

10:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Coffee Break

11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Democracy, the Armed Forces, and Society

Presentation: *Marcela Donadio*

Discussion

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Lunch

2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

National Defense and Natural Disasters

Presentation: *Miguel Navarro*

Discussion

3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Coffee Break

4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

Conclusions.

Toward the Next Conference: How Can We Work on a Hemispheric Conference in a Challenging Environment?