

# USA 2008: candidates confront the critical issues in Colombia

Robert Matthews  
Associate Researcher, FRIDE

The question of US policy towards Colombia offers a window onto US hemispheric policy in general. The US presidential candidates' attitudes towards Colombia likewise provide an opportunity to speculate on changes in US strategy after November 2008. Current US policy revolves around support or opposition to Plan Colombia, the US programme to address narcoterrorism in that country, and the still pending US-Colombia free trade agreement. The issues that rotate into this discussion include US geopolitics and regional security, narcoterrorism, insurgency and human rights violations. Both Democratic candidates' have raised human rights concerns regarding US-Colombian policy during the presidential primary campaign.

More than any other holdover from the 1990s, the Bush administration has embraced and renewed Bill Clinton's Plan Colombia, designed to provide a military approach and significant military aid to bolster anti-drug efforts in the country. Washington has also promoted the controversial fumigation of crops. Nearly all independent analyses have concluded that this has been a failure. Colombia is currently the source of more than 90 percent of the world's cocaine, despite record-level aerial fumigation of coca crops.

As Latin America skewed towards left-wing populism in the past decade, the government of Alvaro Uribe became a staunch ally of the Bush administration. Colombia, in return, has received over \$6 billion in aid from the US in the past eight years, averaging nearly \$750 million a year since 2003. It is today the fifth largest recipient of US foreign aid following Israel, Egypt, Pakistan and Afghanistan. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Bush administration argued for more military aid for Colombia from Congress, linking narcotics and terrorism as threats to democracy. Human rights violations by the military and paramilitary forces engaging the leftist guerrilla insurgency (considered by human rights groups to be responsible for 70 percent of the atrocities) were downplayed. Since 80 percent of the aid is military, a significant portion is used by the Colombian army to fight the 40-year leftist insurgency. Yet Washington's record has been no better in seeing the defeat of the main guerrilla group, the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC), than in staunching the supply of cocaine entering the US.

Plan Colombia's military aid, the US approach to cocaine production and trafficking, and the proposed free trade agreement have all raised criticism of Colombia's human rights record—mainly among Democrats. On the other hand, the presumptive Republican nominee for president, Senator John McCain, has not distanced himself from Bush's Latin American policy. It is hoped, therefore, that a look at the Democratic candidates' response to these contemporary issues in the region will bring us closer to sensing what new policy directions—if any—a Democratic administration might take.

## The Colombia Free Trade Bill

US-Colombia policy today represents the ideological intersection of free trade, human rights, counternarcotics and US geopolitics. At the centre of the debate over the proposed Colombian free trade agreement (FTA) is the government's human rights record. The government is also accused of a murky association with right-wing paramilitaries and death squads. Colombia has a reputation as the most dangerous place for unionised workers in the world. Since the 1980s more than 2,500 union members have been murdered, nearly a fifth of them during Uribe's tenure - although the rate has fallen from past periods. However, Colombia's president is still under such a cloud that former Vice-President Al Gore last year refused to attend a Miami environmental conference because he would have had to share the stage with Uribe.

The costs/benefits of the FTA bill to either the US or Colombia in socio-economic terms are often relegated to a secondary consideration below the political and moral arguments of both sides. The Republicans stress the importance of shoring up a troubled regional partner while downplaying its human rights problems. John McCain argues that passage of the Colombia pact is key to bolstering a pro-US ally against narcoterrorism, supporting "a bulwark of democracy" and impeding the spread of movements that "threaten US economic and political influence" in the region. The epicentre of these movements is in Hugo Chavez' Venezuela; thus, Uribe's Colombia is promoted as a critical counterweight to Chavez' anti-US "Bolivarian Revolution" next door. McCain has no objection to Plan Colombia's massive aid package or to the fact that the lion's share goes to the Colombian military to fight "narcoterrorism."

The Democrats argue that the humanitarian situation - from extrajudicial killings to internal displacement - needs to be addressed before the administration can count on their support. Correspondingly, their rhetoric tends to mute the geopolitical role of Colombia as a factor in approving the treaty and to criticise the Uribe government's human rights record. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton both oppose the treaty. However, a look beyond this basic agreement reveals

### The candidates and the March 2008 Colombia-Ecuador-Venezuela crisis

On March 1 of this year Colombian forces launched a military operation into Ecuador to attack a jungle camp occupied by guerrillas of the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC). The incursion killed 24 people, including three Mexican students and Luis Edgar Devia Silva, alias Raul Reyes, second in command of the oldest and largest guerrilla force in the hemisphere. The attack was a clear violation of Ecuadorian sovereignty and article XXI of the Organisation of American States (OAS) charter.<sup>1</sup>

Ecuadorian President Rafael Correa and Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez, voicing outrage, lodged protests with Bogotá, broke diplomatic relations and ordered troops to their respective borders. The crisis was eventually resolved March 7 during a summit held in Santo Domingo by the 20-member Rio Group, a political forum for Latin American heads of state created in 1986. Uribe, while not admitting that Colombia had violated Ecuadorian territory, apologised for the raid and promised he would not violate another nation's border again. The Organisation of American States (OAS), which had denounced Colombia's attack, endorsed the resolution 10 days later. The dissenting vote was cast by the United States. US Deputy Secretary of State John Negroponte explained that "we believe they [the Colombians] were acting in a justifiable way" and on the basis of "legitimate defence".<sup>2</sup>

Negroponte was only following the Bush administration spin on events. While most Latin American governments condemned Colombia, the US president declared that "we stand with our democratic ally" and rebuked the Chávez regime for provocative manoeuvres. Four days into the crisis, White House spokeswoman Dana Perino had focussed not on Colombia but on why Venezuela was involved in a dispute "which Colombia and Ecuador should work out on their own....We do think it's curious that a country such as Venezuela would be raising a spectre of military action against a country who was defending itself against terrorism. That says a lot about Venezuela."<sup>3</sup>

Those hoping for a ringing (or even a muted) defence of international law and the sovereignty of borders from either of the Democratic candidates would be sorely disappointed. The senators' responses did not differ materially from those of the administration and in fact, seemed to be

<sup>1</sup> Article XXI of the OAS charter states: "The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognised."

<sup>2</sup> Suggett, James., "Venezuela and Ecuador Resolve Differences with Colombia at Regional Summit." *Venezuelanalysis.com*, March 8th 2008; "American leaders pledge to end border crisis", The Associated Press, March 8, 2008. Janicke, Kiraz., "OAS Rejects Colombia's Military Incursion into Ecuador, *Venezuelanalysis.com*, March 18th 2008.

<sup>3</sup> Ellsworth, Brian., "Venezuela mobilizes forces to Colombia border," Reuters, Mar 5, 2008.

some subtle differences which in turn bear testimony to their different views of the world and the attitudes they may adopt toward the hemisphere as president.

## Clinton and the Colombia FTA

Clinton's opposition to the Colombian free trade treaty, as well as to the 1994 North American USA 2008: candidates confront the critical issues in Colombia Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), argued during the primary campaign in Ohio and Pennsylvania, revolved mainly around its impact on job losses in the US. Even if we grant that the primary campaign tends to distort a candidate's position, Clinton does not have a strong record in standing up for human rights in Colombia. As a senator and presidential aspirant Clinton has been less vocal and less specific than Obama on human rights violations associated with the Colombian government. Almost as an afterthought, she has taken up the violence against Colombian workers, and now says that treaties should promote human and workers rights.

Notably, during the Pennsylvania primary campaign in early April the New York senator told AFL-CIO members that the ongoing abuses against trade unionists were a reason to oppose the treaty: "We've got to have new trade policies before we have new trade deals. That includes no trade deal with Colombia while violence against trade unionists continues in that country." In an interview with CNN on April 9, Clinton referred to "the history of suppression and targeted killings of labour organisers in Colombia". And she added, "there is an argument that there has been some improvement and change by the Colombian government but it is not enough for me".<sup>4</sup> This oblique criticism of the Uribe government is the closest Clinton has come to Obama's specificity in censuring the Colombian government and holding it accountable for the state of human rights in the country.

parroting them. Hillary's statement on March 3 was a reprise of the Bush administration's hard-line rhetoric on Colombia and Venezuela and suffused with the double standards of the Bush administration.<sup>4</sup> From her first sentence Clinton predicated her response on Venezuela's, not Colombia's, behaviour. Ecuador, the presumed victim of the border violation, appeared as an afterthought. In fact, she argued that both Venezuela and Ecuador should desist in their criticism of Colombia's justifiable "combating [of] terrorist groups". Clinton ominously warned at the end that she would use pressure to change the direction of the Venezuelan government.

Finally, she said nary a word favouring a diplomatic solution to the conflict. Fortunately, the Latin Americans themselves were to accomplish this without needing much encouragement from either present or future White House residents.

At first blush Obama's response, issued at the same time, seemed all too much like Hillary/Bush-lite.<sup>5</sup> We also see a similar iteration of the right of self-defence without mention of the violation of international law, national sovereignty or the agreed-upon principles of the OAS. Like Clinton, Obama avoided asking Colombia to make any kind of amends - even diplomatic retribution - which in fact was accomplished at the Rio Group summit. His vague reference to "international actors" while welcome, unfortunately skirts a call for responsible action on the part of Washington. His omission disappointed those wishing for a signal that a new US administration would improve upon the current White House's contempt for international law.

In any event, Obama may have felt constrained in any effort to offer sound counsel or play the part of a fair interlocutor by comments earlier in 2007 indicating he might favour a unilateral, cross-border response into Pakistan. He had declared seven months before that he would attack across Pakistan's Afghanistan border without consulting Islamabad if he had good intelligence on Al-Qaeda positions inside the Pakistani border.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Clinton's statement: "Hugo Chávez's order yesterday to send ten battalions to the Colombian border is unwarranted and dangerous. The Colombian state has every right to defend itself against drug trafficking terrorist organisations that have kidnapped innocent civilians, including American citizens. By praising and supporting the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, Chávez is openly siding with terrorists that threaten Colombian democracy and the peace and security of the region. Rather than criticising Colombia's actions in combating terrorist groups in the border regions, Venezuela and Ecuador should work with their neighbour to ensure that their territories no longer serve as safe havens for terrorist groups. After reviewing this situation, I am hopeful that the government of Ecuador will determine that its interests lie in closer cooperation with Colombia on this issue. Hugo Chávez must call a halt to this provocative action. As president, I will work with our partners in the region and the OAS to support democracy, promote an end to conflict, and to press Chávez to change course."

<sup>5</sup> Obama's comment: "The Colombian people have suffered for more than four decades at the hands of a brutal terrorist insurgency, and the Colombian government has every right to defend itself against the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The recent targeted killing of a senior FARC leader must not be used as a pretence to ratchet up tensions or to threaten the stability of the region. The presidents of Colombia, Ecuador and Venezuela have a responsibility to ensure that events not spiral out of control, and to peacefully address any disputes through active diplomacy with the help of international actors."

<sup>6</sup> Jones, Athena., MSNBC, April 8, 2008; CNN, "Bill, Hillary Clinton disagree on Colombia trade pact," April 9, 2008

<sup>7</sup> Bal, Dan., "Obama Says He Would Take Fight To Pakistan," *The Washington Post*, August 2, 2007, p. A-1.

However, some scepticism is in order given the senator's past record on NAFTA and the suspicion among many voters that she is guided more by opportunism than political conviction. She has waffled and backtracked on her past support of NAFTA, which she articulated as late as 2006. Clinton then compounded the inconsistency by disingenuously asserting that she had always "been a critic of NAFTA".<sup>8</sup>

## Obama and the Colombian FTA

By comparison Obama has been louder, for longer, than Clinton on the subject and on occasion has not shied away from pointing an accusing finger at the Uribe government. During the campaign Obama, explaining why he would oppose any free trade agreement with Colombia, said "I'm concerned frankly about the reports there of the involvement of the Colombian administration with human rights violations and the suppression of workers". Obama has also mentioned his concerns about links between members of the Colombian government and paramilitary death squads.

While not a leading Senate critic of Colombia's human rights record, Obama formalised his censure by signing a strongly worded letter to Secretary Rice in 2007. Between 2003 and 2008 a handful of US Senators have sent letters to the Secretary of State calling attention to the sorry state of human rights in Colombia and implicitly - and sometimes explicitly - criticising the government and Uribe for doing too little or even contributing to the problem. Senator Clinton has never signed any of these letters. Obama, while ducking the issue until last year, signed the 2007 letter with seven other senators led by Christopher Dodd, Russ Feingold and Patrick Leahy

The communication deplored the infiltration of the government and security forces by terrorists, drug traffickers and paramilitaries. It also called attention to the government's "questionable implementation of the paramilitary demobilisations" and its failure to hold human rights violators to account. Later, Obama

While both candidates' reactions bore hard-line similarities, their choice of language and the tenor of their remarks point to shades of difference. These in turn offer clues to their approaches to the region and potential behaviour as occupants of the oval office. While making similar points, especially Colombia's right to self-defence, the tone of Obama's response was more measured and less aggressive than Clinton's. There was a nod to diplomacy and enough perspective not to veer obsessively, as she did, into a denunciation of Venezuela's Chávez. Obama urged regional states to work together to resolve the crisis while Clinton managed only to summon the states to deny terrorists a safe haven and rather naively, called on Ecuador to join hands with Colombia - the country that just violated its territorial integrity.

This account is a slender reed on which to hang an assessment of future foreign policy performance from the candidates. In the case of John McCain, his mild response<sup>9</sup> belied his tough rhetoric on Venezuela and his hostility to the new populism in Latin America. Clinton's reputation as a hawk on foreign policy (recently reinforced by her sabre-rattling comment about "annihilating" Iran should it attack Israel), is enhanced by her comments on the crisis in South America. Her tough approach here and in the Middle East is commensurate with the senators' well-known ties to the defence industry; Clinton's campaign is heavily indebted to military contractors - more so than any other candidate - Democrat or Republican.

On the other hand, Obama's remarks did not satisfy progressives or those looking for evidence of a sharp shift in US foreign policy should the Illinois senator win the presidency. Yet they conform to the more measured tone, relative to Clinton, that he has taken in the campaign - with few exceptions - on foreign policy issues as well as in his political tactics. The gist of Obama's comments arguably opens the door a crack for a change after 2009 in Washington's attitude toward the three Andean countries involved in the crisis, while the form and substance of Clinton's remarks would seem to close that door.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Matthews, Robert., "USA 2008: The Democrats, free trade and Latin America," FRIDE Website, April 25, p. 5.

<sup>9</sup> After a pro forma denunciation of "Hugo Chávez [who] is establish[ing] a dictatorship", John McCain said "I hope that tensions will be relaxed, President Chávez will remove those troops from the borders - as well as the Ecuadorians - and relations continue to improve between the two." This terse statement by McCain avoided cheerleading aggression or encouraging rogue behaviour on the part of any nation.

<sup>10</sup> In a revealing coda to these events, on April 26, former New Mexico governor and presidential aspirant, Bill Richardson, now an Obama supporter, met with Hugo Chávez who agreed to help try to win the release of three American military contractors held since 2003 by the FARC. The rare meeting between a prominent US politician, who also has strong ties to Obama, and the Venezuelan president may offer a hint that relations between Washington and Caracas would improve under an Obama administration. At time of writing Chávez has promised to try to facilitate the release of three Americans held captive by Colombia's largest rebel group.

joined Senators Christopher Dodd and Patrick Leahy in writing a response to Nicholas Burns, the former Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs, who wrote an opinion piece in The Miami Herald touting Colombia's success story under Uribe and soft-peddalling its human rights problems.

There is earlier evidence of Obama's critical attitude towards Colombia in a March 2007 Senate speech dedicated to Latin America. In it he questioned the lack of success of US-Colombia policy, specifically in curtailing the thriving illegal drug industry. Plan Colombia and the US had failed to achieve "the kind of drop off that the effective pursuit of our interests demands". He also alluded to human rights problems linked to the current Colombian government and expressed scepticism regarding Washington's hearty - if not unconditional - support of the Uribe government. In an unmistakable allusion to President Uribe, he warned against tying US interests in Colombia too closely to specific personalities or personal relationships. In general he found hope in the "tremendous democratic strides" Latin America had made in electing governments that "span the ideological spectrum". There is not a single reference to the Clinton and Bush administrations' mantra of free trade or their neoliberal nostrums to address Latin America's poverty and inequality. Instead, Obama accentuated and welcomed "democracy with justice".

## Clinton and Obama compared

Hillary Clinton's positions and statements in the late primary season do not differ starkly from those of Obama and indeed, Clinton and Obama both came late to the debate on human rights in Colombia. In addition, neither Senators Clinton nor Obama have openly questioned the basis for Plan Colombia, Bill Clinton's anti-drug programme for Colombia for which he signed a waiver of the human rights provisions that Congress had imposed on the package. But Obama's harsh criticism of Colombia predates the presidential campaign while Clinton's didn't begin until the Pennsylvania primary this year. In addition, differences in the nature of their comments and speeches, the tone of their rhetoric, and Obama's commitments in writing, lead one to suspect that an Obama administration would be more apt to scrutinise Colombian human rights carefully before approving military aid under Plan Colombia or backing a free trade agreement. Yet, the proposition would still be highly speculative if it were not for two other signs that these differences are deeper and more significant: the biases of highly placed campaign advisers to Hillary Clinton and the recent harsh denunciation of Barack Obama by President Alvaro Uribe (dealt with below).

Three key people in the Clinton campaign are directly or indirectly on the payroll of Bogota's free trade lobby and raise doubts as to the consistency of her position on Colombia and the free trade issue - and in turn as to how she might act as president. Top aide and communications director of her campaign, Howard Wolfson, is a partner (currently on a leave of absence) in the Glover Park Group, which was founded by former aides to President Bill Clinton and receives a \$40,000 monthly retainer to lobby for the US-Colombia free trade agreement. On March 31, Clinton chief strategist, Mark Penn, met with Colombia's US ambassador to discuss the Colombian FTA. Penn is the CEO of the public relations and lobbying firm, Burson-Marsteller, whose polling firm, Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, has collected some \$10 million from the Clinton campaign in part to finesse her opposition to free trade in blue-collar states like Ohio and Pennsylvania. But at the same time the company had signed a \$300,000 contract last year with the Uribe government to promote Congressional approval of the Colombian FTA, among other issues. Although demoted, Penn was not dismissed from the Clinton campaign and still advises the candidate.

Bill Clinton also provides a curious counterpoint to his wife's position. It is no secret now that while Hillary speaks out against free trade Bill Clinton is an unwavering advocate of the free trade agreement. In fact in 2005, he received some \$800,000 for delivering speeches throughout Latin America to drum up support for the pact on behalf of a Bogotá-based group, Gold Service International. Ironically, at the same time that the Senate was penning its 2007 letter of concern regarding Colombia to Secretary Rice, Bill Clinton was being honoured at a dinner in New York City, with Uribe, for the former president's role in a lobbying campaign to counter the Democrats' intense scrutiny of Colombia's human rights record.

Since Hillary Clinton could not have been unaware of the contradictions implicit in these connections, they reinforce the notion that her position on free trade is based on calculation, not conviction. These circumstances also raise the suspicion that the Colombian government was interpreting her close association with three pro-free trade lobbyists as a message from the candidate not take her position too seriously. Indeed, *The Wall Street Journal* reported that a spokesman for Colombia's President Álvaro Uribe at the Colombian embassy "didn't know if Mr Penn was representing Senator Clinton or Burson-Marsteller".<sup>11</sup>

## Uribe weighs in

If the message was mixed at the Colombian embassy, Colombia's leader himself may have a clearer idea of whom to trust in the Democratic contest. Two days after Penn's meeting with the embassy officials Uribe, perhaps not coincidentally, chose to lash out publicly at Obama and his position on free trade. Moreover, his choice of words suggested concern over the prospect of an Obama presidency. He targeted the critical comments on Colombia made by Obama (which after all, echoed those of Hillary Clinton in Ohio and Pennsylvania) before representatives of the AFL-CIO in Philadelphia.<sup>12</sup> Uribe rejected the remarks as "an outrage to his country", implied Obama was uninformed, and "...deplore[d] the fact that Senator Obama, aspiring to be president of the United States, ignores the efforts of Colombia ...I think it is for political calculations that he is making a statement that does not correspond to the reality of Colombia".<sup>13</sup>

Clearly Uribe was responding not just to Obama's words on that occasion, but also to his signing of the letter last year, which pointedly criticised the Colombian government's human rights record and its ties to paramilitaries. The same letter also took Uribe to task for his outspoken remarks against the media, accusing it of "harming democracy" and being "malicious," after the media had exposed these ties.

Since the candidates' stated positions are quite similar, one may surmise that Uribe believes Obama is more likely than Clinton to make good on his rhetoric opposing the FTA and questioning Plan Colombia. Clinton's record in the Senate, the current ambiguity on Colombia evinced within her campaign staff, as well as her husband's close ties with Bogotá, may indeed be construed as adumbrating a favourable shift towards current Colombian interests should Clinton win the presidency.

<sup>11</sup> Davis, Susan, "Clinton Aide Met on Trade Deal," *The Wall Street Journal*, April 4, 2008; Page A3.

<sup>12</sup> "...I'll also oppose the Colombia Free Trade Agreement if President Bush insists on sending it to Congress because the violence against unions in Colombia would make a mockery of the very labour protections that we have insisted be included in these kinds of agreements. So you can trust me when I say that whatever trade deals we negotiate when I'm President will be good for American workers, and that they'll have strong labour and environmental protections that we'll enforce." Giordano, Al, "Uribe's Attack on Obama", *The Narco News Bulletin*, April 3, 2008

<sup>13</sup> "Como un atropello al país..." *ElTiempo.com/Economía*, 2 April 2008; "Uribe deplora..." *Otraexpresion.com*, 3 April 2008.

## Similarities give way to telling differences

The foregoing discussion of issues related to Colombia illustrates the difficulty in parsing the differences between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton on foreign policy. Similarities abound and distinctions are often subtle. In this case neither has expressed serious reservations regarding Plan Colombia and they have voted for its funding. Clinton may have felt more constrained not to critique the plan or criticise Uribe's performance more directly, given that it was her husband, Bill, who, as president in 2000, initiated Plan Colombia. He became its most prominent promoter, overriding the objections of human rights advocates and civil libertarians who deplored the state of human security in Colombia.

Both Clinton and Obama countered Republican security arguments in favour of the Colombian FTA with a reproof of Colombia's human rights record. However, their critique was not broadened to include an assessment of the effects of free trade - positive and negative - on local economies in Latin America, and its social impact, including on unionisation and wage issues, health concerns and the environment. Senators Obama and Clinton have evinced qualified support for free trade agreements in general but during the primary season both attacked NAFTA as harming US workers. During the primary campaign in Pennsylvania the two Democrats also opposed the Colombia FTA, focussing on worker rights in Colombia.

Nevertheless, shades of distinction exist between the two that allow us to glimpse differing attitudes and approaches and which hint at their future foreign policies as president. As senator and candidate, Clinton has shown less rhetorical consistency than Obama on both free trade in general and Colombia in particular. Obama's linking of human rights to a Colombian FTA is consonant with positions he took before the campaign. Clinton's criticism of the state of workers' rights in Colombia emerged only within her anti-free trade pitch to Ohio's and Pennsylvania's workers. Moreover, her advisers' efforts, including those of her husband, on behalf of the Colombian FTA, further the impression that Clinton is at the least programmatically inconsistent, if not guilty of an outright conflict of interest.

While Senator Obama was indeed rated the most liberal lawmaker in the US Senate in 2007 (Senator Clinton is ranked 16th) by the National Journal, many progressives feel he has been tardy and rather tame in setting a progressive foreign policy agenda. However, at this juncture in the campaign Obama gets the nod as having the greater potential for translating campaign positions into a progressive shift in US foreign policy. In fact, as the sidebar on the March Colombia crisis shows, Clinton has at times appeared downright hawkish. Moreover, policy consistency and rhetorical candour have not ranked highly as two of her virtues and Obama in general is more credible as a candidate evoking "change you can believe in".

The two senators' treatment of the issues surrounding US policy in Colombia have allowed us a glimpse into the distinctions between the candidates on international issues and the prospects for policy changes after 2009. The opportunity for a clearer perspective will come with an analysis of other global issues and the general election campaign this fall.

FRIDE's Comments provide a brief and concise analysis of current topics in international affairs in the fields of peace and security, democratisation, human rights, and humanitarian action and development. Further information about FRIDE, as well as its publications can be found at [www.fride.org](http://www.fride.org)

The views expressed by the authors of the documents published on this website do not necessarily reflect the opinion of FRIDE.  
If you have any comments on the articles or any other suggestions, please email us at [comments@fride.org](mailto:comments@fride.org)

Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior  
C/ Goya, 5-7 pasaje 2ª - 28001 Madrid - Telf: 91 244 47 40 - Fax: 91 244 47 41 - E-mail : [fride@fride.org](mailto:fride@fride.org)  
[www.fride.org](http://www.fride.org)