Defense and Internal Security in the Americas

Luc Capdevila, Michael Stricof

IdeAs
Idées d'Amériques

20 | 2022
Défense et sécurité intérieure dans les Amériques

Defense and Internal Security in the Americas

Luc Capdevila and Michael Stricof

Translator: Michael Stricof

Electronic version
URL: https://journals.openedition.org/ideas/13210
DOI: 10.4000/ideas.13210
ISSN: 1950-5701

This article is a translation of:
Défense et sécurité intérieure dans les Amériques - URL : https://journals.openedition.org/ideas/13209 [fr]

Other translation(s):
Defesa e segurança interna nas Américas - URL : https://journals.openedition.org/ideas/13219 [pt]
Defensa y seguridad interior en las Américas - URL : https://journals.openedition.org/ideas/14515 [es]

Publisher
Institut des Amériques

Electronic reference
Luc Capdevila and Michael Stricof, "Defense and Internal Security in the Americas", *IdeAs* [Online], 20 | 2022, Online since 01 October 2022, connection on 20 October 2022. URL: http://journals.openedition.org/ideas/13210 ; DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/ideas.13210

Defense and Internal Security in the Americas

Luc Capdevila and Michael Stricof

Translation : Michael Stricof

1 On December 2, 1823, President James Monroe declared to Europeans:

> It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied [European] powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. [...] We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

2 At the time, this expression of fraternity with the new states of the South was received with a certain enthusiasm in Latin America. Since the era of American independences, the question of defense[1] in the Western Hemisphere has developed at the intersection of international relations and inter-American affairs. In the North, Washington immediately announced that its own security required projecting power across the New World. Allowing for variation among different times and locations, the representation of defense as hemispheric in scope has been shared by other states in the Americas since the 19th century. This was a factor during the foundation of republican societies in South America, between 1862 and 1864, in reaction to the aggression of European monarchies in the Dominican Republic and in Mexico in 1861 (Sánchez Barberán M., 2020). It was also determinant in the role played by the United States in inter-American wars such as the creation of the Triple Alliance in the Southern Cone (1865-1870) and in the Pacific (1879-1884), then in the action of regional groups of contact and Pan-American diplomacy in the Chaco War (1932-1935) and the dispute between Peru and Ecuador (1941-1942) (Bignon F., 2020). Defense in the Americas—in doctrines and their implementation—has also been conceived since the 19th century at global, continental, national and local scales. While this is unsurprising for great powers and whole regions, the hemispheric dimension of defense is unique to

the Americas. It is a fact that organizes inter-American and international relations, in which asymmetrical power has created major tensions and conflicts for two centuries.

3 The other fact that characterizes the history of defense in the Americas is that it is simultaneously at the intersection of global and local scales, taking form in a structural articulation between defense and internal security. Military institutions have been a driving force of this hybridization process in Latin America since before the Second World War, bringing about the emergence of military states in the South (Rouquié A., 1980), where some armed forces are veritable "military parties" (Rouquié A., 1982). In the North, by contrast, the military has generally been represented as fundamentally separate from politics, a "professional" body that submits to civilian authority (Huntington P., 1957; Janowitz M., 1960). While it existed even before the Cold War, the imbrication between defense and internal security was theorized and institutionalized following the elaboration of the doctrine of national security in 1947, which combined external aggression with internal threats. Obviously, for a number of actors, the priority remained "national defense", founded on the designation of an identified exogenous enemy and the projection of regional power (Blasier C., 1983). Nevertheless, defense oriented towards internal security and the fight against an "internal enemy" was largely taught in military schools in Latin America and adapted to local situations, making Latin American societies a high intensity theater during the Cold War, from the Guatemalan crisis in 1954 to the Nicaraguan revolution in the 1980s (Spencer D., 2004; Brands H., 2010). Since the end of the Cold War, the fight against communism has been expanded into "wars" against drug trafficking and ordinary delinquency, then terrorism including political opposition (environmentalist militants, rural or indigenous leaders...), and spread now to the repression of migrants. The military doctrines applied to these "wars", like "low-intensity conflict", have returned to the North by the application of internal security to questions of migration and drug trafficking, leading to the militarization[2] of the US southern border (Dunn T., 1996). Despite civilian control of the military, militarism and the military economy have been criticized as a dominant force in US politics and society since the establishment of a national security state (Sherry M., 1997; Bacevich A., 2005).

4 Therefore, far from limiting our work to fields traditionally associated with defense (foreign policy, military history), these characteristics of defense in the Americas—its hemispheric nature and the focus on internal security—require us to consider society as a whole. Internal security can be used as a lens for understanding the construction of public space, urban policy, economic systems and the transformation of military and civilian institutions (Markusen A., 1991; Grajales J., 2016). These factors have unique qualities in each county and region, all while linking the whole of the Americas.

5 The articles in this issue tackle defense and internal security by studying institutions and groups, definitions of external and internal enemies and links between security and economy. The question of the relationship between politics and military forces is raised throughout, sometimes explicitly in terms of civil-military relations, or between business interests and defense. Similarly, how security is conceived or defined by political and military groups is one of the main topics of the issue. As the articles demonstrate, these relationships and links are often most evident in border areas or during periods of political upheaval or after unexpected violence brings new threats into view.

6 Close connections between the military and the political have been the norm for most of contemporary Latin American history. As Andrés Zambrano argues from a study of the evolution of national defense doctrine between 1958 and 2022, praetorianism is an integral institution in Venezuelan politics. The military's return to state control at the start of the 21st century represents not only pragmatic interests and economic privileges but also political ideals in the Venezuelan military and state.

7 Historical perspective on civil-military relations also helps clarify issues in contemporary Brazil. Adriana Barreto challenges the idea that civil elites were hostile to the military in the mid-19th century. The reorganization of the Army implemented at the end of the Regency (1831-1840) and the beginning of the Second Reign were integrated into a state project, carried out by the Conservative Party. This project sought to create a violent system of repression to quell the numerous internal revolts, to impose social and racial hierarchies and to provide labor for agriculture. The Brazilian Army was thus built in the midst of civil war, in conflicts that went down in history as rebellions, while its repression was designated by the still widely used term "pacification", originally a colonial expression for the violent repression of uprising populations.

8 The composition of the military is intrinsically a question of political identity. Studying the varying forms of mobilizing men for the Peruvian navy following the capture of the Chincha islands by the Spanish navy on April 14, 1864, Matias Sanchez Baberán shows how defense cannot be separated from socio-economic relations. The mobilization of men in this moment of crisis reflected different labor relations, which were intimately tied to political ideals.

9 Institutions designed to provide for defense and internal security are often born following the definition of new threats or an external enemy of the state. (Re)defining can create new internal competition in existing police and security architectures. As Ibrahim Bechrouri demonstrates, following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York, different agencies created new counterterrorism programs, leading to a turf war between the NYPD and the FBI. Competition and lack of communication nearly allowed for other terrorist attacks to succeed. This article both highlights an important, yet less considered institution in the fight against terrorism in the United States and suggests that new threats or political violence will create tensions as the rule, not the exception, between competing institutions with the same goals.

10 Institutions that are not officially part of the state participate in the construction of national security architectures, enforcing norms of security while potentially competing with state institutions. Cléa Fortuné's study of the privatization (and regionalization) of security on the US-Mexican border shows how spaces defined in terms of national security create opportunities for business to profit from new contracts, while subsequently contributing to the militarization of spaces defined by defense and security needs.

11 María José Rodríguez explores the link between capitalism and war. Neoliberalism, as demonstrated in the Mexican case, is shown to reflect the logic of war, with broad-spectrum violence as tools of social control and subjugation of the poor. She directly analyzes the meaning of "internal security". What constitutes security? Security for whom? How is it employed? With what objectives? In this study, institutions of securitization and violence involve more than even contractors for the national

security state and represent the full range of business and political interests in "war capitalism".

12 Economic interests do not always drive internal security policy. Identifying an external threat can redirect security requirements away from trade and investment partners. Using the example of Canada's policy shift from welcoming collaboration with China for economic ends towards ending partnerships with Huawei over security concerns, David Haglund discusses the current questioning of globalization as a panacea resolving economic and security needs. This article raises questions facing the Americas and the world, in terms of new defense and security paradigms. The post-Second World War liberal international order and the post-Cold War promise of engagement have given rise to new geoeconomic rivalries. Notably, these new defense dilemmas swing on questions of internal interests, merging external and internal security for the 21st century.

13 The links between defense and internal security have led to permanent militarization in many American states. As Charles Capela illustrates with contemporary Colombia, militarization of the Venezuelan border area has led to inequalities as crime, political and economic crises have led to a remilitarization since the post-2016 peace. These structures organized around violence may prevent other needed reforms.

14 Understanding the different groups involved in internal security, especially when clandestine repression is involved, reveals several challenges for researchers. Ongoing struggles for truth and memory, political needs to define and redefine repression and power, and the use of academic research in social and political campaigns have muddied and blended definitions. Mario Ranalletti responds to these problems by clarifying the terminology around "grupos de tareas", "task forces", "paramilitary" and "death squads" to better understand the clandestine repression campaign carried out by Argentina's dictatorship between approximately 1975 and 1983.

15 Structuring defense around identified internal enemies is not unique to the Latin American experience. Laure Gillot-Assayag's article analyzes the definition of internal enemies in the US in the middle of the Cold War. It challenges the friend/enemy dialectic in the history of the trial of Angela Davis, one of the FBI's "Most Wanted" fugitives in the 1960s and 70s.

16 The studies presented in this issue are generally set within a national or regional framework. But the parallels, the comparisons as well as the convergences most often verify the historical hemispheric singularity developed in this introduction. This issue highlights the extent to which the hybridization of national defense and internal security has led to the militarization of spaces, places, and sectors of society (Saliba F., 2022), giving the contemporary American experience a dimension that goes far beyond the hemisphere alone. This militarization of societies has been a long-term process throughout the Americas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacevich, Andrew J., *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bignon, François, *La guerre Pérou-Équateur et la nationalisation des frontières andines (1933-1942)*, thèse université Rennes 2, 2020.

Blasier, Cole, *The Giant's Rival: The USSR and Latin America*, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1983.

Brands, Hal, *Latin America's Cold War*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2010.

Dunn, Timothy J., *The Militarization of the U.S.-Mexico Border, 1978-1992: Low-Intensity Conflict Doctrine Comes Home*, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1996.

Grajales, Jacobo, *Gouverner dans la violence. Le paramilitarisme en Colombie*, Paris, Karthala, 2016.

Huntington, Samuel P., *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil- Military Relations*, New York, Vintage, 1957.

Janowitz, Morris, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1960.

Markusen, Ann, *et al.*, *The Rise of the Gunbelt: The Military Remapping of Industrial America*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1991.

Rodríguez Rejas, María José, *La norteamericanización de la seguridad en América latina*, México, Akal, 2017.

Rouquié, Alain, *Les partis militaires au Brésil*, Paris, Les Presses de Sciences Po, 1982.

Rouquié, Alain, *L'État militaire en Amérique latine*, Paris, Seuil, 1980.

Saliba, Frédéric, « Comment le président "AMLO" militarise le Mexique », *Le Monde*, Paris, 10 février 2022.

Sánchez Barberán, Matías, *Républicanisme sud-pacifique : tensions atlantiques, projets politiques Pérou, Bolivie et Chili. Années 1860*, thèse EHESS, Paris, 2020.

Sherry, Michael S., *In the Shadow of War: The United States since the 1930s*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1997.

Spencer, Daniela (coord.), *Espejos de la guerra fría: México, América Central y el Caribe*, México DF, Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2004.

NOTES

1. The CNRTL/CNRS defines defense as: “All the military means used to defend the nation’s territorial integrity and ensure the security of the population.”
2. For this issue, we use the definition of militarization provided by Michael Sherry (1997): “the process by which war and national security became consuming anxieties and provided the memories, models, and metaphors that shaped broad areas of national life.”

AUTHORS

LUC CAPDEVILA

Luc Capdevila (UMR CNRS 6051 ARENES) est professeur d'histoire contemporaine à l'université Rennes 2. Spécialiste d'histoire sociale et des représentations, ses recherches portent plus particulièrement sur les dynamiques sociales et culturelles des sociétés en guerre en Amérique latine. Il a notamment publié récemment : Una guerra total: Paraguay, 1864-1870. Ensayo de historia del tiempo presente, Buenos Aires, Sb Editorial, 2020, 512 pages [nouvelle édition dans la colección “Paraguay contemporáneo”] ; Paraguay bajo la sombra de sus guerras. Historia, memoria y construcción política, siglos XIX/XXI, Buenos Aires, SB Editorial, 2021, 276 pages.
luc.capdevila[at]univ-rennes2.fr

MICHAEL STRICOF

Michael Stricof est Maître de conférences en civilisation des États-Unis à Aix-Marseille Université. Spécialiste de l’histoire politique, ses recherches portent sur le développement des budgets militaires et le rôle de la défense dans la politique étrangère. Récemment, il a co-dirigé avec Isabelle Vagnoux, U.S. Leadership in a World of Uncertainties (Palgrave, 2022).
michael.stricof[at]univ-amu.fr